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Commonist Red Art: Blood, Bones, Utopia and Kittens

Does Red Art exist? And if so, who creates it and where can we find it? This special issue of the Leonardo Electronic Almanac addresses these questions and collates a series of perspectives and visual essays that analyze the role, if any, that Red Art plays in the contemporary art world.

Red Art, these are two simple words that can generate complex discussions and verbal feats since they align the artist to a vision of the world that is ‘Red’ or ‘Communist.’ Nevertheless, even if the two little words when placed together are controversial and filled with animus, they are necessary, if not indispensable, to understand contemporary aesthetic issues that are affecting art and how art operates in the context of social versus political power relations within an increasingly technological and socially-mediated world.

Red Art could be translated – within the contemporary hierarchical structures – as the art of the powerless versus the art of the powerful, as the art of the masses versus the art of the few, as the art of the young versus the old, as the art of the technological democrats versus the technological conservatives, as the art of the poor versus the art of the rich… Or it could be described as the art of the revolutionary versus the status quo. In the multitude of the various possible definitions, one appears to stand out for contemporary art and it is the definition of art as bottom-up participation versus art as top-down prepackaged aesthetic knowledge. And yet, what does Red Art stand for and can it be only restricted to Commonist Art?

The contemporary meaning of Red Art is different from what it may have been for example in Italy in the 1970s, since so much has changed in terms of politics, ideology and technology. It is no longer possible to directly identify Red Art with Commonist Art (as the art of the ex Unio of Soviet Socialist Republics or of its satellite states and globalized Commonist political parties which were and continue to be present in the West – albeit in edulcorated forms) nor as the art of the left, but there is a need to analyze the complexity of the diversification and otherization of multiple geopolitical perspectives.

If today’s Red Art has to redefine its structures and constructs it becomes necessary to understand who is encompassed within the label of Red Artists and what their common characteristics are. Red Artists – if we wanted to use this category – and their aesthetic production cannot be reduced to the word ‘Communist,’ borrowing passé ideological constructs. An alternative to the impasse and the ideological collapse of commonism becomes important since both terms are reflective of constructions and terminological frameworks for an understanding of both society and art that is based on ‘likes,’ actions and commitments for a common or a commune. The commitment, even when disparagingly used to define some of the participants as click-activists and armchair revolutionaries, is partial and leaves the subject able to express other likes often in contradiction with one another: e.g. I like the protests against Berlusconi’s government and I like the programs on his private TV.

I find the idea of the commons (knowledge, art, creativity, health and education) liberating, empowering and revolutionary, if only it was not expressed within its own highly regulated and hierarchical structure. It is this blind faith that has generated the martyrs of communism and heretical intellectuals, accusations from which not even Antonio Gramsci was able to escape. The vertical hierarchical structure of the commune and of the Communist Party produced heretics and imitations, but also supported artists, intellectuals, academics and writers that operated consonantly with the party’s ideals: people that sang from the same preapproved institutional hymn sheet.

Stefania: This young generation horrifies me. Having been kept for years by this state, as soon as they discover to have two neurons they pack and go to study, to work in the US and London, without giving a damn for who supported them. Oh well, they do not have any civic vocation. When I was young at the occupied faculty of literature, I oozed civic vocation. […] I have written eleven novels on civic duty and the book on the official history of the Party.

Jep Gambardella: How many certainties you have, Stefania. I do not know if I envy you or feel a sensation of disgust. […] Nobody remembers your civic vocation during your University years. Many instead of
remember, personally, another vocation of yours that was expressed at the time; but was consumed in the bathrooms of the University. You have written the official history of the Party because for years you have been the mistress of the head of the Party. Your eleven novels published by a small publishing house kept by the Party and reviewed by small newspapers close to the Party are irrelevant novels [...] the education of the children that you conduct with sacrifice every minute of your life [...]. Your children are always without you [...] then you have - to be precise - a butler, a waiter, a cook, a driver that accompanies the boys to school, three babysitters. In short, how and when is your sacrifice manifested? [...] These are your lies and your fragilities. 

