

Talking Culture, Crying Health, Hoping for Nothing: Surviving the Many Flyers above the Human Rights Global Cuckoo's Nests^I

Sanja M. Špoljar Vržina

»Ivo Pilar« Institute of Social Sciences, Zagreb, Croatia

ABSTRACT

Today's talk about any health issue is part of a wider web of neoliberal destructive processes of which all fall into the category of discriminating populations and their cultures, downgrading their right to life and violating their human dignity. Poor health, poverty stricken health systems and screaming epidemiological factors make just one more triangle of the successive visible consequences of destruction that equals to the violation of human dignity, to begin with. Yet no correction is possible since every problem is tied to the double standard perceivement of Human Rights. The author is engaged in presenting a need of a deeper auto-reflexive work-through of our human approachments and biological realities. This urgent stance is based on the new, set by Kalny (2009) and Baxi (2006), orientation towards a critical reading of the Human Rights and the advocacy toward differentiating between the politics for human rights and politics of human rights (the later being the politics of rights instrumentalization). Health and its un-sustainability is one of the most dramatic areas in which this differentiation of ones approaches is dramatically felt and needed. The end conclusions are envisioned to support the already existing field of a number of dedicated critical medical anthropologists, as well as authors across all fields, in their demand for, nothing more or less than, the dignity for the populations that they/we daily represent.

Key words: culture, health, Human Rights, splitting, neoliberalism, consumerism

Introduction

In 2008 the Republic of Mali hosted a major International Conference dedicated towards strengthening research for health, development and equity. The Global Ministerial Forum on Research for Health held in Mali^{II} was an event of high international governmental importance drawing a great number of politicians, leaders, stake-holders, as well as professionals and scientists of many fields, from all over the world. The Conference ended with the signing The Bamako Call for Action. The whole event was a result of a painstaking initiative and the work of great many unmentioned personnel dedi-

cated to the global unrest of the never resolving health issues. The behind scenery of the whole event was, in fact, a fieldwork setting for the observance of a true entanglement of the world-wide scientific and political community, as well as the collision of many with the basics in ethics and moral attitudes. It was a testing ground of sorts for lost or non-lost skills of ones own flexibility to remain human. Human, meaning – seeing, hearing, feeling and witnessing the Other. Not just placing his suffering in texts to be »read«^{1,2}. While in the epistemological and hermeneutical worlds of anthropology this kind of

^I This paper is inspired with the work of two outstanding anthropologists – Professor Barbara Harrell-Bond (Founder of the Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford) and Professor Mahmood Mamdani (Makarere University, Uganda and Columbia University, USA). Beyond their writings, their intellectual bravery is one proposition to answering the question of how to survive the nowadays many living metaphors of the Ken Kesey's »One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest«.

^{II} The Global Ministerial Forum on Research for Health – Strengthening Research for Health, Development and Equity, was held in Bamako, Mali from 17–19th November, 2008, and had the end result of the Declaration »The Bamako Call for Action« – see: / <http://www.globalforumhealth.org/>; / <http://www.tropika.net>

observation is not considered a surprise, even then there is a fair number of scholars enjoying their comfortable etic stance on the expense of the entangled webs of emic worlds, never reached, in fact fled from. On the mentioned conference there was a visible domination of sponsors. In conveying this introductory diatribe, at that time, to a colleague of mine working for one of the respectful International organizations, I was warned gently »Look, all of our work is sponsored mainly through the World Bank.« upon which the remark followed (not only by the writer of this paper) »aren't the investors themselves, giving all this money to all »bellow«, entitled to receive a scientifically professional appraisal of the whole event?« Observed consequently, this obviously blatant fact/question is repeated time after time, conference after conference, meeting after meeting. The first time I heard it being said was by Professor Barbara Harrell-Bond while hosting the Humanitarian Conference »The Role of the Military in Humanitarian Emergencies«^{3,III}. It was often repeated to all the sponsors and officials that came from, at that time, war stricken Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, claiming that they have made order in the land of frenzied ethnicities of the »Balkan«. In much the same divide as pointed out in Mamdani's »Good Muslim, Bad Muslim«⁴, we are not good if we do not abide by the rules of the more powerful (sponsors). Are we human at all?

WB (World Bank), IMF (International Monetary Fund), WTO (World Trade Organization), EU (European Union), UN (United Nations), UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), UNICEF (United Nations International Childrens Emergency Fund), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organiza-

tion), WHO (World Health Organization), numerous to count (Non)-governmental Organizations (NGO's), and many others^{IV} – all fit into the group of institutionalized dedications toward a globalistically changed world. Aren't they all entitled to receive a scientifically professional appraisal? In the name of the many crucial events they sponsor and the many dramatic happenings around the world they cover (with sponsored money) – are they not interested? It was much later that I started perceiving the true global/local/glocal drama, less as an area of a possible scientifically theoretical betterment that matters, and rather more as a triangular battlefield of morality and ethics, of those who care and do not care⁵⁻⁷. Of those that are bothered and not bothered with the many *terra incognitas* of our time, swept with the globalistic strategies. The answers to the prior question presented itself – who cares. Obviously those that hear and see and understand what is being said. This paper is aimed at expanding these contests of the real. It is not only dedicated to the deconstruction of texts and concepts that support the imagined truth about the peoples on ground and the realistic problems of all humanity visible to those who care – it is an analysis of around and beyond catch-phrases that tropes of our time endorse.

