

MARINA GRŽINIĆ / philosopher and artist / Slovenia

Magazine Reartikulacija: www.reartikulacija.org

download Reartikulacija n.6 in pdf., that she is referring to in this interview:
http://www.reartikulacija.org/?page_id=19

In this interview we were discussing 5 concepts related to the situation of the US antimissile shield enlargement in Europe:

1_ (collective) security in the age of global capitalism (between the U.S. "protection" and its expansion / military control)

2_ global dominance - (anti-missile shield,- the quest for global dominance)

3_ disinformation - (control of discourses, lack of information and / or false arguments, mass media and power structures)

4_ democracy (how can we define it today and within this particular situation)

5_ resistance (effectiveness of the organized struggle in the age of global capitalism)

video-interview transcription

The way how you set the topics that you want to discuss, they are very complex. I made a small research, so about this security I think it is very important to understand that the whole so called defensive missile theory has to be seen on the reversal part. So this defensive politics is actually very offensive and it is not by chance that the whole idea when it started in the beginning of the 80's with Reagan, as you can find it on the Internet, was afterwards termed Star Wars. And I think that this ideological moment is something that has to be taken into account. So, it's actually offensive, ideologically motivated strategy. The relation between the offensive and defensive strategy, as it stands by the USA, is showing very clearly this process, that is a part of the neoliberal global capitalism, and this is actually a complete deregulation. This deregulation always is done in such a way that something is promoted as positive but actually in the background of this is always the policy of war; producing precisely the opposite of what is actually declared.

I think this missile complex has different roles. First is this idea of protection of the USA as being something special, a kind of "sovereignty" that is in one way deregulated, taken outside of any kind of legal system. It has to be perceived outside of any framework that might be implemented in certain European context and on the other part I want to make a connection; that this complexes that are installed all around the world are also having the function of detecting the information.

So this whole idea of having this military installations and the missile construction in the background is actually also related with the process of getting information and with the changes of global capitalism. It is very interesting that Andrew Ross already in the mid 90's argued that today, through such complexes and installations, practically, the secret service of USA and other developed European countries that are

coming from the First capitalist world, also collect data concerning the demography, maps, routes of migration, sites of hunger and practically it is a certain doctrine to prevent the war but on the other part we see that this prevention is also to take the advantage of this data and provoke the war, why? Because capitalism works constantly with deregulation. This idea of the balance between defensive and offensive policy is actually the fake one. So it works and lives in one way from getting this sensitive data and then provoking the war, because through this other so to call complexes of industry that are vital not only for USA but for Europe, especially the developed Europe, they are making an extra profit, they got works, etc. So, in one way, behind there is another or many parallel stories that has to be taken in this whole idea of defense, that is actually an offensive politics and really has to be connected with the whole logic of how the global capitalism function today.

In one way this possibility that it will be a change in the US politics is actually the fake one because the capitalism, that is today called financial capitalism, and we can see this very clearly, is in one way getting the force precisely through provoking the crisis. So this deregulation, this instability is something that is at core of functioning of global capitalism. The US system is working from this; it is getting all the profit as well as the developed first European countries, so I don't think the change is possible, because instability provoked through this deregulative and also through the process of privatization of the certain public space, public opinion and so on,- these are the tools in which USA and also capitalism function. Practically this is at its core.

I think that the whole missile complex has to be related with, and especially in Europe, the situation of relation USA-Russia. This is one of the mayor points, because though the Cold War is over, as it is said, the rivalry and also different interests regarding historical issues between USA and Russia is something that has to be all the time emphasized. So the politics that is promoted by the USA to install this in Czech Republic and Poland is related to Russia and also it is some kind of warning that came from the American part but also from the Russian part that this is the beginning of some kind of new Cold War. And we could see this definitely in the way how Russia function, for example, recently, regarding some relations between Russia and other parts of Europe.

There is one point that I would like to emphasize, saying and repeating that global capitalism function with deregulation. But also if we make this analysis or relation to financial capitalism and to the way how capitalism function nowadays it is very important to understand that today we cannot divide capitalism and reality. What I want to say is that every layer of capitalist system is actually infected by the interest of capital. So this instability, this getting profit and making profit is something that is going on, on every layer, that means that mass media are functioning hand in hand with the needs of the system. So as I tried to explain that capitalism function with this deregulative processes, disinformation is one of the mayor point.