To the question, then, if Red Art exists I would have to answer: YES! I have seen Red Art in Italy (as well as abroad), as the Communist Art produced in the name of the party, with party money and for party propaganda, not at all different from the same art produced in the name of right-wing parties with state or corporate money – having both adopted and co-opted the same systems and frameworks of malfeasance shared by sycophantic artists and intellectuals.

In order to understand the misery of this kind of Red Art one would have to look at the Italian aestheticization of failure – which successfully celebrates failure in the Great Beauty by Paolo Sorrentino when the character of Stefanía, and her ‘oozing civic duty,’ is ripped apart. It is a civic responsibility that is deprived and devoid of any ethics and morals. 

This is but one of the multiple meanings of the concept of Red Art – the definition of Red Art as Communist Art, is the one that can only lead to sterile definitions and autocelebratory constructs based on the ‘aesthetic obfuscation of the lack of meaning’ as a tool for the obscurity of the aesthetic to act as a producer of meaning when the artist producing it is inept at creating meaning. Even more tragically, Red Art leads to the molding of the artist as spokesperson of the party and to the reduction of the artwork, whenever successful, to advertising and propaganda.

Communist Art, founded on the whim of the ‘like’ and ‘trend,’ on the common that springs from the aggregation around an image, a phrase, a meme or a video, is able to construct something different, a convergence of opinions and actions that can be counted and weighed and that cannot be taken for granted. Could this be a Gramscian utopia of re-construction and re-fashioning of aesthetics according to ‘lower commons’ instead of high and rich ‘exclusivity,’ which as such is unattainable and can only be celebrated through diamond skulls and gold toilets?

Communist Art – the art that emerges from a common is – a celebration of a personal judgment, partially knowledgeable and mostly instinctive, perhaps manipulated – since every ‘other’ opinion is either manipulated by the media or the result of international lobby’s conspiracies or it can be no more than a reinforcement of the society of the simulacra. Conversely, it may also be that the image and its dissemination online is the representation of a personal difference towards systems of hierarchical power and endorsement that can only support ‘their own images and meanings’ in opposition to images that are consumed and exhausted through infinite possibilities of interpretation and re-dissemination. 

If Communist Art offers the most populist minimum common denominator in an evolutionary framework determined by whims, it is not at all different from the minimum common denominator of inspirational/aspirational codified aesthetics that are defined by the higher echelons of contemporary oligarchies that have increasingly blurred the boundaries of financial and aesthetic realms.

Commonist Art – if the current trends of protest will continue to affirm themselves even more strongly – will continue to defy power and will increasingly seek within global trends and its own common base viable operational structures that hierarchies will have to recognize, at one point or the other, by subsuming Communist Art within pre-approved structures.

Red Art, therefore, if intended as Commonist Art becomes the sign of public revolts, in the physical squares or on the Internet. It is art that emerges without institutional ‘approval’ and in some cases in spite of institutional obstacles. Gramsci would perhaps say that Communist Art is a redefinition of symbolic culture, folk art and traditional mageries that processed and blended through digital media and disseminated via the Internet able to build up its own languages and its own aesthetics without having to be institutionally re-processed and receive hierarchical stamps of approval.

Red Art can also be the expression of people whose blood and tears – literally – mark the post-democracies of the first part of the XXIst century. Non-political, non-party, non-believers, the crowds of the Internet rally around an argument, a sense of justice, a feeling of the future not dominated by carcinogenic politicians, intellectuals and curators, that present themselves every time, according to geographical and cultural spaces, as Sultans, Envoys of God, or even Gods.

Red Art, the Commonist Art that perhaps is worth considering as art, is the one that is self-elevated, built on the blood and bones of people still fighting in the XXIst century for justice, freedom and for a piece of bread. Art that rallies crowds’ likes and dislikes based on the whims of a liquid Internet structure where people support within their timelines an idea, a utopia, a dream or the image of a kitten.  

This piece of writing and this whole volume is dedicated to the victims of the economic and political violence since the beginning of the Great Recession and to my father; and to the hope, hard to die off, that some utopia may still be possible.