Splitting^{8-12,V} in the Domain of Global

Ten years ago, in trying to expose the same academic uneasiness of seeing and hearing among the politically corrected and silenced, the prominent socio anthropologist Jonathan Friedman wrote an important article under the title »From roots to routes Tropes for trippers«¹³. In this article he made one of the first appraisals of the ambivalence of the global^{14,VI} and the transnational vul-

^{III} For more information see the report based on the comments of speakers and participants at the conference »The Role of the Military in Humanitarian Emergencies«, which took place under the auspices of the Refugee Studies Programme, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, 29–31 October 1995. (http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:14). This event preceded all the Kosovo efforts of the international community, yet is never cited as one of the starting points for the dialogue between the humanitarian and military sides of the parties on ground, in action. Neither is the path-breaking analysis of Harrell-Bond in 1986, *Imposing Aid*, considered as one of the first critiques of the false humanitarianism. It is usually forgotten by many Western scholars that the politics of military and humanitarian interventions do not begin with Kosovo. Perhaps the preceding genocide in Vukovar and Siege of Sarajevo, committed through the Yugoslav people's Army and Serb extremist aggression and ongoing in the middle of »civilized« Europe, are easier to compartmentalize when conjoined into the syntagm of »Balkan civil wars«, »ethnic wars« or generally »conflict«. In this way, the »New Imperialism« becomes a handy tool for every »new« scholar shamed by discovering it (see for instance the »new« knowledge on humanitarianism of Pandolfi M.). While the motifs may be humanistic, the missing chronology and negated realities offend many populations and pave the way of bad science negating humans, but glorifying identities and ethnicities.

^{IV} The sequence of ordered International players (the first three and the rest) is by no means accidental – it mirrors the order of power and sponsorship. The list becomes endless.

^V A borrowed psychoanalytical term applied in the attempt to reveal the bottom layer of our perceiving people as objects in global and local settings and pose a question of our living in a schizoid »jungle« of triads (projections, denials and splittings), that is the basis for the global narcissistic culture. In the strict psychoanalytical terms »splitting« is a process/defense mechanism by which a mental structure loses its integrity and becomes replaced by two or more part structures. Splitting of both ego and object are described. In the case of the ego the remaining part from that experienced as self is an unconscious split-off part of the ego. In the case of the object attitude towards the spitted part structures is typically antithetical – »good« (accepting, benevolent) and »bad« (rejecting, malevolent). Further defense mechanisms of projection and denial are linked to the splitting process creating a schizoid defense by which parts of the self (and of internal objects) are disowned and attributed to objects in the environment (the basic references recommended for further useful reading Rycroft, 1968; Freud, 1914, 1927, 1938; Fromm, 1964/on malignant narcissism; Lasch, 1979/on narcissism and culture; should precede additional important topical references)⁸⁻¹².

^{VI} In this chapter he discusses the main propositions of James Cliffords *Routes* (1997) highlighting that the ambivalence that Clifford expresses in his seminal work (for instance statements of caution such as – »Transborder activities are not necessarily liberating, nor is the national always reactionary«) is not found in the works of most of his colleagues (Friedman 2002: 23). In fact, Friedman concludes – »Clifford, cannier than his theoretical cronies, does not celebrate the new age« (Friedman, 2002: 22). While drawn to Cliffords work on the discourse of hybridity versus essentialism, especially of objects, and not lives, many get imprisoned in the symptoms of the larger processes referred (Friedman, 2002: 28).

gate^{VII}. Through these chapters of his paper he foresees the problems of correct perception of ongoing realities and the ways in which mainstreamed fashionable academic worlds are built on dangerous quasi translations and deciphering. In one of his observations he states:

»It is true that the IMF, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization have led a consolidation of a new set of rules of international control that may never have existed in global terms, but it is not at all clear that we have entered an entirely different world. These new organizations, after all, are responses to processes and trends that were already present before their creation. The inundation of global commodities in all zones including the 'tribal' zones has risen to levels never previously attained, and the ease and density of world communication has also reached entirely new dimensions, but it is not clear what this implies for real people on the ground as opposed to the fascinated observers who are ready to claim the 'brave new world' of cut'n'mix culture in which all difference is of the same order, like the difference between Coke and Pepsi. The very lack of empirical research into other peoples' worlds of experience is itself the product of fallacious objectivism referred to earlier, one that permits us to »read« other people and ultimately to conflate our own experience with theirs.«¹³

The explanatory strength of Friedman's precise analysis has a number of corollaries stretching into the sad and fearful »old« world of today. There are at least three crucial ones pertaining to the importance of the analysis of this article, all pointing to the historical depth: firstly, the global does not entitle one to speak of the totally new phenomena, especially concerning the fact that our lives have become visibly orientated upon the ages old evolutionistic paradigm in which becoming more civilized, democratic and plural should be the rule enforced upon all positioned lower to the ladder of sloppy development, growth and progress^{VIII}; secondly, the »differences« glorified through the multiculturalist, diversified and picked and chosen »cultures« (claimed to be accessible to all)

