In the following paper I would like to bring to light two main themes. First, some selected video-film works produced in different contexts in order to explore some strategies of visualization that I term as ‘queer positioning’ and that are as queer coming to the idea of ex-centricity, or expulsion out of the center, producing a situation of imbalance as well as one of eccentricity, understood here in the most literal way. In the second part I would like to rethink the space of Europe in terms of a new Europe and its relation to bio-politics and Being (what Derrida named “we and our life”).

**Part One: Queer**

What does queer mean? Queer means to rethink the question of identity in such a way as to dissociate it from the clear dichotomy between man and woman or between gender and sex. Etymologically speaking queer means something wrong, or simply, something that is going the opposite way, or is distorted. Queer traverses, passes in a diagonal way through terms and concepts, positions and attitudes, that in the past existed only and solely as opposites. Queer is not simply about being gay or lesbian, although gay and lesbian can be queer, but what is impor-
Queer is ‘that’ something in-between gender and sex, that allows us to say that something it is not quite right, neither woman nor man, and that connects both toward a radical positioning of life and the medium, art and culture. Seen through a queer perspective the answer to what is political, what is male and what is female, is troubling many histories and many places.

What is the idea of femininity, or phrased slightly differently, what is the story of identity? For women and men, the masquerade is crucially important. Both identities are in relation with unfulfillment, castration and loss, although these identities are not, under any circumstances symmetrical. A one-dimensional identity of woman does not exist, for her the function of veiling, of the appearance and semblance (maybe symbolizing a phallus) is crucial. In the video film ‘Boygirl’ by Aurora Reinhard, 12.00 min, Finland, 2002 (awarded by the International Media Art Award 2002, ZKM and SWR Baden-Baden, Germany), we listen about the life of persons on the screen, whilst looking at their faces. While we expect from the visual introduction, that these persons are men, the shock is produced by the fact that they are all women. The general public around these girls detects the same shock. They are shocked. They even ‘flip-out’ (as said in the video, by one of the interviewed woman), when they realize, looking at them, for example, in the swimming pool, that where they expected to see something on their bodies there is –
nothing. Instead of the penis, there is – nothing. Even more, this is precisely the primal scene of fetishism that clearly shows to us that under such a semblance or appearance is – nothing.

The point of reversal is the visually formal “strange and bizarre” approach that contradicts the level of narration. From the first point on within this narrative “documentary style” text narration a very precise set of visual “disturbances” (or queer interventions) are added. They in-
We were expecting “too little” from this supposedly stereotypical documentary narration, but in the end we get “too much”. A story based on codes of complete arbitrariness. The story about the documentary that turns into fiction, or fake (and vice versa), is carefully constructed in the video from the very first moment, yet we cannot grasp it from the seemingly very pure and honest beginning. In this video it is shown clearly that the gaze (contrary to the eye) is coming from the outside, emanating from the field of the other. The feeling that emanates from this work was that named by Freud as ‘das Unheimliche’; the frightening feeling of something that we already known, something familiar, that we have known from before, but which constantly retains an odd strangeness.

The video by Walid Ra’ad can be seen in such a context as a pure radical travesty (if we think about ‘Boygirl’, as being the one with a homosexual narrative), and as a work of complete arbitrariness. Ra’ad’s work is therefore a kind of reversed symmetry in hysterical view. With its travesty we can think about Ra’ad’s video plot also as a farce, while ‘Boygirl’ is inscribed within the realm of tragedy.
и како фарса, додека „Момчедевојка“ е впишан во доменот на трагедијата.

Уште повеќе, „Заложник: Лентите на Бахар“ може да се смета и за најприцизен судир помеѓу егзистенцијална приказна која претендира да биде документ, и апсолутно анти-документаристичкиот визуелен пристап во ова дело на формално визуелно ниво. Во делото на Ра‘ад се соочуваме со мизансценот на појавата во мас-медиумите. Тука документирањето, опишуването и уредувањето изгледа како чиста надворешност. Но, моќта на мас-медиумите се состои токму во ова, и тоа е исто така моќта на делото на Ра‘ад. Резултатот е „извртен“ приказна која е не баш, и не сосема во рамнотежа со вистината и лагата.

