



BOREC 721–723, LXVII/2015

AVTORSKI IZVLEČKI  
★  
AUTHORS' ABSTRACTS



PRIMOŽ KRAŠOVEC

## RASIZEM, ODVEČNOST, BEGUNSTVO

Članek razčlenjuje rasizem z vidika razmerij med rasizmom in ideologijo, kapitalizmom, državo ter Evropsko unijo. Izhodiščna teza tega članka je, da sodobni evropski rasizem ni stvar osebne psihologije ali predsodkov, temveč določene institucionalne ureditve ter segregacijskih in nasilnih družbenih procesov. Rasistični diskurzi in ideologije niso drugotni odsev bolj »resničnih« ali »materialnih« družbenih procesov, temveč so pomemben del rasizma kot družbene prakse. Nikakor niso manj resnični ali manj materialni, kot so pridrževanje beguncev, izgoni, odrekanje političnih pravic ali onemogočanje dostopa do socialnih institucij, omejevanje svobode gibanja itn. Vse naštete sistemskorasistične prakse so večinoma tudi diskurzivne, kar pomeni, da ne gre (le) za to, da bi določene prakse producirale določene diskurze *ex post* (denimo v primeru medijskih poročil o »begunskih valovih« ali »begunskih krizah«), temveč so tudi same večinoma sestavljene iz produkcije specializiranih, strokovnih rasističnih diskurzov s področij kriminologije, sociologije, urbanizma, ekonomije, prava itn. ter odvisne od te produkcije.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *rasizem, begunstvo, država, rasistični diskurz, Evropska unija.*

PRIMOŽ KRAŠOVEC

## RACISM, DISPENSABLENESS, REFUGEEISM

The article deals with racism, it analysis the relations between racism and ideology, capitalism, state, and the European Union. Author's key thesis derives from his argument that the contemporary European racism is not a matter of a personal psychology or prejudices, but rather of the institutional order as well as of segregative and violent social processes. Racist discourses and ideologies are not a secondary reflection of more "real" or more "material" social processes. They are an important part of racism in terms of social praxis. For example, they are as material and as real as is retention or expulsion of refugees, or violation of their political rights, deprivation of social institutes and freedom of movement, etc. All these systemic racial practices are mostly discursive in their nature, which means that they do not produce such discourses *ex post* (for example, in case of media reports on "refugees waves" or "refugee crises"), but rather *ex ante* – they themselves derive from the production of specialised, professional racialised discourses from the fields of criminology, sociology, urbanism, economy, law etc.; they depend on this production.