have become gadgetry replacements of the old time colonial mantle pieces such as lion floor skins, bison wall heads and »progressive« ways of advanced mobility toward the Other. Yet, still accessible to only a few, with means of »getting there«, technically; thirdly, the discrimination of a prolonging nature, that is tied to what Friedman rightly stresses – »large scale movements of territorial pulsation at work in world history«¹³ – (thus, not only tied to the strict »global« phenomena), are predominantly visible but not dealt with in the matters of severe poverty, health decline, sickness, suffering, famine, disease stricken and those dying the worst kinds of deaths, amidst the rightly and orderly set world goals calibrated on their destinies^{IX}. More specifically the visibility of the consequences is in the direct correlation with the longevity of International Institutional programmers on ground, among the people (for important basic literature on these problems see: Baer, Singer and Susser¹⁵, Castro and Singer¹⁶, Fort, Mercer, Gish¹⁷; Farmer^{18-21,X}). The Institutions and many of their International Programmes are not institutions of »new« progressive programmes, salvatory prescriptions and rights for all. They are the product, as Friedman precisely emphasizes, of old solutions to, not necessarily new processes. With a distance of ten years, after Friedman's initial statement, we may be even more bold in concluding that the way of the »cultures« has become the dominant approach style in which nations, populations and countries world-wide have been depleted of their resources and robbed of their basic means for living, while moved into integrative processes of »progress«, beyond the reach of their financial sustainabilities. Matters of »culture« may be talked about in terms of cultural studies concepts, but in the end must be connected back to their initial on-ground levels of reality. The problems of brutal extinction of peoples happens, regardless (or precisely because)^{XI} of their ethnicities, identifications, cultural values, geographically positioned worlds (1st to last) and transitional stages. To »talk« of »cultures« is to, in the end, talk of biology and

^{VII} In this chapter he warns that Cliffs root metaphor »stretched to the limits equates in new discourses perfectly fitting the »global elites« – It is a discourse (of global elites) whose relation to the earth is one of consumerist distance and objectification. It is bird's eye view of the world that looks down upon the multiethnic bazaar or ethnic neighborhood and marvels at the fabulous jumble of cultural differences present in that space. Hybridity is thus the sensual, primarily visual, appropriation of a space of cultural difference. It is still, the space below that thus becomes hybridized, even if, for the people who occupy that space, reality is quite different« (Friedman, 2002: 27–33).

^{VIII} Required »progress« not surprisingly coincident with the unobidient, Third World and Development countries of rich economical resources, multiplied conflict zones and the punitive First World military interventions. Regardless of the fact that this is a vulgar geographical portrayal it is a very usual kind of orientation appraisal of the global World – for instance see – Central Intelligence World Factbook (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>)

^{IX} Allusion to the mockery of the UN Millenium Developmental Goals that are all based on a endorsement of the social and economical rights and none to the global restrictions of the neoliberal plundering agents. Thus, the vicious cycle being – we are sponsored by the same – Banks, Economic Institutions and non-limited trading markets.

^X All these authors are among the leading critical medical anthropologists/medical professionals working on ground with populations. Unfortunately, the space/aim of this paper does not permit going into specific elaborations of each of these humanistic views and the work of their seeing, hearing and doing, apart from scientifically documenting within our academic society.

^{XI} When manipulated through the political filters and returned back into the academic parlance of positioning on the scale from rootedness/uprootedness, hybridity/essentialism, monoculturalism/multiculturalism, etc.

physiological rights^{6,22,XII}. Not having a sewage infrastructure in a city of over millions of people does not qualify to be talked about in terms of rights and culture differences. It qualifies to be »talked« about in the terms of straight-jacket tailoring programmes lacking the sensitiveness towards the on-ground realities, on-ground livelihoods and the ethical stance towards a mentally sane global future. Apart from the abused money of all the »developmental«, »adjustment« and »technical support« programmes the question of sponsorship is a wider issue than perceived. It entangles all in a web of global sincleptocracy^{7,XIII}. To »talk« of »cultures« is to, in the end, talk of biosocial unsustainabilities and mental survival in a world that doesn't care for the talk of culture by the people themselves.

Splitting in the Domain of Local – with the Wundercameras of the Global

The neoliberalistic solipsism's of greed and poor feeling for the real, present in the world, are equally present

in Croatia. In the course of drawing a parallel of the local-global comparison one of the most pertaining examples can be given from Croatia's capital – Zagreb. Precisely Zagreb in the summer week from the 5th to 10th July, 2010. It was the last week of the exhibit »Bodies Revealed« in one of Zagreb's museums in the upper town; and the starting week of protests being held against one of Zagreb's old city center streets turned into the entrance of an underground public parking space beneath a Mall. Of course, the Mall being upraised by one of Croatia's newly promoted millioners (Figure 1). While both these sites were the epitomization of crime scenes in the service of profiteering, deserving an outpour of civil reaction, only one was recognized as a reason to protest and stand up in defense for ones rights. The right to the city (»Pravo na grad«) got precedence over the right to dignity in death and dying. To make a precise correction, a right that is proved to be overridden, through the exhibit »Bodies Revealed«^{23,XIV}, even after ones death. Could it be that the rights conscious activists are oblivious to other deaths on the basis of »some« ethnicities



Fig. 1. The happenings in Zagreb, Croatia in 2010 (three upper photos) and in 2011 (the last photo is of the Varšavska street today, bottom right). In 2010 we had the opportunity to witness both sites of corruption, oppression and loss of human dignity. Yet only one was recognized as such by the activists and Human Rights (N)GO's trained according to the Western cannons of Human Rights consumerism. Sources: Bodies Revealed <http://www.galerijaklovic.hr/izlozba.aspx?id=33>, (photo left); <http://www.eko-oglasnik.com/ekoecho-magazin/drustvo-politika-ekologija/slucaj-varsavsko-prosvjedi-protiv-izricito-privatnog-interesa/351/>; <http://politika.com/ruse-varsavsku-dodite-u-12-00-danas>; <http://www.books.hr/specials/344> (photo right); <http://www.novilist.hr/hr/Vijesti/Zagreb/Horvatincic-pokazao-zavr-senu-rampu-u-Varsavskoj-ulici> (photos right upper and bottom).