Затоа, „извртеното“ не треба да се поставува само преку различни сексуални практики и родови улоги, туку за него мораме исто така да размислим и во врска со политичкото расткажување приказни или заземајќи ја позицијата која Хоми Баба (Homi Bhabha) ја опишал како не-сосем/не-баш (not-quite/not-right). „Вака изгледа демократијата!“ на Оливер Рessler (Oliver Ressler), 30 мин, Австрија (исто награден на International Media Art Awards, ZKM и SWR Baden-Baden, Германија) ги документира првите австриски анти-глобалистички демонстрации по повод Светскиот економски форум одржан на 1-ви јули 2002 во Салцбург. Анти-капиталистичките демонстранти против Светскиот економски форум (приватна организација за лобирање со огромен капитал) во Салцбург биле брутално третирани од страна на австриската полиција: 900 демонстранти биле опколени и држени од полицијата на отворено во градот Салцбург повеќе од седум часа. Филмот се состои од визуелен материјал од демонстрациите, монтиран и преклопуван со додатни осврти на настаните во Салцбург од страна на шест демон-

‘Hostage: The Bachar Tapes’ may also be regarded as the most precise clash between an existential story pretending to be a documentary and the absolutely anti-documentary’s visual approach present in this work on the formal visual level. In Ra‘ad’s work we are confronted with the mis en scene of appearance in the mass media. Their documentations, descriptions and editing seem to be purely cosmetic and for appearance. But this is exactly what the power of the mass media consists of, and also the power of the video work by Ra‘ad. The result is a queer story not right and not quite in balance with truth and falsity.

Queer is not only therefore to be seen through different sexual practices and gender roles, but it has to be rethought of also in connection with a political story telling or taking a position that Homi Bhabha described as not-quite/not-right. ‘This is what democracy looks like!’ by Oliver Ressler, 30 minutes, Austria, 2002 (also awarded at the International Media Art Award 2002, ZKM and SWR Baden-Baden, Germany) records the first Austrian anti-global demonstrations on the occasion of the World Economic Forum on July 1st, 2001 in Salzburg. The anti-capitalist demonstrators against the World Economic Forum (a private lobbying organization of major capital) in Salzburg were ferociously handled by the Austrian police: 900 demonstrators were encircled and held captive by the police in the open space of the City of Salzburg for more than seven hours. The video consists of visual material from the demonstration, edited and spliced with additional reflections on the events in Salzburg given by six demonstrators. The video is a precise re-articulation of the event that also shows how mass media and the general public are caught up in a process of falsification, mis-
страни. Филмот е прецизно доразјаснување на настанот, кој исто така покажува како мас-медиумите и јавноста се фатени во процесот на фалсификување, погрешно толкување на фактите, односите и позициите. Важноста на овој видео проект е многу соодветна.

Прво, филмот е прецизна анализа и претставување на анти-глобалистичките и анти-капиталистичките демонстрации во срцето на она што се смета за Западна либерална демократија. Анализата на медиумите, државните сили на репресија, т.е. полицијата, јавното изразување на повиците за почитување на граѓанските права и целата структура на судирот помеѓу државниот репресивен апарат и демонстранитите за граѓанските права е снимен тук, монтирани и раскажан токму од центарот(ите) на капиталистичката Империја и од неедно друго место, на кое што основните демократски права се и онаа под тежок удар. Накратко, од начинот на кој е структуран филмот, можат да се распознаат некои од клучните елементи на современиот капитализам, државните сили на репресија и начинот на кој тие коваат завера за да доведат до она што треба да биде западни либерално-демократски права, кои се распаѓаат и истовремено одново се конституират, секогаш на поинаков начин. Кога процесите на неотуѓивото право на демонстрација, критика и јавен говор очигледно се закануваат на структурата на капиталистичката машина, тие веднаш се трансформираат (со други зборови, без одолговлечување), особено во ити ситуации, на самоот место на интервенција. Таму, либерално демократските права еднозначно се сведуваат на хартиени безаби тигри. Имено, филмот ја систематизира демократијата во современите капиталистички држави како мртва точка меѓу два блока. И, на што се чека за да проработи? Тоа е токму „состојбата на исклучок“. Џорџо Агамбен (Giorgio Agamben), италијанскиот