KEYWORDS: *racism, refugeeism, state, racialised discourses, European Union.*

## ETNICIZEM PO NACIONALIZMU: KORENINE NOVE EVROPSKE DESNICE

Zamešati ali zanemariti razliko med nacionalizmom in etnicizmom je ena od glavnih zablod sodobne levice, slepota, ki lahko naznanja nove poraze. Buržoazni nacionalizem je bil utemeljen na državi, ki je vsaj na abstraktni ravni priznavala državljansko enakost, in na strastni politični participaciji, ki so jo oblikovale velike množične stranke in odkriti razredni boji, na državljanskih vojskah (vpoklic ali nacionalna vojaška obveznost), splošni osnovni izobrazbi, pismenosti, ljudskem tisku, medrazredni solidarnosti (državljanski patriotizem), ustavnih zagotovilih in močno reguliranim svobodnem trgu, javni higieni, sekularnosti ipd. Temelj vsega tega je bila hipoteza, da ni nobenih naravnih ovir med državljani, da se da ljudi tujega izvora asimilirati in povzdigniti v zameno za brezpogojno lojalnost, vključno s kulturno lojalnostjo nacionalni državi in hegemoni zgodovinski identiteti, ki jo je oblikovala »napredna« in domoljubna inteligenca, običajno iz vrst vladajoče etnične skupine. Ta nacionalizem je v začetku 20. stoletja postal konzervativen, toda večji del svoje zgodovinske kariere je imel – ko je čistil pot kapitalizmu – emancipacijske funkcije, zlasti ko je nasprotoval arbitrarni vladavini monarhov (npr. leta 1848). Toda nacionalizem je mrtev. Izginotje tega svetovnozgodovinskega tekmeca pomeni, da reči, ki so vzete kot samoumevne, kot sta vladavina prava in liberalni nacionalizem, niso nujno sestavni deli modernega kapitalizma, kot je prepričljivo pokazal fašizem. Tega je premagalo neverjetno zavezništvo liberalnega imperializma in sovjetskega »socializma« (planskega, egalitarnega, državnega kapitalizma, ki so ga vodili kadri iz delavskega razreda). Fašizem je prisilil Sovjetsko zvezo, da je postala nacionalistična in sklenila mir z zahodnim liberalnim imperializmom. Toda zmagoviti Sovjetska zveza in pozneje Ljudska republika Kitajska sta, prvič, prisilili Zahod, da je postal egalitarnejši in da je na območjih, kot sta Italija in Francija, kolikor toliko ugodil proletarskemu nasprotniku, in drugič, da se je odpovedal kolonialnemu imperiju. To je bil agonističen in antagonističen svetovni sistem, verjetno najbolj »demokratičen« v svetovni zgodovini. Ta bipolarni sistem se je leta 1989 končal ter z njim klasični nacionalizem. Etnicizem pa je rezultat razpada poznega kapitalizma brez obeta alternative. Stara desnica je zagovarjala red, disciplino, ubogljivost, čast in podrejanje. Etnicizem je kaos. Lahko se uporabi za smotre tiranske dominacije – in tako ga v tem trenutku uporablja skrajna desnica v Evropi –, toda ker je apolitičen, je tudi destruktiven. V odsotnosti emancipacijske alternative dekadentnemu kapitalizmu je morda uvertura v kolaps, v katerega pelje globalna kontrarevolucija.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *nacionalizem, etnicizem, fašizem, nova evropska desnica.*

GÁSPÁR MIKLÓS TAMÁS

## ETHNICISM AFTER NATIONALISM: THE ROOTS OF THE NEW EUROPEAN RIGHT

Confusing or conflating nationalism with ethnicism is one of the major failings of the contemporary left, a blindness that may herald new defeats. Bourgeois nationalism was based on state recognizing, at least in the abstract, civic equality, and on passionate political participation shaped by huge mass parties and open class struggles, on citizens' armies (the draft or national service), on general elementary education, literacy, the popular press, on cross-class solidarity (civic patriotism), on constitutional guarantees and a well-regulated free market, on public hygiene, secularism etc. The foundation for all this has been the hypothesis that there are no natural barriers between citizens, that people of foreign extraction could be assimilated and elevated in exchange for unconditional loyalty fashioned by the progressive and patriotic clerisy drawn usually from the the dominant ethnic group. This nationalism had become conservative at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but through most of its historical career – clearing the way before capitalism – had its liberating functions, particularly when it was opposing arbitrary rule by monarchs (e.g. in 1848). But nationalism is dead. The disappearance of this world-historical competitor means that things taken for granted, like the rule of law and liberal nationalism, are not necessary components of modern capitalism, as fascism has convincingly demonstrated. But fascism was defeated by an unbelievable alliance of liberal imperialism and Soviet 'socialism' (planned, egalitarian state capitalism led by working-class cadres). Fascism forced the Soviet Union to become nationalist and to make its peace with western liberal imperialism. But he victorious SU and, later, the People's Republic of China, on the one hand, coerced the West to become more egalitarian and to accommodate, up to a point, the proletarian adversary in places like Italy and France and, on the other, to renounce its colonial empire. It was an agonistic and antagonistic world system, probably the most 'democratic' in world history. This bipolar system ended in 1989 and, with it, classical nationalism. Ethnicism, on the other hand, is the result of the dissolution of late capitalism without the benefit of an alternative. The old right stood for order, discipline, obedience, honour and deference. Ethnicism is chaos. It may be used perhaps for the purposes of tyrannical domination – it is so used at the moment by the extreme right in Europe – but as it is apolitical, it is also destructive. In the absence of an emancipatory alternative to decadent capitalism, it might be an overture to collapse and global counter-revolution.