^{XII} See Špoljar-Vržina 2007 – for extreme reasons of the need to atomize human rights towards physiological rights – the most drastic example cited from Arundhati Roy 2000:3 where three men from the poor slums of Delhi were killed in 1998. on the basis of defecation in public places. The places without sewage system infrastructure are also places of tension in connection to the rights to defecating (Roy, 2000:3).

^{XIII} See Špoljar-Vržina, 2008 – the author proposes the neologism »syncleptocracy« to represent the phenomena of the many webs of cleptocracy, synchronized through a long process of emerging, unbounded by time and space, as well as moral or rigor of consciousness.

^{XIV} Famous and controversial exhibition touring the world. Consisting of Chinese cadavers of prisoners plastinated in order to be preserved. At the time of the Zagreb exhibition a long-term research of the Zagreb exhibition was conducted by Branimir Paden (2010). His Graduation Thesis was

coming from lands to far to matter? Can it be that the suffering of the Other, viewed from a birds-eye view, from above and solely through the thirst for the sensual¹³, enters so blatantly the many worlds of entertainment right under our politically correct sniffing noses? What is with morality, compassion, empathy? Is it dependent on the cosmopolitan emphatic *déjàvu* mantras, successful in the brainwashing of our normal human responses to a deprived dignity in the real time?

Unfortunately, this soliloquy upon our sad unbrave world gets worse than this. The exhibit »Bodies Revealed« in Zagreb was, coincidentally, closed on the memorial date of the fall of Srebrenica (10th July)^{XV} and lasted without any obstacles in a country that just twenty years ago fought a War of Independence, after surviving the genocide in Vukovar of 18th November, 1991^{XVI}. Cadavers should not be a part of the experience of the Other. It was also, at one time, our own experience. The Chinese cadavers, that in the course of their postmortem transnational global flows are deduced into »biological material«, for the sake of trouble-free customs, were banned only in Paris^{13,XVII}. In all other countries people had »no trouble« observing other peoples death causes (from lung tumors to heart failures) and were successfully convinced that they are being »educated« about the complexities of their bodies. Thus, the citizens of Croatia witnessed, unknowingly, the world-wide phenomena of the West blind to the Other. The dead people from China became an epitomization of just how far the destruction of moral has set in, while erasing the authenticity of The Rights. For only 75 kunas (14US\$/10 Euros), the ticket price of this »exhibition«, one could become aware of the fact that to 'belong' to the West also means being able to permit oneself the luxury of »educating« oneself upon the expense of the Far, inversely proportional to the Human Rights and the right to be buried with dignity.

In just one summer day, on the stroll from a neoliberal forensic crime site to the neoliberal Disneyland construction site one could experience a full plethora of a Human Rights consumeristic offers. As demonstrated, upholding them does not necessarily implicate that one is capable of diverting from the offer to enter the amoral world of governing exclusively in accordance to the market-driven fragmented and dispersed humanity. In Varšavska street the Right to the city became the Right to one's own door, once the intervention police entered and turned the demonstration into a place of forceful removing of some »bod-

ies« towards the police van. The experienced and described event probably inspires a rich potential for tropes and metaphorical linkages of meaning. But one must know when metaphors are impolite, when to use them or when their usage is in direct danger of becoming the apologetic stance of defending the price of the »anxieties« and »panics« of the global. The seemingly anxious and panicked are in fact presenting a symptom of a pressure towards desensitization and detachment of the social moral, rather than a marker of the globalist itself.

The epilogue of this case? The worse gets even worse. Just a few streets away from Varšavska, »Amnesty International« volunteers were agitating towards inviting bypassers to open Bank accounts in the favour of their organization. The account could be opened *ad hoc*, on the street, within any of the banks that Amnesty International has a deal with (such as Zagreb Bank, Raiffeisen Bank, Erste Bank) – thus, conveniently offering the citizens to open an account (through their banks) and support the work of this non-governmental organization with a yearly amount of 120 kunas (22US\$/16Euros). To the question about the unease of supporting the Humanity causes through banks the Amnesty International agitator advised that the best way to support the causes of Human Rights is through arrangements of continuous donations for chosen projects (homeless, for instance), rather than one on one or through direct help to the needy. To the question about the exhibition »Bodies Revealed«, presented through the poster all around the town, the answer was – »What has that got to do with these informations?«.

About the Splitting in the Domain of Human Rights/ In Support of an Ongoing Discussion

In the many silencings and voicings of the historical factography concerning Human Rights we are tamed to believe that the Human Rights have their cultural and geographical epicenters of spreading and that somehow some people deserve/earn/support while the other lack/ruin and downgrade Human Rights based on their descent. The Human Rights diffusionistically spread from the West to the East and there should be no questioning about the people being »worthy« of their histories and futures under dictatorships, poverty and depletion of resources. They do not know how to »progress« into a

defended under the title »Revealing the Body: socio-anthropological analysis of the exhibition Bodies Revealed« at the University of Zagreb, 2011.

^{XV} Srebrenica genocide refers to the July 1995 killing, during the Bosnian War, when more than 8,000 men and boys were killed, in and around the town of Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina, by units of the Army of Republika Srpska (VRS) under the command of General Ratko Mladić.

^{XVI} The town of Vukovar, in the East of The Republic of Croatia, that fell into the hands of Serb extremists and Yugoslav Peoples Army on the 18th November 1991, after which a genocide was conducted upon its citizens. Vukovar is a symbol of the Croatian Defence Homeland War and the heroic suffering of its citizens and War Veterans.