First, the video is an accurate analysis and a representation of the anti-global and anti-capitalist demonstrations in the heart of what is considered to be a Western liberal democracy. The analysis of the media, state forces of repression, i.e. the police, the public expression of calls for civil rights to be fulfilled and the whole structure of the clash between the state repressive apparatus and the civil rights demonstrators is recorded here, edited and spoken from the center(s) of the capitalist Empire and not from somewhere else, where basic democratic rights are under heavy attack anyway. In short, it is possible to discern from the way the video is structured some of the key elements of contemporary capitalism, state repressive forces and how these conspire to cause what are supposed to be Western liberal democratic rights and are disintegrating – and simultaneously reconstituted, if always in a different manner. When processes of the inalienable right to demonstrate, to criticize and to perform publicly ostensibly threaten the fabric of the capitalist machine, they are transformed immediately (in other words without delay), especially in a state of emergency, at the place of intervention. There, liberal democratic rights are simply reduced to paper tigers with no teeth at all. The video therefore presents / encodes democracy in contemporary capitalistic states as a point of standstill between two blocks. And what waits to be put to work? This is precisely the “state of exception”. Giorgio Agamben, the Italian philosopher, stated in the mid-90s that the juridical norm of 20th century capitalist democracy is precisely the law of exception/emergency, and what we witness in the video is likewise the complete and terminal fusion of the biological body, but without the polis. Indeed, the en-
filozof izjavil vo sredinata na 90-tite deka pravnata norma na kapitalistickata demokratija na 20-tiot век е tokmu zakonot za iskluchok/vonredna sostojba, i toa na што сме сведоци во филмот е исто така kompletna и kraja fuзиja на biolo{koto telo, no bez polisot. Навистина, opkolene demonstranti, drкeni nekolku часа на otvoreno, повеќe ja vizueli-ziраат paradigmata на (концентрационен) logor otkolku taa na otvoren javen prostor vo gradot Salzburg. Toa e повторно нешто што Agamben го формурирал, велеjки дека денес био-polитичката paradigma во Западната цивилизација е логорот (концентрационен), a не Градот.

Moќta ne e jednostavno vo raçete na suverenenot, nitu vo raçete na edna klasa ili grupa i zatoa ne može da biide arituлиранa na samo edno nivo na svest, kako slujaj на iskrivera svest. Materijalistikata paradigma tuка ne e dovolna. Zatoa, za Ressler, moќta на видеото не е „темната комора на идеологиjата“, туку преку анализа на движењата, концентрациjата на расположениjата, телесните пристапи во контекстите на демонстрациjа, Ressler создава една луцидност коja може дури и да ње заслепи нас, гледачите. Зашто, моќта тука може да biide идентификуванa на nivo на инвестирањe во teloto. Spored Fuко, nemа niшto поматериjално од практикувањето моќ; Ressler preцизно го vizuelизира токму ова, за повторно da го цитира Fuко, покажувајки јa „архитектурата, анатомиjата, ekonomikата и механизмот на дисциплинирањe на teloto“.

Oва jasno se gleda vo strukturata na filmot, koja ni ja покажуva arhitekturata na otnosot telo-telo (opkoleniot proces na pritisok); ekonomikata na лишувањe (часовите на неподвижност) и механизмот на stрав и tegobnost. И, што e уште поважно, тука ja gleda strukturata na moќta на видното поле – moќta na nadgleduвањe i okoto на moќta, kojto filmot gi kodira na najverodostoen circled demonstrators, held for several hours in an open space, actually visualize the paradigm of the (concentration) camp rather than that of the open public space of the City of Salzburg. This is again something that Agamben formulated; saying that today the bio-political paradigm in Western civilization is the (concentration) camp and not the City.
What is clearly presented here is that the relationship between the visual and the discursive is not one of correspondence. There is no common territory, as it were, in which image and word happily meet; instead, they meet each other in a “non-space” with relation to power, as
Foucault would say. This is exactly Ressler’s video (medium) of power. Oliver Ressler’s video is a masquerade about democracy. Under the mask of democracy in capitalistic democratic systems today we encounter the (Scmittian/Agamben) – “law/state of exception”.

Looking at these three videos by Ra’ad, Reinhard and Ressler through the only perspectives possible (namely non-essentialism and strict anti-documentary positioning of reality), in the end we witness three stories of the power of discrepancy between the gaze and the eye.