KEYWORDS: *nationalism, ethnicism, fascism, the new European right.*

BENNO TESCHKE

## BURŽOAZNA REVOLUCIJA, DRŽAVNA FORMACIJA IN ODSOTNOST MEDNARODNEGA

Mednarodni odnosi vedno oblikujejo vidik družbene dinamike, ki vanjo vpete družbe obvladuje od zunaj in od znotraj. Razčlenili bomo vprašanje, ali velja tudi obratno: je notranja družbena dinamika vedno že vpeta v mednarodne odnose? Kritično bomo razdelali klasično marksistično razumevanje buržoaznih revolucij in državne formacije. S temi implikacijami se bo moral marksizem šele resno soočiti. Zastavljajo nam namreč splošno vprašanje o tem, koliko je marksizmu uspelo vključiti vlogo intelektualnega v lastno intelektualno samoopredelitev – tako teoretsko, v smislu osnovne terminologije, kot historiografsko, v smislu stopnje, po kateri mednarodno ni pojmovano preprosto kot derivat domačih teženj, ampak kot bistvena sestavina za splošno rekonstrukcijo zgodovinskega toka. Trdim, da je prav odsotnost mednarodnega razlog za mnoge probleme sodobne marksistične analize buržoaznih revolucij in državnih formacij. To bom utemeljil v štirih korakih: z očrtom ortodoksnomarksističnega pojma buržoazne revolucije; s pozicijo političnega marksizma o angleški in francoski revoluciji, in sicer v povezavi z razpravami Roberta Brennerja, Ellen M. Wood in Georgea Comninelja; s prikazom mednarodne razsežnosti (na primeru angleško-francoske zgodovine), ki je postala konstitutivna za družbeno dinamiko prvih modernih revolucij ter razvojne trajektorije državnosti; ter z orisom teoretskega izziva za marksizem, pri čemer bom predlagal ponovno branje političnega marksizma, ki bo omogočalo razumevanje geopolitično posredovanega ter regionalno časovno-prostorsko diferenciranega razvoja Evrope kot celote.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *mednarodni odnosi, buržoazna revolucija, država, politični marksizem.*

BENNO TESCHKE

## BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION, STATE FORMATION AND THE ABSENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL

International relations always form an aspect of the social dynamics that prevail inside and across societies. The question, which I pose here, is whether the inverse also applies. Are the social dynamics inside societies also always bound up with international relations? The conclusions have critical implications for the classical-Marxist understanding of bourgeois revolutions and state formation – implications with which Marxism has yet to fully come to terms. They raise the wider question of the degree to which Marxism has incorporated the role of the international into its own intellectual self-definition – both theoretically, in terms of its core vocabulary, and historiographically, in terms of the degree to which the international is not simply conceptualised as derivative of domestic trends, but an essential component in the overall reconstruction of the course of history. I argue here that it is the absence of the international which accounts for many of the problems in contemporary Marxist thought about bourgeois revolutions and state formation. I shall substantiate this claim in four steps: by outlining the orthodox-Marxist notion of ‘bourgeois revolution’; by introducing the position of ‘political Marxism’ – the literature associated with the work of Robert Brenner, Ellen M. Wood, and George Comninel; by showing (with reference to early-modern Anglo-French history) how ‘the international’ enters as a constitutive moment into the social dynamics of early-modern revolutions and the developmental trajectories of state formation; and by outlining the theoretical challenge this poses to Marxism. I shall suggest here a re-reading of political Marxism that is capable of comprehending the regionally spatio-temporally differentiated and geopolitically mediated development of Europe as a whole.