^{XVII} In 2009 the exhibit was banned, while judge Louis-Marie Raingeard concluded that in the name of their dignity the only place where the bodies should be is on the cemetery (»France Shuts Down Popular Bodies Show«, April, 23 2009- <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/story?id=7411070>) (Paden, 2011).

civilizational equation of modernized, democratized, plural civilizational brilliancy of the Western transparent Other. When Chinese corpses are being drawn through the whole »West«, passing borders not as deceased human beings but »biological material«, it somehow is not perceived as a matter of Human Rights and humanity. Who expects Human Rights being upheld in the »East« or »South«? Who supports them when the chaotic free trade flourishes in the East and South, mainly driven by the free-traders abusing them. Can You buy a 100 corpses of ex-convicts in the West? Trading commodities all the way to media images flourishes under the guise Human Rights diffusionism. The uprising of the whole Arab-African South is viewed as a breakthrough for the people, across countries, taking the course of history and civilized democratization into their own hands. Nobody is bothered with the aftermaths and »side-effects« of violence, that solely but surely, became the standard of media presentations not shocking or worrying anyone, and our global peace-making/keeping/conflict-resolution through force. The »wow« from the Capitol Hill coupled with the fragmented scenes of the blood bathed execution of a dictator is nothing new^{24,XVIII}. Nothing new, just a step ahead in the long line of getting used to Lady Gaga style of bloody Human Rights and (self)executions, amusing the masses trained to perceive the Rights and Justice apart from human reality and humanity.

How are the Libyans to live with that kind of split with their past in their tribal communities? A (media) concern over this question would be a sign of a global humanity maturing in the direction of a global mentally sustainable future. Opposite to this, we are enabled to perceive and contribute to a world with continuous violence as the norm. Instant »justice« being made on the streets and televised as the violently provoked masses take the course of their futures into their hands. Amidst all of that we are invited to believe that the geostrategic trading matrices of resources of certain nations have nothing to do with it all. Is this a question of power?

Unfortunately, convenient addressing of our brilliant theoretical forefathers has nothing to do with the amorality that is being played out on ground. Neither Foucault nor Baudrillard have foreseen this amorality on its way, closely connected to the biological real. We may use the concepts and constructs analyzing power, knowledge and livelihoods, but no matter which way you compare and portray the chronological, geographical and biological realities spell out the divide of centuries of depletion. Not because of ones culture. Every decade of a famine, epidemic, drought and dying in the »South« or »East« is

theorized as a question of humanitarianism, conflict, militarization, weaponizing, etc. The theoreticians of post-colonial became the pilgrims of colonial, depending of the countries they are organized to go to preach. The only stance that changes is their proclamation of the left or radical left they present. Not the Human. They attract donations, sponsors and funds and open Institutes for Cultural studies and Centers for Humanities. Perhaps, seeing and knowing too much needs a defense mechanism of forgetting, splitting and planned dehumanization. It does not progress into remaining human and living in the real. What is needed is a linking of facts not slicing up of theories according to the geographical locations we have had the opportunity to see while jumping into the circus caravan of preaching Human Rights. Coincidentally, the view in the »wagon« of justice donorism is always comfortable drawing us farther from the disturbing scenes of on-ground reality. Humility rather than expertise is needed in a world divided into those who »have« and those who do »not have«. In a world where Human rights have become the special kind of enzymatic factors provoked when the globalized scheme of investing seems to slow down. In other words, when »culture« of the other becomes an obstacle to free trading, consumerism and open markets.

In her prolegomena of trying to perceive and feel a more humane world Eva Kalny^{XIX,25} evokes the history of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Her humane advocacy is not lost in the Foucauldian theories of Power, Cliffordian Diasporic search for meaning nor Baudrillard's corridors of defining the hyperreality. She is not seduced by the great minds of our time trying to mimic their semantic fields of thought. After painstaking on ground activism she is not lost in the labyrinths of solipsistic sermons' intended to be brought back home to the epicenters of western knowledge, rights, right kind of cultures and eventually, good financial supporting. She writes what might not be published, academically appraised or financially supported in any mainstream Foundation, rejected as a rebellious critique. She writes the facts and seeks the truth, which does not go well with the mainstream presentations of our nowadays academic discourses of endless »talks«, »readings« and »gazing«. She does not speak on the behalf of the regimes rejecting the human rights as »Western«²⁵, neither does she propose a denigration of their value for humanity. In fact, drawing on Baxi^{25,26} she warns us of his useful distinction being made between the *politics for human rights* and the *politics of human rights*, which helps us in distinguishing whether a specific policy is being aimed at

^{XVIII} The unbearable splitting of *good* and *bad* and *imagined* and *real* dragged into the extreme of the perpetuated culture of death, or more psychoanalytically precise – an open invitation to a celebration of a confirmed depersonalization. For an in-depth information on the structuralization of the culture of death see: De Marco and Wiker, 2004. In the meanwhile the author proposes a test to the readers, of their positioning towards the culture of death that might be hidden within the reaction to the visual triangulation and the response to it (disturbed/undisturbed/not understanding the linkage): Libyan Col. Muammar Gaddafi's execution <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tE7wjjsZfsA&skipcontrinter=1>; Unconfirmed! – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ed0kn58v8vI&feature=related>; Lady Gaga Paparazzi Blood Performance MTV- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1nhDwoy79DM>

^{XIX} Eva Kalny, 2009:372–375; Upendra Baxi 2005, 2006, 2002:57.

upholding the life in dignity for all human beings, or at achieving the political or economical goals through the instrumentalization of human rights as a pretext²⁵. She helps us see the importance of this differentiation through emphasizing that the central value of human rights, the dignity of all human beings, can only materialize in the prohibition of discrimination. Yet, when one speaks of the development of the rights within the human rights, synergistically, with the postcolonialism and neoliberalism, one tends to forget the question of discrimination and the centrality of the dignity of all human beings²⁵. In fact one supports the division of Rights on the basis of their »Western-ness« and »non-Western-ness« and ascribes to the claiming a hierarchization of civilized rules above the »golden rule« of »treating others as you want to be treated« already present in religions and traditions of the world through centuries²⁵.