Last but not least, it is necessary to read the apparatus of repression in Ressler’s video as a mere semblance of justice. Oliver Ressler’s video is also an act of power; it shows the internal power of the demonstrators, as they are capable of articulating precisely what their own position is, rethinking their moves, contemplating their present position and their possible future defeats. With its proper exhibitionism the anti-global movement claims back for itself a position of power. The video is therefore also a process of rendering the body of the anti-global movement spectacular (but without commercialization!). To put it in a nutshell: it is much better to exhibit power than to be the instrument of power, such as the police are – the apparatus of repression – in the final instance. Throughout the video analysis, the anti-global movement completes a short circuit: it exhibits power embedded in its spectacular function. It is a re-articulation of a proper position as an emancipatory act.
I would like to state that, if art poses, according to the American theoretician Scott Bukatman, the enigma of the body, then the enigma of technique poses the enigma of (media) art. On one side, in relation to the body, the result is the non-sustainable body, as Rosi Braidotti would say. This is not the cybernetic body that is in the function of progress and of the capital machine, but it is, according to Braidotti “a body as a powerful figuration of the non unitary subject in-becoming.” The rethinking of the (post) industrial human through new technology can be theoretically re-articulated in line with Braidotti and her questioning of not simply what we are, but rather of what we want to become! On the other side, we have a situation where it is not possible simply to relate to the video image to being a sign of truth or falsity. Questions of plausibility and implausibility override therefore those concerning whether an image is simply true or false. We have also no longer to deal only with the mental images and consciousness, but with the paradoxical facticity of new media images, especially of the digital video and computer generated images.

What is that that is not not-quite/not-right in the space of the visually dominated global Art World? Tanja Ostojic’s (Serbia/Germany) video work titled ‘Be my guest’ (15.58 min), 2001, is such an example.

The video-film is based on re-edited documentary materials taken from Tanja Ostojic’s performance, presented in Rome in 2002. Invited by the curator Bartolomeo Pietromarchi to give a performance at Palazzo delle Esposizioni in Rome, Ostojic decided to arrange an unusual setting for it. First she sent an invitation card in the form of a letter in which she announced her performance.
Identities


pokana vo vid na pismo, vo koja go najavila svojot performans kako neformalno sobirawe so jadewe, pieše i nevrzani razgovori za umetnosta. Seto toa e namereno da bide videno kako civilizirano (termin upotreben od Ostojic) muabetewe za umetnosta; poetoa, vo pismoto, taa najavuva deka se iskape vo xakuzito koe, kako masata, hranata i pijalacite (doneseni), koe bide postaveno vo prostorot na galerijata za ovaa priila. Vo pokanata ni predlaga da bide nezini gosti, taka sto „Bidi mi gostin“ e naslovot na performansot. Madam Batertflaaj na Žakomo Puchini, kako sto se sluša na filmot, e muzikatna pridružba na civiliziranaa вечера; оперската арија Viene la sera (Доаа вечериа) (во изведен на Марија Калас) се пушта во текот на целата вечер во видеото. На кој начин можеме да ја утврдиме интерпретацијата на овој performans/video проект?

Relying on philosophy and psychoanalyses, I argued that Tanja Ostojic developed two important approaches toward art, media and performance. The first one is the authentic act of traversing the fantasy, through over-identification, the other is incarnation. Both come from psychoanalytic heritage. Ostojic developed in her video work the so-called, Zizekian over-identification with the contemporary art power edifice. If in contemporary art most subjects are about sex and corruption, and about libidinal/sexual fantasies and empowerment relationships, then Ostojic acted precisely in a way to overtly stage this fantasmatic scenario that is discussed, incited and implied, but not made overtly public. Ostojic in her performance/video took on the role of a “society bitch.” “Be my guest” means exactly that, to invite the curators and all protagonists from near and afar, involved in the Art Institution, to perform obscene games, conducted within the setting of the Art Edifice, in an overtly visible and public way. Ostojic staged “the questioning of the fantasmatic scenarios of the con-
temporary art world” publicly in the gallery space. Acting in such a way she performed, according to the Lacanian vocabulary, the authentic act of traversing the fantasy. In short, if the art power edifice is relying on obscenity and promiscuity, and, if this is what the story about art and its power is, than the proposed process of over-identification (being a public “society bitch”) exactly over-displayed these processes in the public realm.

And what is it about incarnation? This over-identification is performed in front of our eyes in “flesh (in – carne) and “hot” blood.” Ostojic and the curator discussed art and life and laid in the Jacuzzi naked, continuing to drink champagne, coming close to a situation of public coitus. With the previously mentioned curator and with the critic Ludovico Pratesi (who joined them, after understanding literally Ostojic’s invitation: be my guest), Tanja Ostojic in the Jacuzzi performed a radicalized version of Federico Fellini’s ‘La dolce vita!’ What was only incited in the golden past of the art nouvelle is today put totally visibly into the public gallery space.