KEYWORDS: *international relations, bourgeois revolution, state, political Marxism.*

ISHAY LANDA

## FAŠIZEM KOT PRESKUSNI KAMEN NAPREDKA?

Napredek in civilizacija lahko zmagata ali ne, gotovo pa nista le mit ali iluzija. Napredek, kakor ga bom poskusil opredeliti, je obstajal. Kolikor še obstaja in ali ima prihodnost, je stvar razprave. Zagotovo pa ima preteklost. Če je propadel, ni propadel zato, ker bi bil iluzija, temveč ker so ga napadli močni in zagrizeni sovražniki. Trditi, da je resnica napredka fašizem, pomeni zanikati, da je resnica fašizma pretežno v nasprotju z napredkom. To ni le trivialen zgodovinski spor, ki bi zanimal samo učenjake. Verjamem, da ima ta ugotovitev pomembne posledice za sedANJI zgodovinski trenutek. Razumevanje napredka kot velikanskega družbenega projekta, ki so ga fašisti želeli sabotirati, pomeni, da obstaja nekaj, kar lahko branimo ali morda raje obnovimo, kakor pa da bi napredek in povezane pojme, denimo razsvetljenstvo ali civilizacijo, zavrgli kot izmisleke in prevare. Ne gre za to, ali smo za ali proti revolucionarni spremembi, temveč za to, da prepoznamo cilj pristne revolucije. Ali gre res za razbitje vsakdanjega življenja? Prepričan sem, da je za večino ljudi revolucija prej nujna za *obrambo* vsakdana, za osvoboditev ljudi od strahu pred vojno, krizami in vratolomno konkurenco. Če brez nadaljnje enačimo kapitalizem z normalnim življenjem, delamo veliko napako; vlogo kapitalizma bi morali analizirati kot *temeljno grožnjo* normalnemu življenju.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *civilizacija, razsvetljenstvo, napredek, kapitalizem, revolucija.*



ISHAY LANDA

## PROGRESS AND FASCISM: THE PROOF OF THE PUDDING?

Progress and civilization may or may not carry the day, but they are certainly not simply 'myths' or 'illusions.' Progress had *existed* – understood in the terms which I attempted to identify. Whether it still exists at the present, or whether it has a future, is open to debate. But it certainly has *a past*. And if indeed progress had collapsed, it didn't do so because it was an illusion but because it was assaulted by powerful and zealous enemies. To claim that the truth of progress is somehow fascism is to deny that the truth of fascism was largely its *opposition to progress*. This is not a historical quibble, of a merely scholarly interest. This realization I believe has some important implications for the present historical time. Understanding progress as an enormous *social project* that the fascists aimed to sabotage, means that there is something to defend or maybe renew. Rather than simply discard progress and interrelated concepts such as enlightenment or civilization as so many chimeras or deceptions. Identifying capitalism without further ado with everyday life is a big mistake: we should analyse the role of capitalism as *a fundamental threat* to everyday life. The question here is not whether to affirm or reject revolutionary change, but rather to identify the goal of a genuine revolution. Is it to indeed smash everyday life? I would argue that, for most people, a revolution is needed rather to *protect* the everyday, to free people from of the fear of war, and crisis, and breakneck competition.

KEYWORDS: *civilization, Enlightenment, progress, capitalism, revolution.*

MARTIN HERGOUTH

## KAJ NAM LAHKO HEGEL POVE O TOTALITARIZMU?

V prispevku smo uporabili Heglovo kritiko francoske revolucije in jo brali kot odprtje novega horizonta politike (in nasploh družbene dinamike) modernosti. Slednjega v prvi vrsti opredeljuje razsežnost občosti oziroma napetost med občostjo posameznika in njegovo zasebnostjo. Francoska revolucija označuje mesto prvega vznika in prvega prikaza omejitev tega modernega principa. Hegel je proizvedel koherentno kritiko, katere območje veljavnosti v resnici ni omejeno zgolj na zgodovinski moment francoske revolucije, temveč se razteza čez celotno politično modernost, lahko je splošni model za razmišljanje o napetosti znotraj katerega koli progresivnega (tj. levega) političnega projekta, vključno s socialističnimi. Namreč, ti vedno vključujejo moment oziroma vsaj težnjo po vzpostavitvi enotnega, v celoti samodoločujočega se političnega subjekta, in na drugi strani se vedno soočajo s težavami, kako s te točke preiti k diferenciaciji, ki jo zahteva stabilno delovanje. Ključno je, da se prav v tem skriva odločilna razlika, ki Heglovo kritiko izrazito ločuje od sheme, ki nam jo ponuja liberalna kritika totalitarizma.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *totalitarizem, modernost, francoska revolucija, politični subjekt, G. W. F. Hegel.*