Lanfranco Aceti
Editor in Chief, Leonardo Electronic Almanac
Director, Kasa Gallery
REFERENCES AND NOTES


2. Communism was used by Andy Warhol. In this essay the word is rooted in internet ‘commons,’ although similarities, comparisons and contingencies exist with the earlier usage. “Thus Warhol’s initial preference for the term ‘Commonism’ was as ambivalent, and ambiguous, as the oscillating signs ‘Factory’ and ‘Business.’ Although it flirted with connotations of the ‘common’ with the ‘Communist’ (from cheap and low to dignity of the common man), the term betrayed no hidden, left-wing agenda on Warhol’s part.” Caroline A. Jones, Machine in the Studio: Constructing the Postwar American Artist (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 205.

3. “For one thing, utopia has now been appropriated by the entertainment industry and popular culture – what is termed the contemporary liquid utopia – as a kind of dystopia.” Anthony Elliott, The Contemporary Boum (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 17.


6. The English translation from the Italian is from the author. La Grande Bellezza, DVD, directed by Paolo Sorrentino (Artificial Eye, 2014).

7. “Anti-communism was never accepted as the moral equivalent of anti-fascism, not only by my parents but also by the overwhelming majority of liberal-minded people. The Left was still morally superior.” Nick Cohen, What’s Left? How the Left Lost its Way (London: Harper Perennial, 2007), 5. La questione morale or the ‘moral issue’ in English is the problem identified by Enrico Berlinguer and that questioned the role of the Communist party and the Left in general in Italy. The moral issue has not been resolved to this day and is at the core of the current impossibility to distinguish between the ideological frameworks of Left and Right – since both political areas are perceived as equally and intrinsically corrupt as well as tools for an oligarchic occupation of democracy. For the original interview in Italian of Enrico Berlinguer see: Eugenio Scalfari, “Intervista a Enrico Berlinguer,” La Repubblica, July 28, 1981 available in “La questione morale di Enrico Berlinguer;” Rifondazione Comunista’s website, http://web.rifondazione.it/home/index.php/la-home-page/766-la-questione-morale-di-enrico-berlinguer/ (accessed March 20, 2014).

8. “Under the surface of images, one invests bodies in depth; behind the great abstraction of exchange, there continues the meticulous, concrete training of useful forces; the circuits of communication are the supports of an accumulation and a centralization of knowledge; the play of signs defines the anchorages of power; it is not that the institution of anti-fascism, not only by my parents but also by the overwhelming majority of liberal-minded people. The Left was still morally superior.” Nick Cohen, What’s Left? How the Left Lost its Way (London: Harper Perennial, 2007), 5. La questione morale or the ‘moral issue’ in English is the problem identified by Enrico Berlinguer and that questioned the role of the Communist party and the Left in general in Italy. The moral issue has not been resolved to this day and is at the core of the current impossibility to distinguish between the ideological frameworks of Left and Right – since both political areas are perceived as equally and intrinsically corrupt as well as tools for an oligarchic occupation of democracy. For the original interview in Italian of Enrico Berlinguer see: Eugenio Scalfari, “Intervista a Enrico Berlinguer,” La Repubblica, July 28, 1981 available in “La questione morale di Enrico Berlinguer;” Rifondazione Comunista’s website, http://web.rifondazione.it/home/index.php/la-home-page/766-la-questione-morale-di-enrico-berlinguer/ (accessed March 20, 2014).


10. Non-believers stands for skeptics and does not have a religious connotation in this context.


changing the Game: Towards an ‘internet of Praxis’

There is a new spectre haunting the art world. Not surprisingly, it has been put forward in recent articles, panel discussions and books as the ‘ism’ that could, possibly, best describe the current disposi
tions of contemporary art. The name of the spectre is “post-internet art.” Unlike, however, its counter
tpart that was released in the world by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848, this contemporary spectre has not arrived in order to axiomatically change the established order of things; conceivably, it has arrived in order to support it.

