Review Paper UDC [1:32]:323.269.6(497.12)
Received May 2nd, 2015

Lana Zdravković
Peace Institute – Institute for Contemporary Social and Political Studies, Metelkova 6, SI–1000 Ljubljana
lana.zdravkovic@mirovni-institut.si

The Possibility of the Impossible: Emancipatory Potential of the Uprisings in Slovenia

Abstract

The text reflects on the emancipatory potential of the uprisings in Slovenia (2012–2013). These are understood as a local manifestation of the global phenomenon, recently seen all over the world. Drawing on Badiou's understanding of the universal the uprisings in Slovenia are understood as a singular impulse of the universal struggle of the oppressed, or, with Rancière, "the not-counted". In times that Badiou describes as "capitalo-parliamentarism", this impulse opens up basic political questions: issues of common life, justice, and equality. I focus of the specific group of rebels who, with their demands, slogans, and activities, radicalized the entire process of rebellion, pushing it into the direction of true politics of equality, and opened up spaces of real political subjectivation, due to its understanding and practice of politics as a singular demand for the universal validity of its statements.

Keywords

emancipatory potential, uprisings, Slovenia, emancipatory politics, radical equality, possibility of the impossible

Context

The text reflects on the emancipatory potential of the uprisings in Slovenia (2012–2013). The uprisings are understood as a local manifestation of the global phenomenon, recently seen all over the world, from Tunisia to Egypt, Libya, Syria, and Turkey, Greece, Spain, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Portugal, as well as Italy, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and the USA.[1] My contribution draws on one basic axiom, namely, that any serious reflection on politics necessarily involves a reflection on basic, radical equality among people, i.e. on politics of emancipation that embraces the egalitarian norm and is therefore non-statist, non-representable, and non-identity/non-communitarian.

I understand the politics of emancipation in contrast to the classical conceptualization of politics (as governance) and to the widely accepted contemporary conceptualization (as a state or the activities of institutional forms). I therefore necessarily conceive of it outside of the framework which we nowadays seem to consider as self-evident, finite, and the best of all possibilities. Its realization is the national, representative/parliamentary/consensual, liberal-democratic state and all of its postulates in the framework of capitalist ideology. On the contrary, politics of emancipation can only exist as a space of universal

1 Uprisings, protests, and demonstrations have and still take place in many other countries around the world. We are actually talking about permanent war, the state of emergency in Agamben's terms (Agamben, 1998).

thought, in processes of proclamation, declaration, and realization. Thought is universal when it addresses all, when it embraces all and anyone, and is realized in this address as power, as an act. I therefore understand politics of emancipation as an active thought-practice proclaimed and executed at the same time by its protagonist, activist, militant. It follows from the universal thought which dissolves all differences, rendering them irrelevant to the thought process. As emphasized by St. Paul, the most famous anti-philosopher, activist and apostle: "Truth is either militant or it is not!" (Badiou, 2003:88)[2]

Drawing on Badiou's understanding of the universal "as a singularity that is subtracted from identitarian predicates; although obviously it proceeds via those predicates" (Badiou, 2004) I understand the uprisings in Slovenia as a singular impulse of the universal struggle of the oppressed, or, with Rancière, "the not-counted". In times that Badiou describes as "capitalo-parliamentarism" (Badiou, 2008:239), this impulse opens up basic political questions: issues of common life, justice, and equality. My aim is to outline and emphasize the aspects of the uprisings that signified true politics: an incessant verification of the axiom of equality that always counters the unjust, or, with Rancière, the "police count" of parts of the whole. True politics is established by those "excluded", the "part without a part" that declares its equality to all other parts of the entire community, thereby revealing the "scandal of politics", the fact that, in its core, politics is grounded in the absence of any *arche*. I shall therefore focus on the not particularly frequent, yet invaluable moments when true politics emerged, "breaks with the tangible configuration whereby parties and parts or lack of them are defined by a presupposition that, by definition, has no place in that configuration – that of the part of those who have no part" (Rancière, 1999: 28–29), thereby demonstrating that

> "… political activity is whatever shifts a body from the place assigned to it or changes a place's destination. It makes visible what had no business being seen, and makes heard a discourse where once there was only place for noise; it makes understood as discourse what was once only heard as noise" (ibid.: 29).

I am drawing on Rancière's conviction that true politics begins at the very moment when those who "do not have time" to do anything other than that prescribed by the normative police order, "take that time that they have not in order to make themselves visible as sharing in a common world and prove that their mouth indeed emits common speech instead of merely voicing pleasure or pain" (Rancière, 2004a: 3).

How it began

The uprisings in Slovenia erupted in October 2012 in post-industrial Maribor, which was left impoverished after the processes of transition. They were triggered by a request that the corrupted mayor resign ("He is done for!/ Gotov je!"), and swiftly spread throughout Slovenia, to go more or less uninterruptedly for over a year in over 20 towns.[3] Using the specific local dialects, all towns told their "local sheriffs" that they were "done for". In fact, this was a rebellion against the social elites' brutal, systemic, structural destruction of the commons (healthcare, education, social care, culture and the arts, public space, nature, etc.). Positioning the interests of the capital over those of the people, the elites first created a "crisis", and then used it as an "objective circumstance" that justified further exploitation (austerity measures, buckling up, cuts). The exceptionality of the uprisings lies in the fact that they started *spontaneously* (they were an act of civil disobedience, were rebellious

in character, were not announced to the authorities), were *non-hierarchical* (not organized from above, by any kind of leaders, political parties or institutions of civil society, NGOs or trade unions, but from below, by numerous people, with the bulk of organization going on via social media or directly, at coordination meetings), *non-identity* or *non-communitarian* (they did not represent particular interests of certain identity/community oriented groups of people, but the interests of all and anyone; the age, professional, and interest structure of the protesters was very varied). This changed over time as many institutions, initiatives, collectives and individuals got the wish to rule over, govern, and orient the potential of the uprisings to the fulfilment of their own goals. However, this text follows the activities of those political realities that managed to uphold the emancipatory potential of the uprisings.

Clearly, the uprisings did not engage the entire population of Slovenia. It is also clear that the "rebels" were not a homogenous whole. The process was co-authored by many, sometimes even internally conflicting agendas, advanced by individuals, groups, initiatives and associations. It involved conservative endeavours that saw the uprisings as an opportunity to consolidate their dominant position, as well as reformist ones that saw the uprisings as an opportunity to occupy the dominant position, and truly emancipatory ones, striving for radical – and not simply cosmetic – change of the extant political system that only represents the interests of the capital, albeit under the guise of parliamentary democracy. This third group of rebels – whose demands, slogans, and activities are of particular interest to this text – radicalized the entire process of rebellion, pushing it into the direction of true politics of equality and opened up spaces of real political subjectivation. It was enabled to do so due to its understanding and practice of politics as a singular demand for the universal validity of its statements.

Initiatives most loyal to this approach were mostly guided by anarchist thought-practice.[4] I am referring to the October 29 Movement (Gibanje 29. oktober) in

2

I use the term 'militant' to describe a radical attitude that persists in proclaiming the necessity of realizing the possibilities of radical equality of anyone with anyone, and hence to describe the ultimate emancipatory gesture of thought-practice.

3

The uprisings did not emerge overnight. They were an organic continuation and deepening of the incessant anticapitalist struggle that proceeds in various ways on a global and local level, and has its emancipatory history in Slovenia as well, referring to the activities of autonomous, antifascist, anarchist, worker, migrant, and social collectives, initiatives, and spaces. In October 2011, Slovenia saw a manifestation under the slogan "We will not pay for your crisis!", which was part of worldwide demonstrations that took place in nearly 80 countries around the world on that day (on all five continents). The manifestation was the people's reaction to the increasingly brutal violence of financial capitalism, an issue that triggered further inquiries into the problems of representational liberal democracy and the state as we know it. Those demonstrations were inspired and encouraged by the precedent years of protests and general strikes in Greece, the revolutionary impulses in Spain, the "Arab Spring", and attempts to occupy the New York stock market that led to camping in Zuccotti park, and demonstrations and upheavals in other American capitalist fortresses, under the slogan "We are the 99%!" that quickly spread around the world. The newly established #15o (2011–2012) movement's several months of camping outside of the Ljubljana stock market may therefore be considered as "a rehearsal" for the vigorous protests of 2012–2013, a rehearsal that greatly expanded the sphere of the "possibilities of the impossible".