In the sequence of earlier described Zagreb events the perception of the instrumentalized version of Human Rights is more than apparent. While the positive FAN-NIMBY^{27,XX} action of Varsavská could be appraised as a civic disobedience to play by the rules of the neoliberal schemes and changing livelihoods, the perception of Human Rights of all of the actors is in fact instrumentalized by the many NGO's not seeing any problems in not having an opinion about the »educational« and »cultural« crime scenes or drawing their finances directly via Bank transactions of their designated supporters. In the same course of thought, as long as the power of a Dictator is »put down« by civic disobedient force, the blood shed faces of the CNN-live executions are a part of the fight for freedom. Lady Gaga hyperreality MTV execution brought back to the real, yet far enough to matter in a shrinking world of dehumanized splitted objects. For many it is forgotten that the Republic of Croatia had a fair share of the violence sequence started by the Serb Aggression in the North-East (Slavonia) and South-East (Dubrovnik) of Croatia, followed by a fall of the town of Vukovar that was internationally silenced through media. Upon the fall of Vukovar on the 18th November, 1991. a genocide took place in and around Vukovar, Croatia. United Nations, European Union and all other (N)GO »observers«, »watchers« and »keepers« did nothing. Yet today, Croatia is joyfully entering the very promising arrangements with unstable international Institutions such as European Union and NATO, that to this

date have not opened the chapter »lessons learned« from their fieldwork and political diaries of what took place in the genocidal territories they, together with the media, decided to switch off from viewing in the fall of 1991. The whole sequence was repeated afterwards in the case of sequential genocidal falls of many towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina, followed by the occupation of Sarajevo and fall of Srebrenica in 1995. Justice? Human Rights?

Discussion about the Splitting in the Domain of Biological/ In Further support of an Ongoing Discussion

Within the matrix of all entanglements *difference* becomes the critical word of our theoretical and activist stances. In his seminal account on culture Adam Kuper^{XXI,28} tries to ease the culture craze of or days by disillusioning at least some of the premises upon which the whole project of cultural studies or multiculturalism are upraised. For instance, he exposes the double standards of culture talk concerning the question of racism and culture. He gives the example of an anti-racist standing up for the right of the Chicano identity, emphasizing, that the whole point is that the rights holder is recognized and singled out as a Chicano identity. In other words, on the basis of his descent²⁸. In the same fashion he gives the example of the »gender/sex« issues of the many gender solidarity movements, whereas although the gender (culturally constructed) should not be directly derived from the biology of the »sex«, identity does depend on biology²⁸. The cult of difference underlies all actions towards a free process of cultural and identity invention, yet, Kuper concludes, difference is regularly accompanied or not by superiority. Leaving the whole issue in the domain of the culture talk, means to forget one of Levi-Strauss most valuable urgings for anthropologists – not to measure the differences between people on a single scale. The measure of human uniformity is our common ability to learn, to borrow, to assimilate²⁸.

This biological basis of uniformity is often forgotten in nowadays talk about identities, cultures and Rights. We are glued to the schizoid double-bind standards of confused, but consumeristically perpetuated differences of human/dehumanized, right/wrong or perceived/non-perceived^{29,XXII}. Does a first world participant of an International Conference being held in the Third world

^{xx} NIMBY – a well known acronym of »not in my backyard« syndrom where the residents uprise towards responding to an oppression (see: Emilie Travel Livezey, 1980). The original acronym was coined in connection to being aware of the nuclear waste and chemical degradation. In other words, the post NIMBY reactions are a reversal of its original usage by Livezey. In the case of Croatia it might be called FAN-NIMBY, signifying the First Anti-Neoliberal response of viewing ones own street, town and region under attack. Two blocks farther there is another street – Kupska, disappearing under the constructions being conducted. Thus, the Croatian FAN-NIMBY response does not necessarily carry the full moral stance of a defense of one's dignity. It is, however, a good start towards understanding that only a few streets farther (at that time ongoing Bodys revealed exhibition) there might be a cause of expanding the phrase from urbanistically mapped ones (Right to the city) to more appropriate ones – Right to remaining human – anywhere, anytime.

^{xxi} Adam Kuper 1999:241–243.

^{xxii} Double-bind in lay terms describes an impossible, confusing positions we may find ourselves in. The author proposes its usage in the context of today's consumerism of Human Rights. The concept was introduced into psychiatry through the famous anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1956), upon his ob-

(say about AIDS in South Africa) celebrate or scorn the differences? It is not an amazement, but rather a remorseful (to this day) shame of being part of a group of academics toured through the Soweto (SA) and witnessing the freight of the majority to get out of the bus in order of not being infected with HIV while being invited to step out and be honored with a singing recital of the orphans in one of the Mandela's Kindergartens. It is not an easy memory of being in a group of academics that felt the divide by being taken in 5 minutes from the slum outskirts of Johannesburg to a residence of a major International Institutional observer/donor. The same people that we were invited to »gaze« were probably the parents and grandparents of the dressed up butlers that paraded around the pool among the many invited participants, at least having the job of earning a daily portion of bread, while serving us with caviar canapés. This is not to downgrade the hospitality, but pay respect to the everyday bearers and their on-ground international donors/observers enmeshed in the great humanity divide. While the world is »brave« and »new« for some, transgenerationally and visibly biological, it is centuries old and vicious for the majority of humanity.