MARTIN HERGOUTH

## WHAT CAN HEGEL TELL US ABOUT TOTALITARIANISM?

The author uses Hegel's critique of the French revolution in order to open a new horizon of the politics of modernity (as well as of its social dynamics in general). A key feature of this horizon is the dimension of universality, that is, a tension between the universality of an individual and his/her private life. The French revolution is a place of the first emergency and presentation of the limitations of this modern principle. Hegel elaborated a coherent critique, which can be applied on the whole domain of political modernity – we can use it as a general model of how to think a tension within any progressive (leftist) political project, including the socialist one. Namely, an inherent feature (or at least a tendency) of all such projects is a constitution of the unifying, self-determined political subject on one hand and a confrontation with the way of how to move from the point of unification to the differentiation which is necessary for any stable agency on the other. It is crucial here that precisely this point of transition reveals a decisive distinction between Hegel's critique and the liberal critique of totalitarianism.

KEYWORDS: *totalitarianism, modernity, French revolution, political subject, G.W.F. Hegel.*

ANŽE DOLINAR

## LOGIKA IZKLJUČITVE IN NJENI »SOVRAŽNIKI«

Članek s protipostavitvijo fašističnih in liberalnih teoretikov razčlenjuje skupne predpostavke obeh miselnih tradicij, zlasti izključitev političnega subjekta iz območja relevantnega družbenega delovanja. Obravnava tudi razdor v liberalnem taboru, ki naj bi bistveno ločil ekonomski in politični liberalizem, sklene pa se z eksplikacijo logike izključitve kot konstitutivnega momenta neoliberalizma.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *liberalizem, fašizem, logika izključitve, država, neoliberalizem.*

ANŽE DOLINAR

## THE LOGIC OF EXCLUSION AND ITS "ENEMIES"

By juxtaposing fascist and liberal theoreticians, the author analyses their common platforms, especially the exclusion of the political subject from the field of meaningful social engagement and political action. It further deals with the rift in the liberal camp, out of which emerges the split between the economic and political liberalism. Lastly, the author explicates the logic of exclusion as a constitutive moment of neoliberalism.

KEYWORDS: *liberalism, fascism, the logic of exclusion, state, neoliberalism.*

TIBOR RUTAR

## DRŽAVA, MEDDRŽAVNI SISTEM IN KAPITALIZEM: RAZLIČNI PRISTOPI

Članek je razdeljen na dva splošna dela. V prvem delu kritično razčlenjujem tri Marxove teorije države, pri čemer se posebej podrobno lotim njegove zadnje, zrele teorije države v navezavi na njegovo kritiko politične ekonomije. V drugem delu na kratko predstavim in kritiziram dva konvencionalna pristopa k proučevanju odnosa med vznikom meddržavnega sistema in kapitalizmom: klasičnomarksističnega in neoweberovskega. Nato predlagam, da se tega vprašanja lotimo na drugačen, a še vedno razločno marksistični način.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *teorije države, lastninski odnosi, meddržavni sistem, Karl Marx, Max Weber.*

TIBOR RUTAR

## STATE, INTERSTATE SYSTEM AND CAPITALISM: DIFFERENT APPROACHES

The article consists of two parts, both general in their nature. The first part provides a critical analysis of Marx's three theories of state, focusing primarily on his last more mature theory of state, which it combines with his critique of political economy. The second part provides a short overview and a brief critique of two conventional approaches towards the examination of the relationship between the emergence of interstate system and capitalism, that is, the classical Marxian and the neo-Weberian approach. I introduce the idea that this issue requires altogether a completely different approach, but the kind that still retains the distinct elements of the Marxist methodology.