4

Contemporary anarchism encompasses many fractions and directions, but all of them share one conviction: anarchism as theory and as a movement has, for centuries, strived for just, egalitarian, solidarity driven society and "today, anarchism is not only the most revolutionary current, it is, for the first time in history, the only revolutionary current left" (Vodovnik, 2011: 9).

Maribor, anarchist groups in various towns, organized into the Federation for Anarchist Organization (Federacija za anarhistično organiziranje),[5] and the Anticapitalist Bloc (Antikapitalistični blok – AKB) in Ljubljana, an informal fluid platform that emerged out of the need for coordination, self-organization, and self-defence during the uprisings. AKB embraced a heterogeneous array of collectives, initiatives, and individuals.[6] They were not subordinated to universal subjectivity, but they mobilize themselves upon universal questions and problems. All of the abovementioned initiatives shared a critical stance toward capitalism that generates and sustains a permanent state of emergency/war that articulates globalization today ("Against the dictatorship of capitalism!"). In brief, their understanding of politics may be outlined with reference to three axes: a non-statist conceptualization of politics, i.e. rejection of the relevance of statist or institutionalized forms of politics; a non-representational understanding of politics, i.e. a mistrust toward representational entities such as political parties, trade unions, and NGOs ("No one represents us!"); a non-identity/non-communitarian understanding of politics, i.e. opposition against centralist, particularistic, and conservative aspirations in the name of a certain identity or community. In terms of the question of mobilizing the protesters, this potential was evident in attempts at self-organization on the streets and in everyday activities (such as: organization of upriser and district assemblies, implementing direct democracy and direct action, collaboration on the basis of solidarity, production of new common knowledge, analyses, and ideas), which led to a re-discovery of common power beyond the constraints of extant institutions, structures, and protocols, which tend to act by the "fear of the masses"[7] principle. In terms of ideology, this potential was expressed as loyalty to the classical emancipatory ideals of freedom and equality. Their basic guideline was the assumption of equality of anyone to anyone else, wherein politics emerges as a declaration of "the possibility of the impossible", as eternal persistence at the point of the impossible. This means believing that every "impossible" is actually just a materialization of a previously unnoticed, universally valid possibility and a negation of the self-evidence that the "managers of the only thing possible" legitimate themselves with (Rancière, 1999: 133).

In line with expectations, the frightened ruling structure confronted this structure of the rebellion with vigorous resistance. Today, truly emancipatory ideas are usually seen either as impossible or as dangerous, so those who persistently advocate them are mostly treated either as utopians or as criminals.

Non-statist understanding of politics

The most emancipatory segment of the uprisings revolted against the state in its nation-state variation, which calls itself democratic, but aims at preserving capitalism. As such, it is first and foremost a place of power, and not of true equality. This premise had certain practical implications. Firstly, the protesters insisted on not registering the demonstrations, defending the conviction that everyone has a right to express their political will directly, without special permission of the state (which usually also involves a fee on using space that is otherwise public/common, and individualizes responsibility in favour of more efficient discipline and penalization). Furthermore, there was an incentive encouraging creative and autonomous demonstrations, resorting to civil disobedience, i.e. to unpredictable direct interventions (such as occupations of banks or state institutions and interrupting their activities, occupation of

the streets and interrupting traffic, occupation of faculties, a general strike or a decrease in labour intensity volume, and, in extreme cases, thefts and destruction of corporate private property) in various places, and not only where it might have been expected (in the proximity of the symbolic fortresses of power, such as the parliament, the municipality hall, the court). This allowed the demonstrations to truly reveal the otherwise concealed conflict between state power and the people. The protesters refused to follow the dictate of homogenization and form common demands, as they did not acknowledge the state as the instance capable of fulfilling their demands.

The protesters promoted the egalitarian idea that all decisions should be adopted by those indirectly or directly affected by them, on the basis of agreement and not on the basis of the (majority) vote, and that these decisions should be implemented collectively, rather than by one person or by a small group. This had an impact of their chosen method of organizing assemblies. Upriser assemblies took place according to the principles of direct democracy, which work best in small groups, e.g. in local self-organized communities that can be created "on the spot": wherever one lives, studies, or works (at the university, school, workplace, in household communities, etc.). The point of these assemblies, which revived the ideas of direct co-organization and co-decision, was to exchange information, convictions, and ideas, as well to discuss issues such as logistics, activities, and actions during the uprisings. Direct democracy meant that all those present took part in adopting the agenda, articulating propositions, and putting them into practice according to the principle of self-organization. Everyone present had the right to express their opinion and speak out at assemblies. The words of those present from the very first day were valued equally to those uttered by people, who had come for the first time or who only came once. A minority decision-making model emerged. Decisions were not adopted on the basis of consensus, but rather on the basis of the principle of direct democracy,[8] Rancièrian dissensus,[9] meaning that anyone who proposed and wanted to do something had the opportunity to proceed to do so, alone or as part of an affinity group, regardless of the majority opinion. Ideas were therefore put into action according to the DIY principle; all initiatives, which anyone was willing to put some time and effort into, got realized. This was only possible under the condition that all or whichever

5
These are: The Anarchist Front of Posavje / Anarhistična fronta Posavje – AFP, Alternative Exists / Alternativa Obstaja, Anarchist Initiative Ljubljana / Anarhistična pobuda Ljubljana – APL, Autonomous Group Nettles / Avtonomna skupina Koprive, Rijeka Anarchist Network / Mreža anarhista Rijeka – MASA, Organized Zasavje Anarchist Community / Organizirana skupnost anarhistov Zasavje – OSA, Maribor Comradery of Anarchists / Tovarišija anarhistov in anarhistk Maribor – TAAM, more at: www.a-federacija.org.

6
The Rog Social Center (Socialni center Rog), Invisible Workers of the World (Nevidni delavci sveta), Komunal, Rebellious Social Female Workers (Vstajniške socialne delavke), #15o, The Erased (Izbrisani).

7
Étienne Balibar uses the term "fear of the masses" to describe the phenomenon of mistrust in Spinoza's maxim "the people think" that exemplifies the complex relationship between the people and society as a structured community (Balibar, 1994).

8
In the context of the contemporary crisis or vulgarization of parliamentary representation, direct, participatory democracy is being given ever more thought and discussion not only in activist circles (where it has been practiced for a long time) but in wider public discourse, as well.

9
Rancière introduces the term 'dissensus' as a live principle of politics, as a process of reciprocal simultaneous mastery and subjection within a society (2001).

ideas and initiatives were at the same time *for all*, that they could potentially involve anyone, that they excluded exclusion as such.[10]

Thereby, the uprisers unveiled the concept of democracy which, being "the main organizer of consensus" (Badiou, 2005: 78), emerges as "authoritarian opinion" (ibid.), and in practice outlaws any critical position. Today, the stance that the rule is better than tyranny and that freedom is better than slavery, seems to have elevated the discourse on democracy as the only possible model of implementing and executing politics, to the level of an imperative. This has created a false opposition between democracy and totalitarianism, portrayed as the ultimate face-off between good and evil. The victory of democracy as a political practice is hence presented as a guarantee of a political form of justice and an economic form of the production of wealth. However, here, democracy is not conceptualized as "the rule of the people" or as an absence of any kind of rule "from the people for the people". On the contrary, it is conceptualized as the victory of the system of (state and suprastate) institutions wherein the sovereignty of the people is materializes, and which appear under various names: as liberal, parliamentary, representative democracy. It has become the global mantra to stand up for this kind of democracy, a mantra, backed by the logic of consensus, which eliminates the true subject of politics, replacing it with social, national, ethnic, racial, gender and similar identity groups. Thereby, a situation emerges, where identity conflicts are seen as problems that need to be "administered" with recourse to acquired expert skills, negotiations, and adapted interests, i.e. by normalizing and unifying anthropological differences in sovereignty. Democracy, understood along these lines, is, as emphasized by Badiou, never anything but a form of state.