The questions about the work remain open, although it forces us to think not only about what art is, but what are we, as artists, and critical intellectual activists, compelled to do, in order to change the state of things? Especially, as it is today blatantly obvious that the effective, but simple critical avant-garde assertion, used in the past, about the Art Institution being too empowered and obscene, is not enough!
As a video artist and theoretician, I suggest an unconditional clear queer politicization of a proper position. Such an approach is developed in the videofilm ‘The Eastern House’ (18 min, 2003) by Marina Grzinic and Aina Smid (Slovenia). Instead of seeing and presenting myself as a feminist from Eastern Europe, I suggest, as it is performed in the video, to think about Eastern Europe in a completely different way, not to think about me as a woman, or as a feminist and an academic, but to think about Eastern Europe as a female paradigm (Eastern Europe as a woman). In such a way the relation between Eastern and Western Europe is not seen as a relation just between individuals and their private inequalities and sexual differences, but such a positioning brings to the surface a much greater deeper structural inequality and disproportion that deeply and differently affects our relationship to history, philosophy (Alain Badiou), gender and politics.

Part Two: New Europe and Agamben’s Out of Being

On the time table of important discussions about the cultural identity of Europe today is the question of a possible identity of the new Europe, the one that will be reshaped when the 10 new states join the European community and help form the New United Europe which will consist of 25 states in 2004. A possible unity/or a multiplicity of a common spirit is therefore expected to be developed. However, my question is under what condition?

An analysis of this question is possible by reviewing what certain academics had to say about Europe in May 2003. On 31st May, 2003, Habermas published a text in the
Mas) (објави текст во Франкфуртер Алгемајне Цајтунг, потпишан и од Дерид (Derrida) (кој објасни дека не бил во можност да учествува во пишувањето на текстот, но е среќен што има можност барем да го потпише); текстот треба да се гледа како прецизен одговор и „побуна“ против договорот за поддршка на војната на САД против Ирак, потпишан на 31 јануари 2003 год. од страна на некои стари и нови држави, меѓу кои има некои што се надеваат дека ќе станат дел од ЕУ. На 31 мај 2003 година, датумот на кој текстот на Хабермас беше објавен, Еко (Eco), Ватимо (Vattimo), Рорти (Rorty) и Алтри (Altri) исто така објавија, во исто време, иако во различни, но еднакво важни дневни весници, дополнителни текстови кои ги поддржуваат идеите формулирани од Хабермас.

Да се обидеме да простудираме и анализираме што е тоа, така да го наречеме, стекнување нов европски идентитет, нов дух на Европа, прво преку размислувањата на Хабермас, а потоа на Ватимо.

Во својот текст, Хабермас расветлува две поенти кои заслужуваат да бидат анализирани. Прво, дека нова Европа мора да се гледа како пространство со различни брзини, но во срцевината останува она што тој го нарекува авангарда, авангардното јадро образувано од најразвиените европски држави. Така, тој повторно ја прикажува, но со малку поинаква реторика, приказната за Западот и Истокот. Оваа разлика е развиена подобна во неговото гледиште, во кое Западот се согледува како духовна рамка, контура која е многу повеќе од Европа, како духовно живеелиште кое е поврзано со индивидуализмот, рационализмот и, на крајот, со јудео-христијанската основа, и е во целосна хармонија со САД, Канада и Австралија (сето ова е, повторувам, според Хабермас!).

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, co-signed by Derrida (who clarified that he was not able to join the writing of the text, but was happy to have a chance to at least sign it); the text is to be seen as a precise answer and “rebellion” against the 31th January 2003 charter of support to the USA’s war in Iraq, signed by some old and new states, some of those hoping to become part of the EU. On 31 May 2003, the date when the Habermas text was published, Eco, Vattimo, Rorty and Altri also published, at the same time, although in different but equally important daily magazines, additional texts supporting the main ideas formulated by Habermas.

Let’s try to study and analyze what it is, so to speak, to take on the new European Identity, the new European spirit, first looking at Habermas’ and secondly Vattimo’s thoughts.

Habermas brought to light two main points in his text that deserve to be analyzed. First, that new Europe has to be seen as a space of different speeds, but at its heart remains what he called the avant-garde, with the avant-garde nucleus formed by the most developed European countries. So he is displaying again, through a slightly new rhetoric, the story of West and East. This difference was developed further in his view, that sees the West as a spiritual frame, a contour that is much more than Europe, it is a spiritual habitat that is connected with individualism, rationalism, and last but not least with the Judeo-Christian framework, and it is in complete harmony with the USA, Canada and Australia (all this is seen, I repeat, according to Habermas).
We have to note that Japan is omitted, although this Western spiritual frame, is first and foremost the depiction of nothing other than that of the developed World, therefore of the Fist Capitalist World. It is important to note that to the Asian space is granted within the Global World, according to Trinh T. Minh-ha, the Vietnamese theorist and filmmaker, a specific set of domination relations and expropriation processes/evacuations of historical grounds. An obsessive situation is going on toward this East (of Asia), that has to be seen as radically different from the East (of Europe); in relation to Asia an almost daily shaping of different forms of inclusion and exclusion is going on within the First Capitalist World.