KEYWORDS: *theory of state, ownership, interstate system, Karl Marx, Max Weber.*

SAMI KHATIB

## ESTETIZACIJA POLITIKE: PONOVRNO BRANJE BENJAMINOVE TEORIJE FAŠIZMA

Dolgo časa je bila Benjaminova kritika fašizma povzeta s tole formulo: estetizaciji politike komunizem odgovarja s politizacijo umetnosti. Manj znani pri tej pretirano citirani formuli pa je argument, s katerim je Benjamin orisal sklepni zev med politizacijo in estetizacijo. Vse od šestdesetih let 20. stoletja so generacije akademskih proučevalcev Benjaminina, umetnostnih teoretikov, levičarjev in antifašistov poskušale osmisliti ta zev. V tem spisu se ne bom posvečal temu, kaj bi politizacija umetnosti lahko pomenila danes in koliko sodobni kapitalizem uresničuje to zahtevo v perverzni obliki, v sferi tako imenovanega nematerialnega dela. Posvetil se bom estetizaciji politike in vprašanju, kako ta formula prispeva k teoriji zgodovinskih in sodobnih oblik fašizma.

Fašizem na splošno lahko uokvirimo kot izraz navideznega upora proti kapitalizmu, kajti gre za ohranitev prevlade kapitalizma. Vsako normativno pojmovanje liberalnega kapitalizma, ki temelji na ločitvi med tem, kaj je vladavina in kaj njena izjema, nujno zgreši značaj fašizma. Ko rečem, da je kapitalizem nujni, a še ne zadostni pogoj fašizma, ne ustvarjam reduktivnega vulgarnomaterialističnega razpravljanja o zgodovinski vzročnosti, temveč skoraj kantovsko trdim, da je kapitalizem zgodovinski pogoj za možnost fašizma, ki šele omogoča razpravljanje o zgodovinski vzročnosti. Še enkrat, šele kritično pojmovanje kapitalistične kontinuitete nam omogoča nereduktivno in neidealistično pojmovanje fašistične motnje kapitalizma – posega, ki teži k ohranitvi kapitalistične kontinuitete za vsako ceno.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: *teorije fašizma, estetizacija, politizacija, Walter Benjamin.*

SAMI KHATIB

## THE AESTHETICIZATION OF POLITICS: REREADING BENJAMIN'S THEORY OF FASCISM

For a long time, Benjamin's criticism of fascism has been summarized along the lines of this formula: to the aestheticization of politics communism answers with the politicization of art. What is less known about this over-cited formula is the argument from which Benjamin draws the concluding chiasmus of politicization versus aestheticization. Ever since the 1960s, generations of Benjamin scholars, art theorists, leftists and antifascists have tried to make sense of this chiasmus. In this paper, I will not focus on what the politicization of art could mean today and to what extent contemporary capitalism has fulfilled this demand in a perverted way in the domain of so-called immaterial labour. Rather, I will only concentrate on the aestheticization of politics and how this formula contributes to a theory of historical and contemporary forms of fascism.

Generally, fascism can be framed as the articulation of a pseudo-rebellion against capitalism in order to keep capitalism in power. Any normative concept of liberal capitalism, based on the discrimination between what is the rule and what is its exception, necessarily misses the character of fascism. If I say capitalism is the necessary, yet non-sufficient condition of fascism, I do not make a reductive vulgar-materialist argument concerning historical causation. Rather, in almost Kantian fashion, I claim that capitalism is the historical condition of possibility of fascism, allowing, in the first place, for arguments concerning historical causality. Again, it is only our critical notion of capitalist continuity that allows for a non-reductive and non-idealist concept of capitalism's fascist interruption – an interruption aimed at preserving capitalist continuity by all means.

KEYWORDS: *theories of fascism, aestheticization, politicization, Walter Benjamin.*