The statist perception of politics functions as a sort of objective given. Monopolizing the legitimate use of force, and using structural, symbolic, objective violence, it produces strictly defined subjects-citizens which in all respects comply with Balibar's characteristics of "normality", where anthropological differences are unified and incorporated into power relations and discourse. This is biopolitics *par excellence*: we are not simply talking about state strategy of disciplining and controlling the population, but about creating their demands and desires, their initiatives and needs. The state is thereby the generator of the ideology of capitalism, reliant on creating the illusion that everything is allowed, that there is no authority, censorship, or repression, that everything is left to individual freedom of choice in the infinite supply of various possibilities. Supporting capitalism based on constant production, maintenance, and reproduction of the state of emergency and inequality, the state allows this state of emergency to become a rule. The state and capitalism are internally connected; capitalism's calls for "the free market" and "the withdrawal of the state from the economy" are nothing but a deception. Recent events in the capitalist world, where states "in crisis" are rescuing banks, stock markets, and corporations, i.e. the fortresses of the capitalist system, to the detriment of the people and common wealth, are an excellent case in point.

This is why certain protesters emphasized that understanding revolution as a struggle over state power, ultimately aimed at the dissolution of the latter, is problematic. Most of the revolutions of the past led to the state's reinforcement and expansion, and suppressed the very revolutionary forces that tried to control these processes. Saul Newman calls this the "place of power" or "the idea of the necessity and inevitability of the state, particularly at revolutionary junctures" (2007: 107). Or, in Badiou's terms:

"More precisely, we must ask the question that, without a doubt, constitutes the great enigma of the century: why does the subsumption of politics, either through the form of the immediate bond (the masses), or the mediate bond (the party) ultimately gives rise to bureaucratic submission and the cult of the State?" (Badiou, 2005: 70)

Not all protestors conceive the state as the place of concentrated power and consequently something that revolution would be able to destroy. Rather, they understood it as a series of relations between people, as a mode of human conduct; therefore, it could only be destroyed by constant active intervention, promoting alternative forms of grouping, organization, engagement, introducing different relations and different modes of conduct. Instead of "revolution", they went on to propose incessant protest; instead of reforming extant institutions they advocated self-organization; instead of hard structures, they spoke about temporary autonomous zones (TAZ).

"The concept of TAZ arises first out of a critique of Revolution, and an appreciation of the Insurrection. The former labels the latter a failure; but for us uprising represents a far more interesting possibility, from the standard of a psychology of liberation, than all the "successful" revolutions of bourgeoisie, communists, fascists, etc." (Bey, 1991)

Finally, instead of supporting extant relations, they proposed to render them obsolete through a process of construction of new egalitarian relations, believing that politics should not be a regulator between totalitarianism and democracy, but "interpreting active thought with no stakes in power" (Badiou, 2004: 14).

Non-representational understanding of politics

In their most emancipatory segment, the uprisings presented resistance to the principle of political representation, as they embodied the idea that real politics cannot be represented, but can only be implemented and verified directly. In practice, there was evident insistence on the premise that no one (an individual, an initiative, an institution) can call themselves a representative of the protests, as no one can actually represent numerous, varied, and heterogeneous people. The uprisings rejected the view that politics can only manifest itself as a technology of governance and administration, that it can only be executed through political parties. In doing so, they also defied the pressure of calls upon the "uprisers" (which were reduced to a homogenous whole in the discourse of spectacle) to form a political party in order to be taken seriously.[11]

The imposed concept of politics conceives political plurality and heterogeneity in terms of a bunch of "left" and "right" political parties that allegedly "represent" the interests of the people in the parliament (Rousseau's "common interest"). Political participation is limited to elections as a "celebration of democracy", and political equality is to be guaranteed by law; the entire

10
City Council Initiative (Iniciativa mestni zbor) emerged in Maribor at the time, dedicated to organizing regular local and district assemblies that allowed local inhabitants to become directly involved in the decision-making processes regarding matters of their concern. The initiative is still thriving. A similar initiative on district assemblies emerged in Ljubljana as well, and has so far organized five district assemblies.

11
The first movements that started spreading the idea of searching for equality without a struggle for power, led by the slogan "For us, nothing, for all, everything!", emerged in South America (which is of no coincidence, as this region was, as is well-known, one of the first guinea pigs for Milton Friedman's shock doctrine that politically, socially, and economically devastated South America and triggered a series of uprisings) (Holloway, 2002).

conundrum is allegedly driven by economic interests and competitiveness. In reality, however, we are dealing with the phenomenon of "capitalo-parliamentarism" – "an overly objectivist conflation of market economy and the election ritual" – as underscored by Badiou (2008: 166), where "left" and "right" political parties are hardly any different, as they all represent the capital, and not the people. This "parliamentary fetishism which in our society fills the place of 'democracy'" (Badiou, 2010: 3) homogenizes plural opinions on the basis of identity; dissensus as the live principle of politics is "civilized" into consensus, any heterogeneity is unified and classified in the name of pragmatism and utilitarianism, and the good of the common is subjected to the technocrat and profit-seeking interests of the social elites. Expert and technicist techniques therefore inhibit true politics. Rancière maintains that this phenomenon may be called "postdemocracy": here, democracy is reduced to the way of life in society, its *ethos* (which replaces *demos*), and understood as a practice of administration that legitimizes itself as an instrument of some scientific necessity. It therefore actually signifies an annihilation of forms of democratic activity. Moreover, it is "democracy that has eliminated the appearance, miscount, and dispute of the people" (Rancière, 1999: 119). This situation of democracy's reducibility to "the sole interplay of state mechanisms and combinations of social energies and interests" (ibid.) leads to the disappearance of the *demos*, to the elimination of the phenomenon of the people as the basis of democracy, as some principle of rule "in the name of the people, but without the people" (Rancière, 2004: 46), which in fact signifies a disappearance of politics as such.

In this situation, elections have a hegemonic role in political participation, and within the statist dispositive, all real political activity is seen as unnecessary, redundant, even illegitimate. Elections are first and foremost a statist operation: they can only be a political operation if one assumes that the state equals politics, which is something I oppose, like Badiou: "voting is on a mass scale and experienced as an imperative, whereas political or ideological conviction is floating or even nonexistent" (Badiou, 2010: 12). According to Badiou, their founding principle of counting by the number reflects a basic political powerlessness that becomes a rule inscribed in the "democratic" operations of the state. Badiou stresses: "If numbers alone are a cause for celebration, then this means that democracy is strictly indifferent to any content" (ibid.: 31), adding that Hitler actually won the elections too. Freedom from the tyranny of the number, "number of voters, as well as number of protesters" (Badiou, 1985: 68) therefore remains an important task of the real politics of emancipation.[12]

Part of the protestors did not want to become subjected to the hysterical reproach, articulated by the spectacular media machine, that they do not know what they want, that they have no demands, and that they "forgot to found a party".[13] This characteristic reduction of politics to the parliamentary circus and the political party as a historical necessity was used to tell all those who were not represented by anyone that they were utopians, losers, and dreamers. The activists responded to this gesture with slogans, such as "Let's not discriminate, you are all done for!", "We do not want the parliament, we will not give the streets!", "If elections changed anything, they would be banned!", and with analyses of the situation. One of the initiatives that emerged in the framework of the AKB, was a series of talks titled *Thinking the Impossible*, examined the theme of anti-capitalist struggle from a horizontal perspective. The initiative emerged from the movement's need to collectively reflect upon the ideas, processes, and phenomena within the

uprising, and from the desire to establish a space for talks where equal, active participation of all present is possible and encouraged. Therefore, no speakers at these events were determined in advance. The first talk of the series, titled "Beyond the Representation" (21 February 2013) discussed the issue of the representation of politics with reference to the uprisings and to the cynical calls upon the protesters to homogenize, and to form a political party.[14] This mode of reflection gathered invaluable insights, particularly taken into account that the people's faith in the mechanism of the elections is evidently wavering. Only slightly over 51 per cent of the voters participated in the last parliamentary elections in Slovenia (13 July 2014), and only slightly over 41 per cent attended the presidential elections (2 December 2012). It appears that half of those eligible to vote do not proceed to do so, which should make one think.