Conclusion (Politically Non-Correct)

Bravery is seldom perceived as an act of everyday living. Yet numerous anthropologists portray the livelihoods where the »talk« falls right back to the basics – we live in bodies and bodies are in realities of daily suffering, dying and brave biological resistance. Some can feel the Others suffering body, compromised land with its resources, abused air and sold-out water reserves. Others tend to wrap it into theories and defense mechanisms. Some can sense that dignity means dwelling with one's body and soul, not only with uncatchable cultures, ethnicities or identifications. Others calculate these positions as unworthy, yet unavoidable, ballast into the cosmopolitan liberal world of »democratization« and »pluralistic« formalized civility. It may mean not giving a damn about future Vukovar's, Sarajevo's and Srebrenica's genocidal grounds amidst Europe, yet that is the way of the path. No? To be more precise and scientifically informed – Kalny²⁵ warns of the formattized form of the human rights and what enables it:

»The idea of the alleged Western-ness of human rights and related processes of othering can lead, in combination with unequal power relations, to an explicit denial of human rights. In fact, only imbalances of power and a feeling of superciliousness make it possible to argue with success, on the one hand that all human beings are

born free and equal in dignity and rights and are endowed with reason and conscience, as stated in Article I of the UDHR, and, on the other hand, that only people of one specific cultural context have been able to find this out«^{XXIII,25}.

It would be hard to find a today's forum of dialogue without the domination of imbalanced power and superciliousness. Sociologist Peter Berger, in his visionary work »Pyramids of Sacrifice/Political Ethics and Social Change«^{XXIV,30}, gives one of the first renditions upon the state of world-wide conferencing, debating and 'solving' problems. As early as 1974 he warns of the fatal double standard that prevents seeing and hearing the real issues on ground. Berger is more prone to conclude that this flaw of communication falls into the domain of purposeful ignorance rather than sensory problems in 'translating' cultures. Lining up all the important global players (of which many have developed, grew and financially progressed more than the populations they supported) he sees great trouble in their power-based approach which measures all by its own standards, negating the local definitions of reality. While the Western standards may be founded on the right of individuals to choose their own meanings, in the rest of the world abiding by tradition is the main right. It is not uncivilized, barbarous or primitive. It just is.

It is the meaning of different life's that we should respect, according to their own defining of their world³⁰. Three decades later, Kalny rightly states again, and this time with even more argumentation based on the sad real, that we must keep track of our politicizing of the human rights and our dynamics of othering in a time when WTO has forcefully introduced the »right of unlimited free trade«, while the economic and social rights lag behind²⁵. The uncomfortable tension of this difference should not be perceived only through discursive theories, indescribable identifications, relations of power (in which we are secretly happy to be seated on the better end) or transcendence of sovereignty (all well known syntagmas of well known authors). It should be turned back to the questions of morality and the quest of recognizing dignity and discrimination as the central issue of academic concern. As shown earlier, this quest is not a new one and neither are the »relations of power«. Yet, to see this means to ascribe the right to ones history, as Čolic³¹ explains in her study of the many relations of culture and history, placed in the paradigm of evolutionary progressive stampede, or as Fabian warns when debating representationalism³². We could stretch these important debates even further. We live and are educated towards different worlds of differentiating and perceiving differ-

servance that the schizophrenic patients on the ward get more agitated and worse in their symptoms after the visits of their mothers. In the strict psychoanalytical terms being put in a situation of double-bind is being in a position of prolonged incompatible, emotional demands from the ambivalent Other. However, it is not a psychoanalytical concept since it functions on the level of intrarelational dynamics. In recovering Bateson's concept and introducing its usage in the wider social and cultural phenomena's of our time the question presents itself: are we in a continuous consumeristic double-bind usage of all values?

^{XXIII} Eva Kalny 2009:389–390.

nces. Even the most informed on immigrants, transnational and multicultural issues do not stop to reflect about the functionality of it all and question the approaches towards cultures rather than the approaches toward humans. There is an epidemic of positioning oneself outside the matrices of differences, but only to the point of losing one's (mental) health or life, in which case, all are one. Sensing this on the path towards understanding is an important step towards the humility, much needed in the quest of politics for human rights.

Acknowledgements

This paper was part of the International annual course Anthropology and Health organized by the Institute of

Anthropological Research, Zagreb in Dubrovnik July, 2011. The autor is indebted to Professor Linda A. Bennett and Academic Pavao Rudan for inviting her and their support. This paper is supported through the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sports and is part of the Project »Cultures of Consumerism and Sustainability: Global Challenges to the Socio-cultural Development of Croatia« (No.194-1941560-1549). The author is continuously indebted to the Social Science Research Council and Mac Arthur Foundation for the support given through the SSRC-MacArthur Fellows grant that enabled her significant retooling towards advocacy anthropology, so critical for the further elucidation of today's many ramified problems regarding neoliberal globalism.