Post-internet art refers to the aesthetic qualities defining today’s artistic production, which is often influenced by, mimics, or fully adopts elements of the Internet. At the same time, the term incorporates the communication tools and platforms through which contemporary artworks reach their intended (or non-intended) audiences. Notably, in his book Post Internet (2011), artist writer Gene McHugh suggests that regardless of an artist’s intentions, all artworks now find a space on the World Wide Web and, as a result, “[…] contemporary art, as a category, was/is forced, against its will, to deal with this new distribution context or at least acknowledge it.” Quite naturally, this would seem like a strong oppositional force directed against the modus operandi of the mainstream art world. Yet, further down in the same page, McHugh characterizes this acknowledgement as a constituent part of the much larger “game” that is played by commercial galleries, biennials, museums and auction houses. Thus, there are inevitable contradictions and challenges in the role that post-internet art is called to fulfill as a movement and/or as a status of cultural production. Firstly, there is an easily identifiable ‘anxiety’ to historicize a phenomenon that is very much in progress: the Internet is changing so rapidly, that if we think of the online landscape ten years ago, this would be radically different from our present experience of it. Furthermore, the post-internet theorization of contemporary art runs the danger of aestheticizing (or over-aestheticizing) a context that goes well beyond the borders of art: in the same way that we could talk about post-internet art, we could also talk about post-internet commerce, post-internet dating, post-internet travel, post-internet journalism, etc. Therefore, the role and identity of the post-internet artist are not independent of a much wider set of conditions. This false notion of autonomy is quite easy to recognize if we think, for instance, of ‘post-radio art’ or ‘post-tele
tv art’ or, even, ‘post-videogames art’; and the inherent structural and conceptual limitations of such approaches.

Most importantly, however, any kind of aestheticiza
tion may readily become a very effective tool of de
politicization. The idea of distributing images, sounds and words that merely form part of a pre-existing system of power, inescapably eradicates the political significance of distribution. The subversive potentiality inherent in the characterisation of a network as ‘distributed’ was systematically undermined over the 1990s and the 2000s, due to the ideological perva
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siveness of neoliberalism during the same period. Distribution – not to mention, equal distribution – could have enjoyed a much more prominent role as a natural fundament of the Web and, accordingly, as a contributing factor in any investigation of digital art. Last but definitely not least, one cannot ignore the crucial fact that apolitical art is much easier to enter the art market and play the ‘game’ of institutionalization (and vice versa).

To the question: could the Internet and new media at large become true ‘game changers’ in the current historical conjuncture? What does ‘red art’ have to propose, and how does it relate to the previously described ‘post-internet condition’?

Interestingly, the term “post-internet art” was born and grew parallel to the global economic crisis and the Great Recession of 2009. One the most important objectives of the social movements that were engendered by the crisis has been the effort to “reclaim” and “re-appropriate.” This aspiration referred not only to economic resources, but also to social roles, democratic functions, human rights, and – of course – urban spaces. Syntagma Square in Greece, Puerta del Sol in Madrid, Zuccotti Park in New York, as well as some of the most iconic public locations around the world saw a surge in apolitical and counter-utopian movements (Modernism). If we were to consider the Internet as a movement, then, the natural historical link that would be established through the term ‘post-internet art’ would be with net art. Nevertheless, such a decision would assign net art to a status of ‘legitimization,’ towards which major museums, curators and art fairs have shown a rather consistent hostility. In this instance, historicization becomes a foe, since it would refuse a ‘neutral’ relationship of the Web with art. This perspective is closely connected with the formation of an abstract notion of universalism, to which I refer further down (see endnote 8).

Digital art is today in a position to capitalize on the participatory potentialities that have been revealed by the socio-political events that defined the early 2010s. The reconceptualization of cyberspace as a ‘cybertopos’ is a constituent part of this new ground on which people are called to stand and build. Accordingly, the emergence of a culture of ‘post-net participation’ in which digital media transcend physical space by consolidating it (instead of ‘merely’ augmenting it), may allow us to explore “concrete utopias” to a greater extent than ever before in recent times. It is by actively pursuing this objective that we would expect to change the rules of the game. Artists are often the first to try.

Bill Balaskas
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Suggestions for Art That Could Be Called Red

What is Red Art? Or rather: what could Red Art be in today’s post-communist, post-utopian world, a world shaken by conflicts engendered by contrary beliefs and ideologies which have little to do with communism? A world in which countries and societies are disrupted by territorial disputes, and by bloody fights about questions of religious identity, national identity, and ideology? Where communism has been overrun by capitalism with rare exception; where the European left movement is weak. Where the post-industrial era has produced an economic reality that is orders of magnitude more complex, transnational and therefore more difficult to control or change, than history has ever seen. In this situation, can there (still) be art that deals with ideas of communism constructively, or does contemporary art look at communist ideals only with nostalgia?