In this vein, the protestors critically re-examined Marxist categories of revolution, class, and rule of the proletariat, which are, albeit in a slightly modified version, regaining relevance in the process of formation of "new left parties". The critique of these parties is mostly rooted in anarchist theory:

"Wherever the socialist left has been successful in organizing and taking power it has at best reformed (and rehabilitated) capitalism or at worst instituted new tyrannies, many with murderous policies – some of genocidal proportions." (McQuinn, 2011: 272).

The critics therefore reproach the "new left" for deviating ever further even from symbolic opposition to the core institutions of capitalism: wage labour, market production and the rule or value, relying on organizations (political parties, trade unions, front groups) that mediate between the capital and state on the one hand and a mass of the dissatisfied on the other. It is all marked by reductionism, specialization or professionalism, substitutionalism, hierarchical organization and authoritarianism, fidelity to the "right" ideology.

"In the end, the biggest difference is that anarchists advocate self-organization while leftists want to organize you. For leftists, the emphasis is always on recruiting to their organizations, so that you can adopt the role of a cadre serving their goals. They don't want to see you adopt your own self-determined theory and activities because then you wouldn't be allowing them to manipulate you. Anarchists want you to determine your own theory and activity and self-organize your activity with like-minded others." (ibid.: 279)

12
For Badiou, thinking about the number is an important philosophical question particularly with regard to emancipation from the "tyranny of the number" in truly emancipatory thought. His work *Number and Numbers* (Badiou, 2008a) meticulously discusses the question of the number as a philosophical term, namely providing an analysis of the Greek conception of the number, and an analysis of radical mathematicians Dedekind, Frege, Pean, and Cantor.

13
The most symptomatic case of this patronizingly-subordinate call for an homogenization of demands and entrance into the sphere of governance that aims to passivize and to neutralize the emancipatory, radical, and dangerous, from the perspective of the elites, political action on the one hand, to implicitly justify the absence of a proper political imagination and courage on the other, and, furthermore, to create an illusion of normalization of the situation and of a fantasy of the possibility to choose among so-called "average people", is a text published in *Mladina*, titled "You Forgot to Found a Party" (7 February 2013). Other "means of mass stupification", as well as various initiatives, committees, and groups that acted as actors in the midst of the upheavals, were no less full of such calls, explicit and implicit.

14
The transcript of this talk is available in a thematic issue of the *Journal for the Critique of Science, Imagination and New Anthropology* (Zdravković, 2014), accompanied by a brief introductory text.

Non-identity/non-communitarian understanding of politics

The most emancipatory segment of the uprisings represented resistance to identity/communitarian demands, drawing in their core on universal demands for equality, related to everyone and anyone. In practice, this resulted in a very sharp critique of those individuals, institutions, and collectives that advocated particular (national, cultural, ethnic, etc.) interests, which allowed the state to loosen the grip of the protests, to manage, control, and criminalize them. Therefore, the most emancipatory actors not only distanced themselves from the state, overtaking power, establishing a new "upriser" party, and stepping onto the floorboards of the parliament, but from civil society as well, realizing that it was also, to a great extent, involved in the controversial process of numbing the social and political struggle.

Civil society organizations fighting for the rights of a certain identity group typically do not demand anything more than its successful "integration" into *extant* society, acknowledging "their" rights, respecting "their" difference. Although this approach doubtlessly has a major effect at a certain point, it never problematizes the antipolitical identity approach to the issue. Thereby, it ends up maintaining the identity minority aspect of these groups forever, instead of doing the contrary, i.e. weakening this identity ghettoization. This results in various "special programs" for "inclusion" of the excluded into society, which structurally forever remain in the minority, marginalized, discriminated position because of this very approach. Significantly enough, these types of groups eventually lost their protagonist position due to this kind of activity, which thrived on victimization and persisted in emphasizing the demarcation line of their symbolic identities. This is one of the key differences between autonomous social movements, initiatives, collectives that work *together* with the excluded (and are in the position of exclusion themselves) and the organizations of civil society, which act *for them*, *instead of them*, *in their name*.[15]

A part of the uprisers triggered the process of political subjectivation, defined by Rancière as "a process of disidentification or declassification" (Rancière, 1995: 67), as a formation of the one which not only relates to the self, but to the self as it relates to others. Rather than being about constructing identity or identification, it is about "crossing of identities, relying on a crossing of names: names that link the name of a group or class to the name of no group or no class, a being to a nonbeing or a not-yet-being" (ibid.). This identification is always impossible, it cannot be actually embodied by those articulating it. At the same time, it does not imply that one stops being what one is. It implies distancing oneself from the signifiers one is attributed. Only then can one become aware of the equality of anyone to anyone else. The political subject thus emerges from the gap between two identities: the one renounced and the one symbolically embraced. Neither the one nor the other is completely "ours".

> "Any subjectification is a disidentification, removal from the naturalness of a place, the opening up of a subject space where anyone can be counted since it is the space where those of no account are counted, where a connection is made between having a part and having no part." (Rancière, 1999: 36)

Using slogans such as "We are all Maribor!" at the protests in Slovenia, "Free Pussy Riot!" in front of the Russian embassy in Ljubljana, or "Today Greece, tomorrow the whole Europe!", the protesters consciously distanced themselves from their own identity in the name of equality of all and anyone.

They were particularly critical of attempts at nationalization that interpreted the uprisings as a desire to maintain national identity, as a question of patriotism or as an expression of state-formation. These attempts were mostly voiced by various cultural associations. Most of these were united in the Culture Coordination Committee of Slovenia (Koordinacijski odbor kulture Slovenije – KOKS) initiative, which ensured that the uprising was "Slovenian" enough. The public tribune of the Society of Slovenian Writers (Društvo slovenskih pisateljev – DSP) titled "Slovenian Culture amidst the Disintegration of Values" was also a vampire-like attempt at civilizing the "discourse of the street" into the "discourse of the unity of Slovenianness". In the "temple of Slovenian culture", Cankarjev dom, the organizers demanded unification in the discourse of Slovenianness, not without recourse to Slovenia's independence.[16]

However, certain uprisers maintained that the aim of true politics of emancipation as politics of radical equality, where equality is an assumption rather than a goal, was not to correct an "accounting error", to "count the uncounted", the excluded, transforming them into a "normal" part of the community. The very fact that the "uncounted" come forth, that they become visible, that they publicly announce their existence, already entails a subversion of any kind of common identity. The impossible equality of the part and the whole, "the many as one, the part as the whole" (Rancière, 1999: 25), represents a sort of an impossible count that embraces everyone without exception.

"'Workers' or 'women' are identities that apparently hold no mystery. Anyone can tell who is meant. But political subjectification forces them out of such obviousness by questioning the relationship between a who and a what in the apparent redundancy of the positing of an existence. In politics 'woman' is the subject of experience-the denatured, defeminized subject-that measures the gap between an acknowledged part (that of sexual complementarity) and a having no part. 'Worker' or better still 'proletarian' is similarly the subject that measures the gap between the part of work as social function and the having no part of those who carry it out within the definition of the common of the community. All political subjectification is the manifestation of a gap of this kind." (ibid.: 76)

"Impossible" demands

The most emancipatory demands were hence directed against the state and overtaking power, against the principle of representation, establishing a new party and entering the parliament, and against the identity/communitarian struggle. These were "impossible demands", "demands for being". As emphasized by Jelica Šumič-Riha, understanding the difference between a demand on the level of having and a demand on the level of being is a key to understanding any kind of protests (Šumič-Riha, 2007: 90).

The demand for having means demanding something specific, real, realpolitical, and expressing our lack of "possession". The Other is always latently

15
It is characteristic of the Slovenian context that emancipatory activist movements long lived in the shadow of the independence frenzy and the self-praise of civil society which transformed into the contemporary political establishment, marked by corruption, nepotism, and profiteering.