It is not the question that nobody knows, I think the public, those who would have to be asked, they are having no clue, but capitalism, different multinationals, I think there is a clear plan of the interest. This interest is also traced in a certain future. But on the other part this is saying something very clearly, that actually the whole idea of the public does not exist anymore. In one way the public voice, being one of the important points of capitalism, today it is very clear, also historically, that it was always controlled and that the public opinion was asked when it was not actually

important. But today because of this process nobody asks the public what is in fact their point of view. And as well when there is a big demonstration and big conflicts, all of this things, are completely canalized, especially today, in such a way that this is not taken seriously and also you can see that the public is completely powerless.

I would like to talk about democracy making a reference to the newspaper that we are publishing. It is called Reartikulacija, in terms of rearticulating the state of things in relation to capitalism and reality. I think only in such a way it is possible to understand, and in this last number, number 6, there is a very interesting text by theoretician from Kosovo, called Agon Hamza, who emphasizes precisely the question of democracy. I think that this defense policy is in fact, as well as the whole idea of intervention through missile complexes in different parts of Europe, an act of the certain outside, the certain policy that is brought in, for example, in European space. And it is interesting that similarly it is possible to think about the situation in Kosovo, because what is missing in this and as well showing the situation, is precisely that the public opinion is not asked for, so to call, opinion in such policy, and what is missing is a possibility for a self determination. Why? Because it is more and more becoming clear that the certain way of thinking exists and it is all the time just imposing from the outside a certain future, but nobody is asked to explain or to say or to put clearly what is truly the status, for example, the public opinion in Czech Republic or Poland.

And the same situation, as explained by Agon Hamza, is in Kosovo. So we can connect this situations and he said that in Kosovo, practically, it is a democracy that is given, but this democracy is just imposed from the outside, it is a kind of interventional politics, but nobody, the people there were not asked to self-determinate what they actually want. But they were just said, Kosovo is a special case, like it is possible to say for Czech and Poland, and there it is necessary just to bring from the outside and to impose the politics of intervention.

In a certain way I think it is important to understand that the position of Czech Republic and Poland cannot be seen outside of European Union. And as well the whole policy of constitution of European Union, as a some kind of extra territory, an exceptional territory, is connected with this process.

And the question of resistance is again connected with, why actually the European Union was formed; the idea of joining the forces, making a new extra place of exchange, that started already 50 years ago, in 1958, shows clearly that the politics was not the first point, but the first point was actually the global market. It happened because of strictly and firstly economical reasons.

So, the resistance is already monitored and organized through the whole way of how the European Union is, in one way, produced. Because it is not just about this case, it is historically speaking. So resistance, I think, first has to be seen only as a political measure, but as we can think, we don't see any politics, not politics by this national states, but not even a certain politics of resistance or politics of the future in the realm of the whole Europe Union.

So the effect of this is some kind of post ideological, emptied space, a space where all about is to have a free market, to produce profit, and also with the law and many other measures to stop any resistance. So with one word I think that the resistance, that is the most important point is almost, at this point, put to shut up, and it's also the

question if in the future it's possible to organize anything that will be, one of the things that I see, it's just to break the processes of just going into a public space, behave as a certain codified way, because it's obvious that the public is already not existing anymore, and all what is given by the capitalist system for the legal resistance, is something that is pasified and it is already made in such a way that it will not work anyway.

So I think it is necessary to think of other formats of resistance, that I think is difficult, because the capitalism function from the deregulation, actually is changing more and more from a certain biopolitics to a necropolitics, what I want to say, we had a feeling that it is about life, to have a better life, to have security, but actually, may be, it's time to start to think that it is not about the good life, it's only the good life for capital, but for all the others is actually almost a question of just making profit from death, and that means what? Death not only in the physical mean, but death of any public opinion, of any kind of resistance, and looking outside of Europe , actually, we see death just on the other continent.

*HIT-TO-KILL (2009); written, directed and edited by Tjaša Kancler; camera by Roberto Gant; sound/music by Bronislaw Szalanski; web programming by Pau Artigas; <http://www.p-a-r-a-d-i-g-m-a.net/> & <http://www.hit-to-kill.net/>

www.hit-to-kill.net