And let’s be clear: is art that simply speaks out against capitalism, globalisation and neo-liberalism from a leftist position – is this kind of art ‘red’ per se? Do we expect Red Art to be ‘red’ in content, for instance, in directly addressing topics such as class struggle, the negatives of capitalism and a new neo-liberal world order? And if it does, is it enough to be descriptive or do we want art to be more than that, i.e., provoking, forward-thinking or even militant? In 1970, Jean-Luc Godard drafted a 39-point manifesto Que faire? What is to be done? that contrasted the antagonistic practices of making political films and making films ‘politically.’ It called unequivocally for art that actively takes up the position of the proletarian class and that aims for nothing less than the transformation of the world. With his legacy, what kind of objectives do we request from Red Art? Do we really still think that art can change the world or is that another idea from the past that has been overwritten by something that we like to call reality? Can art that is for the most part commercialised and produced in a capitalist art market be ‘red’ at all, or does it have to reject the system established by galleries, fairs and museums in order to be truly ‘red’?

Decades ago, when artists started to use new media such as video and the computer, their works were ‘new’ in the way they were produced and distributed, and changed the relationship between artists and their collaborators as well as between the artworks and their audiences and ‘users’ respectively. Most of this new-media-based art circulated outside the ordinary market and found other distribution channels. The majority of works were inspired by a quest for the ‘new’ and consistently broke with old aesthetic principles and functions. Much of it was also driven by a search for the ‘better,’ by overthrowing old hierarchies and introducing a more liberal and inclusive concept of the world, based on self-determination and active participation. Last but not least the emergence of the Internet brought us a fertile time for new and revisited utopias and artistic experiments dealing with collaboration, distribution of knowledge, shared authorship, and appropriation of technologies. Today we know that neither the Internet nor any other new technology has saved us, but that the hopes for a more democratic world and alternative economies sparked by it have come true, if only to a minor degree.

So how do artists respond to this post-communist, post-utopian condition? What can be discussed as Red Art in the recent past and present? In this issue of Leonardo we have gathered some answers to these questions in the form of papers, essays and artworks, the latter produced especially for this purpose. Bringing together and editing this issue was challenging because we decided from the start to keep the call for contributions as open as possible and to not pre-define too much. We were interested in what kind of responses our call would produce at a moment when the world is occupied with other, seemingly hotter topics, and it is fascinating to note that the resulting edition quite naturally spans decades of art production and the respective ‘new’ technologies as they related to ideas of social equality and empowerment – from video art to net art to bio art. This issue shows that the search for alternative ideas and perspectives, and an adherence to leftist ideals is neither futile nor simply nostalgic. But that this search is ever more relevant, particularly at a time when European politics is seemingly consolidating and wars around the world are establishing new regimes of social and economic inequality.

Susanne Jaschko
Why Digital Art is Red

The divide between the art shown in major museums and art fairs and that associated with the new media scene has been deep and durable. Many critics have puzzled over it, particularly because there is much that the two realms share, including the desire to put people into unusual social situations. Yet some of the reasons for the divide are plain enough, and they are about money, power and social distinction. The economic divide is across competing models of capitalist activity: the exclusive ownership of objects set against the release of reproducible symbols into networks with the ambition that they achieve maximum speed and ubiquity of circulation. The social divide is between a conservative club of super-rich collectors and patrons, and their attendant advisors, who buy their way into what they like to think of as a sophisticated cultural scene (Duchamp Land), against a realm which is closer to the mundane and more evidently compromised world of technological tools (Turing Land). Power relations are where the divide appears starkest: in one world, special individuals known as artists make exceptional objects or events, with clear boundaries that distinguish them from run-of-the-mill life; and through elite ownership and expert curation, these works are presented for the enlightenment of the rest of us. In the new media world, some ‘artists’ but also collectives and other shifting and anonymous producers offer up temporary creations onto a scene in which their works are open to copying, alteration and comment, and in which there is little possible control of context, frame or conversation.