16
They started by remembering the May declaration of 1989 where the signatories – the DSP being the first among them – demanded "a sovereign state of the Slovenian people", setting a nationalist frame for the newly formed state. Judging by the role played by the DSP in the process of Slovenia's path to independence (and the role played by Yugoslav writers' associations in the process of Yugoslavia's disintegration), it is fortunate that its activities at the time were not more influential.

present or assumed in this demand, as an instance one can demand something from, an instance that can, if it wishes to, satisfy this demand. This demand for having lies at the core of most uprisings, protests, and demonstrations that demand "more democracy", "more human rights", "more freedoms", an adoption or reform of a certain law, dealing with a certain issue, attention to a certain affair from those in power. In these demands, the Other is necessarily established as superior, perfect, unavoidable. On the contrary, the demand for being asks nothing from the Other. The Other is thus completely abolished, as the demand for being only demands space allowing one to exist. The demand for being is therefore in no way dependent on the good will of the Other. On the contrary, its essence assumes destabilizing or, ultimately, an abolition, a disappearance of the Other.

"To find one's place in the Other, if that space does not exist to start off with, means drilling a hole into the Other, making space for oneself in the Other. The demand for being addresses the whole Other, or at least assumes that it is whole, only to point to its lack, its inconsistency." (ibid.: 90)

Insofar as it demands an abolition of the Other as an instance of hierarchy, the demand for being is truly emancipatory.

Understandably, the state or any kind of power aims at reducing any kind of demand for being to the level of a demand for having, as this is the only way it can legitimize and maintain its own existence. It will only accept any kind of demand or a relative absence of a substantial accuracy of demands, if it is articulated "in the name of a certain communal identity, an affiliation to a certain community, which is represented in the order of the Other" (ibid.: 91). What the state cannot tolerate in any circumstances is that singularities can form a community without referring to a certain identity. "In no case can it accord status to a demand addressed to it by 'whatever', generic singularities that are withholding themselves from any identity, from any kind of affiliation to a community. Acknowledging the demand of a singularity implies the disintegration of every social bond, an unbinding that questions the very Other, whose *raison d'être* is arranging singularities in space according to their places and functions" (ibid.). The demand for being is therefore the very essence of the politics of emancipation, as it demands rights for "anyone" rather than "for all", i.e. beyond the "possible" as dictated by the state or any kind of power. It therefore demands "right without right, by which political consciousness is *declared*" (Badiou, 2008: 167). This is why the greatest void in the Other is created by the universal demand: "what the Other finds so unbearable, unacceptable that he uses force to respond to it, is *the persistence of a demand beyond any specific contents to this demand*" (Šumič-Riha, 2007: 90). As the most radical demands in Slovenia were of this precise nature, it is not surprising that they triggered vigorous resistance from the ruling structures. This involved a series of various complex, inherently connected processes that oscillated between ignorance, mockery, contempt, and marginalization, repression, and criminalization.

The criminalization and terror of law

In practice, the resistance of the ruling structure resulted in producing the discourse of "violent protestors", "troublemakers", "hooligans", and "delinquents" that were to be separated from "peaceful protestors", isolated, tranquilized, and denounced to the police, as they allegedly inhibited "democratic", "civilized", "dignified" protests. The repressive organs and dominant media,

as well as some of the protestors, internalized this division. This resulted in an informal internal rift between those who supported such a distinction – these started performing various "cultural" activities at the protests (and turning the protest into a festival with their "Protestival"), the pinnacle of bizarreness probably being giving flowers to fully armed policemen – and those not in support of such a distinction. The latter warned that this dangerous process of aesthetization of the uprising would undoubtedly lead to its criminalization, which would have destructive consequences for the arrested, beaten, and criminalized individuals, as well as for the protest as a whole. As the first protests were first and foremost a manifestation of anger, which resulted in street confrontations of the protesters and the police, in burning certain objects and damaging the facade of the Municipality of Maribor building, the strategy of "tranquilization" was most evidently at work when central stages were erected at the protests that followed in Maribor and Ljubljana and elsewhere. This spatial configuration led to a hierarchization: speakers appeared, as well as an entertainment program, concerts. The main aims of this festivalization of the uprising was to transform uprisers from active protagonists into passive recipients of the "cultural program", to limit "uncontrolled" anger, transforming it into controlled, non-conflicting, non-dangerous conduct, to convert attempts at self-organization, solidarity and mutual empowerment into obedience to central organization. To a notable extent, this process of carnivalization contributed to the emergence of self-declared organizers, representatives, coordinators of the struggle, who parasitically exploited its emancipatory potential.

The initiatives that neutralized the vigour, multiplicity, and unpredictability of the riot on the street using a central stage featuring politicians-managers-technocrats in the making, who told the people, what they had to desire, the performers, who entertained the people and the "organizers" of the protests, who told the people, when to go home, contributed to the fact that all those who participated in the riots autonomously were put onto a list of suspects. Those who did not agree to the passivization of the protests, to protesting as folklore, filling up one's free time or scoring points for one's future career, were considered suspicious. Those, whose direct interventions, civil disobedience and deviations from the "rules of protest" made the conflict between the people and the authorities visible. In these circumstances, the AKB, for example, symbolically focused on the fence put up on the square in front of the parliamentary building in Ljubljana. As the fence was the symbolic border between the people and the authorities, and was guarded by a fully armed Robocop-like police squad, they performed various interventions directed at it, from pulling and trying to tear it down, to setting on fire and hanging printed out heads of politicians, all accompanied by slogans, such as "The Fence Must Fall!" and "The Fence Everywhere, Justice Nowhere!".[17]

All of this made it very simple for the process of criminalization to begin. All in all, with the history of protests in Slovenia in mind, the repressive apparatuses of the state responded to these riots in the most violent manner to date. During the uprisings, the police repeatedly used tear gas and helicopters; it was also the first time that it had ever used a water cannon. From October 2012 to April 2013, over 220 persons were arrested on account of civil disobedience. Numerous testimonies, recordings, and analyses show that arrests

17
It must be added that one of the protesters pulling at the fence and recognized by a policeman was – without trial or any kind of process – penalized with four months of probation to be performed over two years.

were conducted in a non-selective manner, arbitrarily, with recourse to excessive violence, and that some were conducted by policemen dressed in civilian outfits. The response of the prosecutors and courts was also disproportionally repressive. The prosecution was unusually quick in issuing indictment bills (which were often, and in an arbitrary manner, transformed from charges of misdemeanor to criminal charges), and courts were also swift in issuing penalties. This revealed a relatively evident urge to expel the protests from the sphere of politics, pushing them into the field of crime. This is a globally well-known procedure, used by the repressive and legislative apparatus with the help/according to the script of state establishment in order to maintain the extant state of affairs.[18]

When speaking about the process of criminalization, framed by the discussed method of discriminating between "violent" and "peaceful" protestors, one must recall that violence is an integral part of the antagonism in society. The state is founded on violence – systemic, structural, objective. It requires violence to unify the variety, multiplicity, heterogeneity of voices into one homogenous, citizen, national – imagined, and thus imaginary! – community. Systemic, structural, objective violence is part and parcel of the social conditions of global capitalism and is evident in the automatic *violent* creation of excluded and easily missed individuals: the homeless, foreigners, homosexuals, minorities, the physically and mentally handicapped, women, minors, members of subcultures, the poor, the unemployed, the structurally unemployable (precarious). The dominant system that structurally produces and maintains inequality, exploitation, and control, where people only have the worth of cheap labour – as a commodity –, that supports the creation, maintenance, and reproduction of global domination, is therefore sustained by violence. Its use bans any kind of conflict that could threaten the highest demands of capitalist rationalization – economic growth, profit maximization, productivity, efficiency.

Subjective violence that is usually portrayed as some sort of "outburst", "excess", "deviation" from this "normal state" is just a *consequence*, and not the cause of state violence. Structural violence persistently hides behind subjective violence which is highlighted, persecuted, criminalized, in reality always only being a *response* to the systemic violence of the state. In other words,

> "… subjective violence is just the most visible peak of a triangle which is also made of two other kinds of violence. There is a 'symbolic' violence which is embodied in language and forms, what Heidegger would call 'our house of being'. (…) Then there is what I call systemic violence, or those often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems" (Žižek, 2007: 7).