Secondly, Habermas exposed in his text two main traits that are in his view at the heart of Europe today. He stated that Europe has in common two main features: the totalitarian regimes and the Holocaust. Here I have to raise a question and ask where and when are we then to include the massacres within the Balkan territory: Kosovo, Srebrenica, Vukovar? What is evacuated and abstracted is precisely the condition of impossibility of Europe to be a “happily individual and rational Judeo-Christian entity”, as termed by Habermas. Or we can see in this gesture an act of omission, of evacuation and abstraction of precisely that impossibility that today prevents the new European home (as termed by Vattimo) to be fully closed, completed and at peace with itself. The massacres of the 90’s in the Balkans must be evacuated, abstracted, and rejected, in order that this endeavor to form a European home can be successful.

It is interesting to note that within the real space of Europe, on the one hand we have the Balkans which are perceived as the disgusting remainder, and the new Holo-
која се случу таму е абстравирана. Од друга страна, како што забележа теоретичарот Борис Буден (Загреб/Виена), имаме специфична опсесија на естетско ниво која се однесува на Источна Европа, поточно на Балканот. Се чини дека балканскиот регион игра посебна улога за идентификацијата на Европа бидејки се смета за скоро сиров ентидет кој може да создаде, но само на полето на естетиката, нови концепти и заради тоа е способен да го снабди современото европско уметничко движење со еден вид свежа крв. Значи, поранешната Западна Европа е вампирира ентидет, или модерен канибал! Ова може да се согледа ако размислиме за сè поголемиот број изложби во Европа чиј интерес е барање и истражување на балканскиот идентитет и медот со кој треба да се покријат крвавите рани создадени на реалниот простор на Европа од овој ист балкански ентидет.

Ватимо дури оди и чекор понапред во трагањето по нов европски идентитет, изложувајќи го фактот дека ако треба да зборуваме за идентитет, тогаш тоа е нешто што ги надминува националните европски држави. Но, зарем со тоа не дава позитивна оценка за она што бездруго се случува на реалниот простор на Европа? Светската банка, Меѓународниот монетарен фонд и Светската трговска организација ги донесуваат најважните одлуки што се однесуваат на економскиот и политичкиот статус и иднината на голем број држави денес. Покрај тоа, надоврзувајќи се на Џорџио Агамбен, мораме да потврдиме дека она што навистина го интересира Западот е генетскиот материјал, таканаречената био-моќ. Тоа е цело едно подрачје на нова технологија и нова биологија, кои се соединуваат, отворајќи едно ново поле кое е познато како био-политика. Био-политиката го истражува животот (артифициелен) и исто така е средство со кое модерните држави денес ги управуваат нашите животи. ДНК се прикажува на Интернет како

Vattimo is even going a step further in searching for the new European identity, exposing the fact that if we are to talk about identity then it is something that is going beyond the national states of Europe. But is he not simply giving a positive mark as to what is going on anyway within the real space of Europe? The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and The World Trade Organization are taking the most important decisions regarding the economical and political status and futures of a number of states today. Furthermore, following Giorgio Agamben, we have to assert that what really interests the West is the genetic material, the so-called biopower. It is a whole realm today of new technology and biology, which are coming together, and opens a field that, is known as bio-politics. Bio-politics is about exploring (artificial) life, and also it is the way modern states are administering our lives today. DNA is shown on the Internet as a computer game. But it is not as simple as this! Actually it is even more frightening! The states, and to a greater extent the multinational companies instead of the national states
Identities (even in their names), are prescribing what sort of life we lead, when we can die etc. It is not the idea of nations so much that is a problem today, says Agamben, but the administering of the definition of life and our right to die! The border in question is a question of bureaucratic administration by the capital machine, whereas the modern state is taking all the rights to decide upon these topics. It is time to understand that already at work here are the neo-liberal principles of regulations beyond certain states national interests, within the global economical, political and cultural imperatives of the day, month, and millennium.