This description of the divide has been put in extreme terms for the sake of clarity, and there are a few instances of the split appearing to erode. Yet its persistence remains one of the most striking features of the general fragmentation of the fast-growing and globalising art world. That persistence rests on solid material grounds, laid out by Marx: the clash of economic models is a clear case of the mode and relations of production coming into conflict, and is part of a much wider conflict over the legal, political and social aspects of digital culture, and its synthesis of production and reproduction. Copyright is one arena where the clash is very clear. Think of the efforts of museums to control the circulation of images and to levy copyright charges, while at the same time surrendering to the camera-phone as they abandon the attempt to forbid photography in their galleries.

So where is Red Art and the left in this scenario? Amidst the general gloom and lassitude that has beset much of the Left in Europe and the US, the development of the digital realm stands out as an extraordinary gain: it allows for the direct communication, without the intermediary of newspapers and TV, of masses of people globally – who turn out to be more egalitarian, more environmentally concerned and more seditious than the elite had bargained for. Alexander Cockburn, with his long career in activism and journalism, remarks:

Thirty years ago, to find out what was happening in Gaza, you would have to have had a decent short-wave radio, a fax machine, or access to those great newstands in Times Square and North Hollywood that carried the world’s press. Not anymore. We can get a news story from […]. Gaza or Ramallah or Qassara or Vidarbha and have it out to a world audience in a matter of hours.

It is hard to ban social media, it has been claimed, because it entwines video fads, kittens and politics (and banning kittens looks bad). So the insight attributed by some to Lenin – that capitalists will sell us the rope with which to hang them – is still relevant.

In an era in which the political and artistic avant-gardes have faded, the affiliation of the art world that is founded upon the sale and display of rare and unique objects made by a few exceptional individuals – in which high prices are driven by monopoly rent effects – tends to be with the conspicuous consumption of the state and the super-rich. Here, the slightest taint of the common desktop environment is enough to kill aesthetic feeling. The affiliation of at least some of new media art is rather to the kitsch, the populist, and to the egalitarian circulation of images and words, along with discourse and interaction. New media artists who push those attachments work against some of the deepest seated elements of the art world ethos: individualism, distinction, discreeteness and preservation for posterity (and long-term investment value). It should be no surprise that they are frequently and without qualification denied the status of ‘artist’.

It is also clear why the death of leftist ideas in elite discourse does not hold in new media circles, where the revival of thinking about the Left, Marxism and Communism is very evident. The borders of art are blurred by putting works to explicit political use (in violation of the Kantian imperative still policed in the mainstream art world). Very large numbers of people are continually making cultural interventions online, and value lies not in any particular exceptional work but in the massive flow of interaction and exchange. In that world, as it never could in a gallery, the thought may creep in that there is nothing special about any one of us. And this may lead to the greatest scandal of all: think of the statements that artists who deal with politics in the mainstream art world are obliged to make as their ticket of admission – ‘my art has no political effect.’ They have to say it, even when it is patently absurd; and they have to say it, even as the art world itself becomes more exposed to social media, and is ever less able to protect its exclusive domain and regulate the effects of its displays. So at base, the divide is economic, but at the level of what causes the repulsion from digital art – that puts collectors and critics to flight – it is deeply and incontrovertibly political. They run headlong from the red.

Julian Stallabrass
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9. 20
I live in Los Angeles. And this city is filled with millionaires. You know what’s funny, half this city is rich and the other half is poor! You live in this place where there’s billionaires right down the street from you, and yet you’re struggling just to get insurance, and struggling to pay this [and that], and there’s a billionaire right down the street! It’s so funny, but it’s true. And everybody’s like ‘the city of Angels, oh I can’t wait to go to Los Angeles.’ If they could see that there is a whole other side that is so poor – in poverty! really bad! – like little hut houses! I don’t know why that is, but I’ve seen it. And then you go to this beautiful side of Hollywood and it’s gorgeous, makes you want to cry – their bathroom is bigger than my house! And it’s like holy crap, how do you get there?