In reality, it is subjective violence that renders objective violence visible, exposing it in all of its brutality. We are therefore dealing with violence in both cases, with the only difference being that state violence is perfectly normalized and legalized, while all subjective violence that responds to it is criminalized and brutally penalized. The two types of violence differ in quality. One aims at (radical) change, and the other at maintaining the *status quo*:

> "The role of the Fascist spectacle of violence is exactly opposite: it is a violence whose aim is to prevent the true change – something spectacular should happen all the time so that, precisely, nothing would really happen." (Žižek, 2004: 497)

This is exactly what happened during the uprising, when (even underage) protestors, whose future and dignity were stolen by the exploitative politics of "tightening the belts", ended up in prison, were turned into subjects of crimi-

nal charges, were tapped, followed, and intimidated, while criminals, tycoons, speculators, and politicians suspected of criminal acts, such as corruption, nepotism, and position abuse were not only free but occupying high ranking positions that bought them social respect. Each piece of broken glass in the windows of the parliamentary building, each granite brick that was thrown, each attempt to move the police fence therefore calls for a question about the causes of such deeds rather than a sermon on vandalism. Thoughtless, *a priori* criminalization of such actions dangerously diverts attention away from real problems: the aggressive decay of the common good, complete havoc in social rights and persistent trampling on the values of solidarity.

"In contemporary politics, referring to democracy involves a rejection of radical attempts to 'step out', to risk a radical break, to follow the trend of self-organized collectives in the sphere beyond law." (Žižek, 2004a: 157)

The concept of law that, in Slovenia as well, is a way of normalizing inequality, marginalized, ignored, or in the most extreme cases criminalized attempts of affirming true politics. The law protects the interests of the state; it is through the concept of law that the state acquires monopoly over legitimate use of force. Law is the ultimate defender of the interests of the social elite; social inequality is legalized and normalized through the concept of law. The law occupies a privileged place in relation to other social institutions, it is ascribed a certain transcendental value, as it allegedly decides or judges on good and evil, on justice and injustice, on the possible and impossible. Rancière warns that when law is established as a principle of a certain identity community, the legal discourse hijacks the political:

"Today, the identification between democracy and the legitimate state is used to produce a regime of the community's identity as itself, to make politics evaporate under a concept of law that identifies it with the spirit of the community." (Rancière, 1999: 108)

Politics thus disappears in "the pincers of economic necessity and juridical rule" (ibid.: 110).

It is clear that true democracy may never be identified with the juridico-political form. This does not mean that democracy is indifferent to this form, but that the "power of the people" lies below and above this form, but is never identical to it (Rancière, 2006: 54). True politics begins with an exception, and not with a rule; it is not based on justice but on injustice (Rancière, 1999: 97). A regime rooted in the identification of democracy and the rule of law, on the other hand, creates the illusion of a community that is identical to itself and leads directly to the disappearance of politics in the concept of law, as politics is identified with the spirit of the community. Identifying democracy and the rule of law, the rule of law and liberalism is no guarantee for the rule of the people. Subordinating the state to the law is at most subordinating the political to the statist. The protestors thus succeeded in opening an important question of legitimacy in a situation where the state does not guarantee a decent life, but allows for exploitation, domination, inequality and penalizes those who point to this under the guise of respecting the rule of law.

18

An analytical text (Freedom for the Uprisers Group /Skupina Svoboda vstajnikom/, 2013) discusses the violent, suspicious, politically motivated arrests during the third Maribor uprising (3. 12. 2012), where 119 protesters were arrested, charges were pressed against 28, and most of them were held in preventive confinement for almost a month. The incident also led to the emergence of the Criminal Charge Group (Skupina Kazenska ovadba) that offers legal help and advice to the indicted.

An inner exit out of capitalism

The truly emancipatory effect of the uprisings was co-created by those uprisers who sought their place *outside of any law*, regardless of the consequences (and exactly because of them). Such an understanding is rooted in an evental understanding of politics, as an event is "a-cosmic and illegal" (Badiou, 2003: 42), it is "that which inscribes no difference in the subjects to which it addresses itself" (ibid.: 76). Such an "event as illegal contingency" (ibid.: 81) does not assume any kind of law, any form of domination, any hierarchy. The interconnection of the subject and the event therefore reveals that singularities are equal to one another in the universal or that "this paradoxical connection between a subject without identity and a law without support provides the foundation for the possibility of a universal teaching within history itself" (ibid.: 5).

If we follow Badiou, we can think the uprisings in Slovenia as a singular event that begins as an exception and not as a rule, and through which "anonymous individuals are always transformed into vectors of humanity as a whole" (ibid.: 20). If the cause and consequence or material proof of the event is its proclamation, we can, in the case of the uprisings in Slovenia, talk about the advent of a militant political subject that emerges as a set of singularities united by the universal. Part of the protesters therefore managed to establish a particular form of the collective with their emancipatory activity. Here, the 'collective' is no numeric concept. Numeric abundance and counting are operations that have nothing in common with true politics of emancipation, they are antipolitical: the event is collective when it "is addressed to all without exception" (Badiou, 2003: 74). The event is collective when it contains a universal demand of equality that encompasses "all" and "anyone", and refers to no one (no individual or group) more than to anyone else, or when it has the capacity of referring to everyone without exception, without a remainder. The demands of a certain part of the protesters for true equality of all or anyone with anyone else were of this very nature: they were internally universal, radical, "impossible" demands, they were singular demands that laid claims to universal validity. This is why this declaration interpellated the protesters as a political subject and enabled anyone to occupy this name.

Such an understanding of the universal even suggests "the void of any and every subject" (Badiou, 2004: 175) in the name of "infinite generic multiplicity" (ibid.).[19] Constructing such multiplicity is an example of universal activity: "a multiple such that to belong to it, to be one of its elements, cannot be the result of having an identity, of possessing any particular property" (ibid.: 174). To the constitution of "infinite generic multiplicity", no subset is more important than any other, this multiplicity has no characteristic feature, no hierarchic arrangement, no identity domination. The state or, in Rancière's terms, police, thinks in subsets, it counts and re-counts, it arranges and classifies (workers, women, children, students, the employed, the employers, the electorate, the population, and so on). The politics of emancipation, on the other hand, only knows the multiple as the universal name of all.[20] The constitution of the multiple "for all" presupposes establishing an inconsistent, not-whole multiple of "any kind of singularities" (Šumič-Riha, 2006: 15), that at the same time presupposes a prohibition for this multiple to present itself as a whole, as a totality. This multiple cannot present itself as All.

"'For All' not only does not aim at a constitution of a certain All; on the contrary, it questions every attempt at totalization, at a construction of a closed All." (ibid.)

This evental conceptualization of the political entails an important conclusion: each event that emerges as a product of declaring the militant subject and that radically transforms the reality existent up to that point, at the same time radically transforming the subject as well:

"… which is also Paul's maxim, which is that of the dissolution of the universalizing subject's identity in the universal, makes of the Same that which must be achieved, even if it includes, when necessary, altering our own alterity" (Badiou, 2003: 113).

In this sense, and the protesters incessantly kept proving this to us, we can never foresee the (final) effects of the politics of emancipation. As declaring equality is not the objectivity of action, but an axiom, the only really possible emancipatory gesture is the *decision for emancipation and trust in this decision*, trust in the fact that every victory achieved, no matter how local, is in truth a victory of all, a "subjective modality of the victory of the universal" (ibid.: 56).

The activities of a part of the protesters enabled the formation of a "paradoxical multiple", and "uncoupled multiple" (Šumič-Riha, 2006: 11), whose members are united by the very things separating them. "It is not something that already exists and would only require us to look closer and more attentively at. The uncoupled multiple is an invention of a mode of abstracting, placing in brackets, 'subtracting' the 'police count', to use Rancière's terms. This subtraction is always the subtraction of a particular mode of counting, valid in a given situation, which in other words means: "there is no recipe for the production of the Same in the realm of politics." (ibid.) A part of the protesters demonstrated that every true emancipation first and foremost requires responsibility, engagement, activity that will only be acknowledged as emancipatory if, in all of its singularity involves elements of universal action. Only such action turns every engaged individual into a part of generic humanity, into a part of "all". The state of emancipation cannot simply be attained without becoming emancipated as a "part of all".