REFERENCES

1. ŠPOLJAR-VRŽINA SM, Coll Antropol, 20 (1996) 159. — 2. ŠPOLJAR-VRŽINA SM, Coll Antropol, 26 (2002) 89. — 3. HARRELL-BOND B, *Imposing aid*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986). — 4. MAMDANI M, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War and the Roots of Terror*. (Doubleday/Random House Inc., New York, 2004). — 5. ŠPOLJAR-VRŽINA S, RUDAN R, *Medical Anthropology of the 21st Century: Between Local/Global Health Myths and Neoliberal Devastation of Global Health*, IUAES Commission on Medical Anthropology and Epidemiology. In: NAS PM, ZHANG J. (Eds.) *Anthropology Now Essays by the Scientific Commission of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES)*. (Intellectual Property Publishing House China, Kunming, China, 2009). — 6. ŠPOLJAR-VRŽINA S, *Simptomi globalne sinergije zdravstveno/okolišne destrukcije ili zašto je Hrvatskoj potrebna antropologija zagovora*. In: LAY V. (Ed.) *Razvoj sposoban za budućnost* (Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, 2007). — 7. ŠPOLJAR-VRŽINA S, *Društvena istraživanja*, 98 (6) (2008) 999. — 8. FREUD S, *On narcissism, Standard Edition*, Vol. 14 (1914) (Hogarth Press, London, 1957). — 9. FREUD S, *The future of an illusion, Standard Edition*, Vol. 21(1927) (Hogarth Press, London, 1961). — 10. FREUD S, *Splitting of the ego in the defensive process: Standard Edition*, Vol. 23(1938), (Hogarth Press, London, 1964). — 11. FROMM E, *The heart of man, its genius for good and evil* (New York, Harper & Row, New York, 1964). — 12. LASCH C, *The culture of narcissism: american life in an age of diminishing expectations* (Norton, New York, 1979). — 13. FRIEDMAN J, *Anthropological Theory*, 21 (2002) 21. — 14. CLIFFORD J, *Routes* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1997). — 15. BAER H, MERRILL S, SUSSER I, *Medical anthropology and the world system* (Bergin and Garvey, London, 1997). — 16. CASTRO AM, SINGER M, *Unhealthy health policy* (Altamira Press, Oxford, 2004). — 17. FORT M, MERCER MA, GISH O, *Sickness and wealth* (South End press, Cambridge, 2004). — 18. FARMER P, *Infections and Inequalities* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1999). — 19. FARMER P, *Ethnography*, 1 (2000) 183. — 20. FARMER P, *Pathologies of power* (University of California Press, Berkely, 2005). — 21. BURGOIS P, *Recognizing invisible violence* In: RYJKO-BAUER B, WHITEFORD L, FARMER P (Eds) *Global health in times of violence* (School of Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe, 2009). — 22. ROY A, *Frontline*, 17 (2000) 3. — 23. PAĐEN B, *Revealing the Body: socio-anthropological analysis oft he exhibition Bodies Revealed*. Razotkrivanje tijela: socio-antropološka analiza izložbe bodies revealed. Master Thesis (in Croat.) (University of Zagreb, Zagreb, 2011). — 24. DE MARCO D, WIKER BD, (2004) *Arhitects of the culture of death* (Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 2004). — 25. KALNY E, *Critique of Anthropology*, 29 (4) (2009) 371. — 26. BAXI U, *The future of Human Rights* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002). — 27. TRAVEL LIVEZEY E, *The Christian Science Monitor*. November 6 (1980) 1. — 28. KUPER A, *Culture* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1999). — 29. BATESON G, *Science*, I (1956) 251. — 30. BERGER LP, *Pyramids of Sacrifice* (Penguin Books, New York, 1974). 31. ČOLIĆ, S. *Kultura i povijest / Culture and history* (in Croat). (Hrvatska Sveučilišna Naklada, Zagreb, 2002). — FABIAN J, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1983).

S. M. Špoljar Vržina

»Ivo Pilar« Institute of Social Sciences, Marulićev trg 19/2, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: sanja.spoljar.vrzina@pilar.hr

GOVORI KULTURU, OPLAKUJ ZDRAVLJE, NADAJ SE NIČEMU: PREŽIVLJAVA JUĆI MNOGE PRELETE IZNAD GLOBALNIH KUKAVIČJIH GNIEZDA LJUDSKIH PRAVA

S A Ž E T A K

Današnji govor o bilo kojem problemu zdravlja je dio šire mreže neoliberalnih destruktivnih procesa, od kojih svi pripadaju kategoriji diskriminacije populacija i njihovih kultura, te kršenju digniteta. Loše zdravlje, siromaštvo narušeni zdravstveni sustavi i dramatični epidemiološki podaci tvore trijas suksesivnih vidljivih posljedica destrukcije koja se izjednačuje sa kršenjem ljudskog dostojanstva. No, korekcija ovakvoga stanja nije moguća bez shvaćanja da je povezana sa dvostrukim standardom percipiranja Ljudskih Prava. Autorica teksta zagovara dublju auto-refleksivnu prora-

du pristupa i bioloških realiteta. Zahtjev za ovim urgentnim stavom temelji se na novom, kroz postulate autora Kalny (2009) i Baxi (2006), orijentiranju prema iščitavanju Ljudskih Prava i zagovoru spram diferenciranja između politike za Ljudska Prava i politike o Ljudskim Pravima (kroz posljednji pristup vrši se i instrumentalizacija). Zdravlje i neodrživost zdravlja je jedno od najdramatičnijih područja u kojem je razlikovanje ovih pristupa potrebito. Teoretska razrada ovog pristupa direktno podržava brojne kritično medicinske antropologe, kao i autore u drugim područjima, u njihovu istupu i zahtjevu za, ništa manje niti više, doli digniteta populacija koje dnevno zastupaju.