I’m going to put it to you like this: I was born in chains because of my social institutions. My mother and father they was on drugs. They sold drugs. So this is the type of environment that I grew up in, and I seen this all my life, so I thought it was normal growing up. And as I grew older, I became a product of my environment and started getting involved in the streets myself. […]

Long Story Short is a composite group interview that takes form variously as a film, an installation, and an online interactive web documentary drawn from and linked to an archive of video diaries made by 75 interviewees who reflect on poverty in America – causes, challenges, misperceptions, and solutions. Multiple frames of videos sit side by side – creating a new form of social cinema. Voices are woven together to align and intersect, suggesting that for every speaker there could be numerous others, and that many of poverty’s narratives are fundamentally shared, as are the psychological states it can produce.

Video diaries were made using webcams and laptops – the tools of amateur online video and some of the same technologies – high tech and digital – that ushered in hardships for low-skilled workers and their families in the first place, leading to a shrinking demand and lower wages for unskilled labor. The video diaries – inserted within the vernacular of social media – bare the markings of that genre: its direct address, intimacy, informality, and faces illuminated by the screen. The potential to travel across digital networks and platforms is written on their surface. While one of the potentially productive effects of networked culture has been a shift away from a focus on one voice to many, it has also produced a class of overvisible and a class of unseen – those whose data is not worth much. Long Story Short creates a missing archive, jarring expectations and making visible the limits of who we typically find speaking to us on our screens. It responds to our current moment of increasing and dramatic economic inequality, and explores how depictions of poverty might benefit from, as well as reflect on, current modes of digital and image mobility, dissemination, and display. It explores lives mostly not seen, and not often represented in public, especially not in digital form, and not on our screens. It proposes a more social media.
I call the American ghetto a prison and I even call it baby Iraq, because in our communities we get little kids running around with AK-47s – they are fifteen – killing each other. But you know I really believe that they are tears that’s coming out of them barrels. They are tears of neglect.

I agreed to do this video because it was very important to me to bring awareness to the new face of homelessness. Ladies like myself, people like myself living in wayward standards, it’s not necessarily safe out here for us. There is very little housing. I wanted to bring awareness to the fact that there’s a crisis here on our frontier, here in our country, that we need to be addressing with and dealing with – right here in our home front. There’s a new face of homelessness that is going unseen, that is not being presented. What happened to equality? Where is all of that? I don’t see it. What happened to the American dream?

You know things are not okay. Children are running around crazy because they don’t have an outlet, they’re not given an outlet; people refuse to give them an outlet. Certain things the media needs to say they’re not saying. There’s people out here struggling and they’re doing the right thing. There’s people out here that are homeless and their father’s on drugs and they’re trying to go to school but they can’t and it needs to be known. I believe the young adults who are trapped in these low-income communities – they’re in hell and they don’t have a way out.

Every story has a different side. So if you’re outside of this box of smoke, you can’t say, “Oh, we’ll turn the fan on from the north and it’ll blow it all out.” You actually got to get in there with the smoke and see what’s causing the smoke. […] A lot of the people who know the neighborhoods, and do know how to fix what’s going on in the neighborhoods, their voices do not get heard. […] Like my mom, when she had her house, she would just sit out on the porch all day after she retired her daycare, and she knew all the people walking by. She had a garden in her backyard, so she would stand how to even write a grant – ain’t been taught to us. How’s somebody gonna to know how to do something or be something if it hasn’t been taught to him? How a rich man gonna be rich unless he learned how to be rich? But if a poor man all he know how to do is be poor than he’s gonna be poor. If all he know how to do is struggle, than he’s gonna struggle. It’s like if all I know how to do is be a laborer, than I’m gonna do what I know how to do and that’s be a laborer. Ain’t gonna sit here and try to better myself to be a boss, cause I only know how to work paycheck to paycheck.
pass out fruits and vegetables to the women at the bus stop with the kids that were coming out of the elementary school right across the street. She would speak to every wino that walked by, every drug dealer, every prostitute, every person from every walk of life. She brought attention to her neighborhood. Don’t just go making a nice environment for you”, [I] explained to the people. “This is our neighborhood. Don’t go gentrifying. This is our neighborhood. We’re a part of this. Let’s make this beautiful together!”

When Occupy came to Oakland, I went downtown. You came these young black people were hanging out downtown looking for a safe place to be without being harassed by the police. They were here!” I asked Occupy to go to East Oakland and show some interest in these neighborhoods. “Don’t just go making a nice neighborhood. We’re a part of this. Let’s make this beautiful together!”