"The paradoxical inner exit out of capitalism as the only form of practicing emancipation in the circumstances of globalization cannot be anything else but the constitution of a local, temporary, provisory community 'for all'. It will not last forever. The only thing that lasts forever is, in the very last instance, its name and the desire for it." (Šumič-Riha, 2005: 38)

The possibility of the impossible

The practice of the protesters is not presented here as the (only or best) model that needs to be copied, as a pattern that has to be followed, a recipe that one has to conduct according to. It is presented as an indicative example of

19
Being part of his "Platonism of the multiple", the generic is a key concept in Badiou's (first) *Manifesto for Philosophy*. Badiou borrows the concept from Cantor's "set theory". Badiou's *Being and Event* meticulously discusses the dialectics of the mathematical production of pure multiplicity and conceptual propositions that can re-define philosophy today, in order to prove that it is sensible to consider "multiplicity as a type of a certain truth" (ibid.) that allows one think a key triad: being, truth, and the subject. Badiou's *Second Manifesto for Philosophy* (and, in more detail, his *Logics of Worlds*) shifts the focus from the conceptual development of generic multiplicities to the body and the possibilities of its subjectivation, which then becomes the key concept.

20
Badiou conceives of this mode of "counting the uncountable" on the basis of Cantor's teaching on the transfinite number, "which succeeds in counting an infinite multiplicity of members by treating it as finite" (Badiou, 2008a).

thought-practice that emerged on the horizon in a certain time-space and was an important contribution to shifting the limits of the possible, to the "possibility of the impossible", to opening the basic question of the politics of equality beyond self-evident categories such as the state, sovereignty, affiliation, representation, advocacy, identity. As local action aspiring toward global effect where "courage directs the local amidst global disorientation" (Badiou, 2010: 76). Such practice makes one wonder, what would be possible if the paradigm of the social did not rely on capital, profit, and competition, but rather on constant collective searches, rethinking and redefining the ways of organization, decision, and action toward the common good, reliant on the assumption of equality of anyone with everyone.

The emancipatory potential of the uprisings gave birth to new initiatives, groups and collectives, new alliances, commitments, and collaborations. But the protesters' greatest "merit" is their constant battle against cynical conclusions that the politics of equality is impossible. The next step that would need to be taken is inventing and realizing ways to overcome the principle of constructing of one's own position in opposition to the existent. One would thus have to invent one's own constitutive force beyond persisting at a point of constant "opposition", where action is primarily constructed as counteraction. If emancipatory movements, in all of their heterogeneity, managed to construct a certain spatio-temporal dispositive that would connect the discourse of political subjectivization with the discourse of organization in a more active manner (aware of all of the pitfalls of such endeavors) (Mezzadra & Roggero, 2007), it would be an important contribution to materializing the politics of emancipation. But this would be the subject of a different text.

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio (1998): *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Althusser, Louis and Étienne Balibar (2009): *Reading Capital*, Verso, London.

Pureber, Tjaša (ed.) (2014): *Anarhizem: onkraj obstoječega* (Anarchism: Beyond the Extant), *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*, XLII/257.

Anderson, Benedict (1991): *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London.

Vodovnik, Žiga (ed.) (2011): *Antologija anarhizma* (Anthology of Anarchism), Krtina, Ljubljana.

Badiou, Alain (1985): *Peut-on penser la politique?*, Seuil, Paris.

Badiou, Alain (2002): *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*, Verso, London.

Badiou, Alain (2003): *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Badiou, Alain (2004): "Eight Theses on the Universal", http://www.lacan.com/badeight.htm (accessed on 27 April 2015)

Badiou, Alain (2005): *Metapolitics*, Verso, London.

Badiou, Alain (2008): *Conditions*, Continuum, London – New York.

Badiou, Alain (2008a): *Number and Numbers*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Badiou, Alain (2010): *The Meaning of Sarkozy*, Verso, London.

Badiou, Alain (2010a): *The Communist Hypothesis*, Verso, London.

Badiou, Alain (2011): *Second Manifesto for Philosophy*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Balibar, Étienne (1991): "Citizen Subject", in Jean-Luc Nancy (ed.), *Who Comes After the Subject?*, Routledge, New York – London (pp. 33–57).

Balibar, Étienne and Immanuel Wallerstein (1991a): *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, Verso, London.

Balibar, Étienne (1994): *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy Before and After Marx*, Routledge, New York – London.

Balibar, Étienne (1995): "Culture and Identity (Working Notes)", in John Rajchman (ed.), *Identity in Question*, Routledge, New York – London (pp. 173–199).

Balibar, Étienne (2003): *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Balibar, Étienne (2004): "Is a Philosophy of Human Civic Rights Possible? New Reflections on Equaliberty", *The South Atlantic Quarterly* CIII/2–3 (pp. 311–322).

Balibar, Étienne (2008): *Spinoza and Politics*, Verso, London.

Bey, Hakim (1991): "The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism", http://hermetic.com/bey/taz3.html#labelTAZ (accessed on 27 April 2015).

Colectivo Situaciones (2009): "On the Researcher-Militant", http://eipcp.net/transversal/0406/colectivosituaciones/en (accessed on 15 September 2012).

Holloway, John (2002): *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*, Pluto Press, London.

Jelesijević, Nenad (2012): "Emancipacija na robu estetskega režima"(Emancipation on the Edge of the Aesthetic Regime), *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* XL/254 (pp. 113–121).

McQuinn, Jason (2011): "Post-Left Anarchy: Leaving the Left Behind", http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/jason-mcquinn-post-left-anarchy-leaving-the-left-behind (accessed on 25 April 2015).

Mezzadra, Sandro (2004): "Državljanstvo v gibanju" (Citizenship in the Move), *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*, XXXII/217–218 (pp. 59–66).

Mezzadra, Sandro (2008): "Border as Method, or the Multiplication of Labor", http://eipcp.net/transversal/0608/ mezzadraneilson/en (15 September 2012).

Mezzadra, Sandro and Gigi Roggero (2007): "Singularisation of the Common: Thoughts on the Crisis of the 'Movement of Movements'", http://turbulence.org.uk/turbulence-1/singularisation-of-the-common/ (accessed on 27 April 2015).

Zavratnik, Simona and Andrej Kurnik (ed.), (2013): *Nesimo jih vun! Premisleki vstajništva* (Let's Take Them Out! Reflections on the Uprisings), *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* XL/254.

Newman, Saul (2007): "Anarchism, Poststructuralism and the Future of Radical Politics", *Substance* XXXVI/2 (pp. 3–19).

Noys, Benjamin (2008): "Through a Glass Darkly: Alain Badiou's critique of anarchism", *Anarchist Studies* XVI/2, http://slackbastard.anarchobase.com/?p=12086 (accessed on 27 April 2015).

Rancière, Jacques, (1989): *The Nights of Labor: The Workers' Dream in Nineteenth-Century France*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Rancière, Jacques (1991): *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Rancière, Jacques (1995): "Politics, Identification and Subjectivization", in John Rajchman (ed.), *Identity in Question*, Routledge, New York – London.

Rancière, Jacques (1999): *Disagreement*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Rancière, Jacques (2001): "Ten Theses on Politics", *Theory & Event* V/3.

Rancière, Jacques (2003): *The Philosopher and His Poor*, Duke University Press, Durham – London.

Rancière, Jacques (2004): "Demokracija kot nujen škandal" (Democracy as Inevitable Scandal), *Maska* XIX/86–87 (pp. 46–51).

Rancière, Jacques (2004a): "Politika estetike" (Politics of Aesthetics), *Maska* XIX/88–89 (pp. 3–9).

Rancière, Jacques (2004b): "Who is the Subject of the Rights of Man?", *South Atlantic Quarterly* CIII/2–3 (pp. 297–310)

Rancière, Jacques (2006): *Hatred of Democracy*, Verso, London.