And again, Vattimo talks about the gene of socialism that can be seen as something specific to Europe. In doing so, he simply puts into parenthesis the real socialist histories of the horrors of Europe. The history of socialism cannot be evacuated from its Eastern European legacy. The gene of socialism seen by Vattimo is a process of swallowing the histories of the East of Europe, evacuating precisely in such a way that those conditions of impossibility that would normally prevent us seeing socialism not only as a process of humanization and prosperity, but also as a process of productive negativity.

If it is to talk about genes then it is to underline the gene of oppression, immigrants, and wars exported from the nucleus of Europe toward its borders or out of Europe. The gene of inclusion and exclusion from or within Europe, is to be seen today according to Gail Lewis, the British theoretician, also in the form of the black women’s body, the body in constant processes of trafficking, exploitation and being subsumed within different stories of
приказни на современ расизам. И уште повеќе, ако треба да ги изброиме сите академски имиња га цитирани погоре кои застанале во одбрана на новата Европа, сите членови на новата света алијанса наспроти гаволот-таму надвор, тогаш не можеме само да го потврдиме она што го кажа Алисон М. Џегар (Alison M. Jaggar), американската феминистка и филозоф, во едно интервју објавено во Зарез, Загреб, дека на глобално нео-либерално ниво, современата демократија е олицетворена во белот маж! Освен тоа, таа додава дека она што треба да биде слушнато од другата страна на родовата разделна линија, се само белите богати академски жени од елитата. Очевидно, во контекст на човечноста и формирањето на новиот европски идентитет, тие се уште не се доволно мощни да бидат повикани да се придружен на клубот на писатели од 31 мај 2003 година.

Ако размислуваме во рамките на овие параметри и приказни кои го формираат идентитетот на нова Европа, тогаш не можеме да бидеме ништо друго, туку критични во однос на приказните за давање моќ на голиот живот. Гор живот (ова го користам повиквајќи се на Џорџ Агамден) е состојба на апсolutно и тотално лишување, кога индивидуалата нема ништо друго освен неговиот/нејзиниот (гол) живот. Овој термин доаѓа од Римското право според кое робовите биле сматрани како свети/животни/, што значи без какви било права освен правото на гол живот, и според тоа и правото да умрат. Денес имаме слична ситуација во врска со бегалците, имигрантите, имигрантите, луѓето без документи, итн. Оваа ситуација се однесува исто така и на современите робови (оние кои само со телото се вклучени во разни видови тргување: деца, жени, итн.). Мора да бидеме критични кон овие интерпретации кои во таканаречените луѓе без државјанство и животот без документи гледаат извор на ирационална сила; да им се даде моќ со време.
when both go they submit to a naked life as dangerous a form of academic institutionalization and, consequently, rationalization on the collective forms of marginalization and, thus, rationalization of all forms of oppression of people and bodies without papers, without rights, that are in possession of only one thing only, their naked lives. Without papers and grounds they are maybe still managing a sort of illegal citizenship, almost inventing systems of life and forms of surviving. My critic is precisely against this transformation of naked life into a category of enjoyment, that is, according to these academics, produced by invention of ways to surpass and survive the most deprived situations in order to simply survive. If we are to give credit to such stories then it means that we are empowering only and solely the managerial academic groups within the global capitalist system that are trying to rationalize, in a world of an almost panicked global capitalist system, forms of deprivation and naked lives of millions. Millions are without proper citizenship, if any, but according to this new interpretation they are inventing interesting systems of surviving day by day. In this process, empowering one and all, even the smallest organization of surviving of naked life, before they will be decapitated, we are able to recognize a disgusting rationalizing form of positivism regarding total misery and forms of absolute and total exploitation. Or worded slightly differently, in reference to Agamben, this will be a rationalization of a life without a form, or this can be seen as a process to give to their formless form of life a specific form, but without life! This means to give exactly a rational frame (so invoked by Habermas) that will allow the modern European administrator’s mind to deal happily and progressively with such deprived invisible and powerless strata within modern society.
I can state that an anthropological machine is working at the basis of globalization, and it is working on a secret connection of putting together man and animal. The idea is to make them both more human; humanization is at the basis of this connection. This idea of humanity is the idea of Being and its inclusion into civilization. But who decides what is human, and when the non-humans will take part in the process of humanization? The capital machine of course!