I would love for someone in political power who’s watching this to imagine being in this chair where I’m sitting right now. Imagine you have been let go from your job. You have lost your car, your family, and your house, and you’re living under the roof of a non-profit organization. Just put yourself, like I said before, in someone else’s shoes. Put yourself in this chair where I’m sitting, and imagine how you would exist and survive. And without the government, with private funding, the answer for me is no.

I’m sitting right now. Imagine you have been let go from your job. You have lost your car, your family, and your house, and you’re living under the roof of a non-profit organization. Just put yourself, like I said before, in someone else’s shoes. Put yourself in this chair where I’m sitting, and imagine how you would exist and survive. And without the government, with private funding, the answer for me is no.

When Occupy came to Oakland, I went downtown Broadway, and – I’m not bragging but I’m telling you – I went down there and I said “Occupy, before you came these young black people were hanging out downtown looking for a safe place to be without being harassed by the police. They were here!” I asked Occupy to go to East Oakland and show some interest in these neighborhoods. “Don’t just go making a nice environment for you”, [I] explained to the people. “This is our neighborhood. Don’t go gentrifying. This is our neighborhood. We’re a part of this. Let’s make this beautiful together!”


CONTRIBUTORS’ BIOGRAPHIES

Doray Atkins is from San Francisco, and was raised by her aunt and her grandmother. She was born with cerebral palsy. She is currently raising her daughter and living in transitional housing in Pasadena, trying to save money. She hopes to find an affordable place to live in a safe neighborhood with decent schools, and to go back to school.

Lolita Charne Brinston is from Oakland California. She received her high school diploma in 2004 and worked as a mail handler at the Richmond, CA post office. She left the job after a very close friend and co-worker and shortly thereafter, her boyfriend, were murdered. She recently completed an internship at The Bread Project, an organization that trains and assists low income individuals for careers in the food industry.

Michael Carter, from Louisiana, moved to Northern California at a young age, where he was abandoned by his parents. He grew up homeless on the streets of Oakland. He is currently an intern a technology company in San Francisco. He is also a member of turfing 24/7, a dance group that makes music and dance videos in areas of Oakland where friends and colleagues have been murdered. Their videos are available on YouTube.

Michael Leningr. from Long Beach, lived in Silver Lake, Los Angeles until he lost his apartment. He had been working as a facilities manager at the Pasadena Play House, but because of bad health – he is HIV positive – he began missing work and was eventually laid off. His disability payments weren’t enough to cover his rent, and now, after nearly a year of being homeless, he’s qualified for Section 8 housing, and is moving into his own apartment.

Tito McMillan is from Oakland California. He drove a tow truck for AAA for fourteen years, but work was inconsistent, so he briefly moved to Texas for a refinery job that never panned out. He’s been mostly unemployed ever since. His dream job would be to counsel young men in similar situations. He recently received his GED and is looking for work.

Joshua L. Morris III is from Oakland California. He’s been in and out of prison most of his life. He is a deacon-in-training at his church, and is studying to get his GED at the mentoring program at Next Step Learning Center in Oakland.

Lorine (Angel) Johnson is from Trenton New Jersey and lives in Oakland. She has six grown children, is a grandmother, and finally has some time for herself. She loves learning, and is back in school.

Suzette Shaw is from Yuma Arizona, a small town on the Mexican border. She worked as a human resources manager for a business processing plant, and was laid off three years ago when the company downsized. Subsequently, she lost her home and moved to Los Angeles in search for find better opportunities. She currently resides at the Downtown Women’s Center in Los Angeles.

Leslie Williams is 31 years old and a former gang member from Inglewood Los Angeles. He moved to Pasadena to get away from his previous life and turn over a new leaf. However, since leaving his lucrative lifestyle, he has become homeless. He is taking workshops and receiving some support from the Union Station Homeless Services in Pasadena.

Natalie Bookchin is from New York, and lives in Los Angeles. She is at work on Long Story Short, an experimental documentary and online archive made up of hundreds of video diaries about the experience of poverty in America, narrated, defined, and analyzed from within.

http://longstory.us
Figure 10. Screenshot from Long Story Short (in-progress). © Natalie Bookchin, 2013. Used with permission.