Rancière, Jacques (2007): *On the Shores of Politics*, Verso, London.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1993): *Razprava o izvoru in temeljnih neenakosti med ljudmi* (Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality among Men), ŠOULJ, Ljubljana.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (2001): *Družbena pogodba ali načela političnega prava* (On The Social Contract, Or Principles of Political Right), Krtina, Ljubljana.

Skupina Svoboda vstajnikom! (Freedom to the Uprisers Group) (2013): "Sestavljanka za dekriminalizacijo vstaj" (A Puzzle for the Decriminalization of the Uprisings), in Simona Zavratnik and Andrej Kurnik (eds.) *Nesimo jih vun! Premisleki* vstajništva, *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* XL/254 (pp. 29–51).

Spinoza, Baruch de (1997): *Dve razpravi* (Two Treatises), Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo – Analecta, Ljubljana.

Spinoza, Baruch de (2003): *Teološko-politična razprava* (Theological-Political Treatise), Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo – Analecta, Ljubljana.

Šumič-Riha, Jelica (1996): "Anahronizem emancipacije" (The Anachronism of Emancipation), *Problemi* XXXIV/5–6 (pp. 25–46).

Šumič-Riha, Jelica (2005): "Drugost v politiki, drugost v psihoanalizi"/ "Otherness in politics, otherness in psychoanalysis", in Filozofski vestnik XXVI/3 (pp. 23–38)

Šumič-Riha, Jelica (2006): "Transfinitizacija v politiki"(Transfinitization in Politics), *Filozofski vestnik* XXVII/1 (pp. 7–30).

Šumič-Riha, Jelica (2007): "Jetniki Drugega, ki ne obstaja" (Prisoners of the Other that Does Not Exist), *Filozofski vestnik* XXVIII/1 (pp. 81–100).

Šumič-Riha, Jelica (2010): "Filozofija kot vzgoja z resnicami" (Philosophy as Upbringing through Truths), *Filozofski vestnik* XXXI/3 (pp. 149–162).

Zdravković, Lana (2009): "Paradoks koncepta človekovih pravic in boj zoper odrekanja državljanstva kot življenjske emancipacijske politike: primer Izbrisanih prebivalcev Slovenije" (The Paradox of the Concepts of Human Rights and the Struggle against Citizenship Rejection as Life Emancipatory Politics: The Case of the Erased Inhabitants of Slovenia), *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* XXXVII/235–236 (pp. 289–294).

Zdravković, Lana (2010a): "The Struggle against the Denial of Citizenship as a Paradigm of Emancipatory Politics", in *The Scars of the Erasure : A Contribution to the Critical Understanding of the Erasure of People from the Register of Permanent Residents of the Republic of Slovenia*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana (pp. 257–277).

Zdravković, Lana (2010b): "Emancipatory Politics as a Process of Involving 'Wrong' Names", in *The Renaming Machine*, Zavod PARASITE, Ljubljana (pp. 72–79).

Zdravković, Lana (2011): "An Arche or Barbarism: The Responsibility of Being of/in the World", *Journal of Visual Arts Practice* X/2 (pp. 113–123).

Zdravković, Lana (2014): "Misliti nemogoče: onkraj predstavništva" (To Think the Impossible: Beyond the Principle of Representation", in *Anarhizmem onkraj obstoječega*, *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* XLII/257 (pp. 53–66).

Žižek, Slavoj (1997): *The Plague of Fantasies*, Verso, London.

Žižek, Slavoj (2004): "Étienne Balibar in problem nasilja" (Étienne Balibar and the Problem of Violence), in Étienne Balibar and Slavoj Žižek, *Strah pred množicami: Politika in filozofija pred Marxom in po njem* (Fear of the Masses: Politics and Philosophy before and after Marx), Studia Humanitatis, Ljubljana (pp. 489–505).

Žižek, Slavoj 1995 (2005): *The Metastases of Enjoyment*, Verso, London.

Žižek, Slavoj 2004 (2006): *The Parallax View*, MIT Press, Cambridge.

Žižek, Slavoj (2007): *Violence*, Picador, New York.

Lana Zdravković

Mogućnost nemogućeg: emancipacijski potencijal prosvjeda u Sloveniji

Sažetak

Tekst razmatra emancipacijski potencijal prosvjeda u Sloveniji (2012.–2013.). Ti se prosvjedi mogu promatrati kao lokalna manifestacija globalnog fenomena, koji se često susreće diljem svijeta. Oslanjajući se na Badiouovo razumijevanje univerzalnog, prosvjedi u Sloveniji mogu se promatrati kao pojedinačni impuls univerzalne borbe potlačenih, ili, Rancièreovim riječima, »neubrojenih«. U vremenu koje Badiou opisuje kao »kapitalo-parlamentarizam«, ovaj impuls otvara temeljna politička pitanja: problem pravednosti, jednakosti i života u zajednici. U radu se fokusiram na posebnu skupinu pobunjenika koji su sa svojim zahtjevima, sloganima i aktivnostima radikalizirali čitav proces pobune, gurajući ga u smjeru istinske politike jednakosti, te otvorili prostor stvarne političke subjektivacije, zahvaljujući razumijevanju i praksi politike kao pojedinačnog zahtjeva za univerzalnom valjanošću tvrdnji.

Ključne riječi

emancipacijski potencijal, prosvjedi u Sloveniji, emancipacijska politika, radikalna jednakost, mogućnost nemogućeg

Lana Zdravković

Die Möglichkeit des Unmöglichen: Das emanzipatorische Potential der Proteste in Slowenien

Zusammenfassung

Der Artikel beschreibt das emanzipatorischen Potential der Proteste in Slowenien (2012–2013). Diese Demonstrationen können als lokale Manifestation eines globalen, in der ganzen Welt oft vorkommenden Phänomens betrachtet werden. Proteste in Slowenien können, unter Badious Verständnis von dem Universellen, als einzelner Impuls des universellen Kampfs der Unterdrückten, oder, in Rancières Worte „der Nichtgezählten" angesehen werden. In der Zeit, die Badiou als „Kapital-Parlamentarismus" beschreibt, öffnet dieser Impuls die grundlegenden politischen Fragen: Fragen der Gerechtigkeit, der Gleichheit und des Gemeinschaftslebens. In diesem Beitrag konzentriere ich mich auf eine bestimmte Gruppe von Rebellen, die mit ihren Forderungen, Slogans und Aktivitäten den Prozess der Rebellion in Richtung der wahren Gleichstellungspolitik radikalisieren und den Raum der realen politischen Subjektivität öffnen, dank dem Verständnis und Praxis der Politik als individueller Anfrage für die universelle Gültigkeit des Anspruchs radikalisieren.

Schlüsselwörter

emanzipatorische Potential, Proteste in Slowenien, emanzipatorische Politik, radikale Gleichheit, die Möglichkeit des Unmöglichen

Lana Zdravković

La possibilité de l'impossible : le potentiel émancipatoire des protestations en Slovénie

Résumé

Ce texte considère le potentiel émancipatoire des protestations en Slovénie (2012-2013). Ces protestations peuvent être perçues comme une manifestation locale d'un phénomène global récemment rencontré partout dans le monde. En se penchant sur la compréhension de Badiou de l'universel, les protestations en Slovénie peuvent être considérées comme une impulsion singulière d'une lutte universelle des oppressés, ou encore, avec Rancière, comme une lutte de « eux qui ne comptent pas ». À l'époque où Badiou la décrit comme ce qu'il appelle le « capitalo-parlementarisme », cette impulsion ouvre sur des questions politiques fondamentales : problèmes de la justice, de l'égalité et de la vie en communauté. Dans ce travail, je me concentre sur un groupe spécifique de rebelles, qui, à travers leurs exigences, leurs slogans et leurs activités, ont radicalisé tout le processus de rébellion le poussant dans le sens d'une égalité politique véritable et ouvert un réel espace pour une politique de subjectivation grâce à leur compréhension et à leur activité politique entendue comme demande singulière de validité universelle des déclarations.

Mots-clés

potentiel émancipatoire, protestations en Slovénie, politique émancipatoire, égalité radicale, la possibilité de l'impossible