Giorgio Agamben in his last book ‘Open. Man and Animal’ (2002) is actually warning us that maybe this is the time to insist on the dissolving, or breaking this connection between man and animal. This animal can be seen also as the body of the modern slave. Today instead of the slave, it is possible to think about the body of the immigrant, refugees, clandestine people, the poor and the proletarians. He proposes to cut with this constant hybridization. To be left out of the anthropological machine, not to be saved. This is, therefore, our only possible salvation. Not to be part of the process of the capitalist humanization, to be left out of Being, this is maybe the only possible way to have a descent being.

Out of Being is also the subtitle of the last chapter in the aforementioned book by Agamben. Allow me now to go quickly but deeply into establishing a story behind this proposed “out of being”. I can put forward the following thesis. In the modern history of philosophy three books or three positions of thinking marked the way of understanding Being (Sein) which Derrida defines as; “We and our life”:

"Nadvor od bitieto" e isto takva podnaslov na poslednотo pogлавие на гореспоменатата книга на Agamben. Дозволете ми сега набрзина, но темелно да утврдам приказна зад предложеното „nadvor od bivstuvaweto“. Можам да ја предложам следната теза: во модерната историја на филозофијата три книги, или три мисловни стојалища го одбележа начинот на разбирање на Битието (Sein) кое Дерида го дефинира како „Ние и нашиот живот“:
Vo 1927 Хайдегер (Heidegger) ja izdava „Битие и време“
Vo 1950 Сартр (Sartre) ja izdava „Битие и ништо“
Vo 1997 Бадиу (Badiou) ja izdava „Битие и настан“

I bi sakala vo ovaа kolona da go dodadam i naslovot na poslednoto poglavje na vecе spomenatata kniga na Agamben „Надвор од Битието“.

Vo 2002 Agamben go izdava „Надвор од Битието“ (kako poglavlje vo Open!)}

In 1927 Heidegger published ‘Being and Time’.
In 1950 Sartre published ‘Being and Nothingness’.
In 1997 Badiou published ‘Being and the Event’.

I would like to add to this line the title of the last chapter in the already mentioned book by Agamben ‘Out of Being’.

In 2002 Agamben published ‘Out of Being’ (as a chapter in Open!).

The Heideggerian Being and Time is about the temporization of History. Sartre’s Being is one of nothingness in relation to the Holocaust. Although, I can state with Derida that Sartre’s nothingness is only a modality of being something as nothing. Badiou made a cut in the line of Being with the event. Françoise Proust, in 1998, defined Badiou’s event as a cut within the house of Western philosophy that resembles the anthropological machine in theory and philosophy. Badiou is very well aware that the house of Western philosophy resembles the anthropological machine that is today compelled just to an empty and panic-stricken rotation, producing a total evacuation of histories and practices out of the First Capitalist world. Françoise Proust describes this house of philosophy as Western metaphysics that is transformed in a suffocating house that is preventing us from breathing. Badiou’s event is, according to Proust, the gesture of opening a window, or of opening the windows to start to breathe again. But is this not this just a gesture to provide fresh air within the same old, unchanged house of Western metaphysics? In this trajectory we can identify other paths or modifications through history in relation to Being. I am reminded of the Deleuzian idea of never ending, Being, or, Being in the process of Becoming. Derrida in-
introduced a difference. It claims a difference through only one single character (the *a* instead of the *e*). Within such a context Badiou made the most radical gesture indeed. He tried at least to start to think about Being from the beginning. Badiou’s event is to be perceived similarly to the gesture of the professor that after listening and making corrections tells us, from the beginning, once again, please. But the text stays the same!

I argue that these moves lead to the modification of the western Institution of metaphysics, or of the great philosophical and civilizational edifice, but in the last instance, the edifice stays unchanged.

Agamben is the one, therefore, that provides us with the most radical gesture. Agamben’s out of Being is not the simple gesture of opening the windows within the old anthropological machine. He is telling us: to be saved, we have to leave the house! Out of Being! Out of Being can be perceived as the radical Badiou event, indeed, so invoked by Badiou himself.

What is important is to understand that this gesture is not the gesture of foreclosure that we will not drag with it suddenly into a queer space without time or out of time, or in some kind of wired suspension. Out of being means to open up for another temporality. Or, if we are to be even more precise, this means to start with a projection of a completely different film, and not to waste time, which is Badiou’s suggestion, with the re-definition of one single sequence, and it doesn’t matter even if it is the initial one. Out of Being is to be open, not toward the space of Otherness, but toward the Other, Second, Third, Space.
So, if I am to give a kind of order, we can read the story of Being and of the madly anthropological machine of humanization run by capital as follows: Badiou beginning, Deleuze becoming, Derrida difference and Agamben the end. And I will end here as well.
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Notes