

Mednarodna konferenca ob 80-letnici profesorja
in urednika dr. Rastka Močnika

International conference on the occasion of the
80th anniversary of Dr Rastko Močnik, professor
and editor

MOČNIKOVİ KONCEPTI

MOČNIK'S CONCEPTS

Ljubljana, 19., 20. in 21. september 2024

Ljubljana, September 19 – 21, 2024



UNIVERZA
V LJUBLJANI

FF

Filozofska
fakulteta

ZALOŽBA

* *cf.*

MOČNIKOVI KONCEPTI/MOČNIK'S CONCEPTS

Mednarodna konferenca ob 80-letnici profesorja in urednika dr. Rastka Močnika/
International conference on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of Dr Rastko Močnik,
professor and editor

Ljubljana, 19., 20. in 21. september 2024/Ljubljana, September 19 – 21, 2024

Organizatorja/Organizers: Oddelek za sociologijo Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani in
Založba /*cf./Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, and
Založba /*cf. publisher

Uredniki publikacije/Edited by: Gorazd Kovačič, Amelia Kraigher, Rastko Močnik

Založila/Published by: Založba Univerze v Ljubljani/University of Ljubljana Press) in/and
Založba /*cf./Založba /*cf. publisher

Izdal/Issued by: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani/University of
Ljubljana Press, Faculty of Arts

Za založbo/For the publisher: Gregor Majdič, rektor Univerze v Ljubljani/rector of the University
of Ljubljana in/and Alvena Žuraj, direktorica Založbe /*cf./director of Založba /*cf. publisher

Za izdajatelja/For the issuer: Mojca Schlamberger Brezar, dekanja Filozofske fakultete Univerze v
Ljubljani/Dean of the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

Prelom/Layout: Jure Preglau

Ljubljana, 2024

Prva izdaja/First Edition

Naklada/Number of copies printed: 70

Publikacija je brezplačna/Publication is free of charge.

Prva e-izdaja./First e-edition.

E-knjiga je na voljo na/Digital copy of the book is available on:

<https://ebooks.uni-lj.si/zalozbaur/>

DOI: 10.4312/9789612973995

Kataložna zapisa o publikaciji (CIP) pripravili
v Narodni in univerzitetni knjižnici v Ljubljani

Tiskana knjiga

COBISS.SI-ID=207964675

ISBN 978-961-297-400-8

E-knjiga

COBISS.SI-ID=207906563

ISBN 978-961-297-399-5 (Založba Univerze, PDF)

Mednarodna konferenca ob 80-letnici profesorja
in urednika dr. Rastka Močnika

International conference on the occasion of the 80th
anniversary of Dr Rastko Močnik, professor and editor

MOČNIKOVİ KONCEPTI

MOČNIK'S CONCEPTS

Ljubljana, 19., 20. in 21. september 2024

Ljubljana, September 19 – 21, 2024

Uredili/Edited by: Gorazd Kovačič, Amelia Kraigher, Rastko Močnik

Lokacija/Venue:

UL, Filozofska fakulteta, predavalnica št. 18 in aplikacija Zoom
UL, Faculty of Arts, conference room no. 18, and on Zoom apps

Spletna stran/Web page:

<https://sociologija.ff.uni-lj.si/mocnikovi-koncepti>
<https://sociologija.ff.uni-lj.si/en/mocniks-concepts>

Oba diskurza, teoretski in politični, »se nanašata« na proletarsko razredno pozicijo: teoretski diskurz *kaže* nanjo s svojimi teoretskimi postopki (s konceptualnimi razločki ipd.); politični diskurz jo *proizvaja* kot družbeno dejanskost razredne sestave proletariata.

— Rastko Močnik, »Historical Transformation and Epistemological Discontinuity« (*Filozofija i društvo*, let. 24, št. 4, 2013, str. 30–62, tukaj str. 59)

Both the theoretical and the political discourse “refer to” the proletarian class position: theoretical discourse *indicates* it by its theoretical operations (like conceptual distinctions etc.); political discourse *produces* it as the social reality of the class-composition of the proletariat.

— Rastko Močnik, “Historical Transformation and Epistemological Discontinuity” (*Filozofija i društvo*, XXIV (4), 2013, p. 59)

The speakers at the conference will analyse Rastko Močnik’s theories in different fields of sociology and humanities:

- semiotics and theory of discourse;
- theory of literature;
- theory of symbolic formations;
- sociology of culture;
- theory of society;
- epistemology of the humanities and social sciences;
- historical materialism.

The conference will be held in a hybrid format, live and online (Zoom), in English and Slovene.

VIDEOCONFERENCE LINKS:

1) Zoom (allows live discussions):

<https://uni-lj-si.zoom.us/j/93110160172>

2) Stream (live image and sound only):

https://youtube.com/live/UaCvYb3P_n8?feature=share

PROGRAM KONFERENCE

ČETRTEK, 19. september, predavalnica št. 18

9.00–9.30	REGISTRACIJA UDELEŽENCEV
9.30–10.00	POZDRAV ORGANIZATORJEV izr. prof. dr. Sašo Jerše , prodekan za doktorski študij in znanstvenoraziskovalno delo, UL FF doc. dr. Primož Krašovec , predstojnik Oddelka za sociologijo UL FF Amelia Kraigher , odgovorna urednica Založbe /*cf.
10.00–11.30	1. del: EPISTEMOLOGIJA moderator Rade Pantić Alpar Lošonc : Ekonomska teorija z ideologijo (Zoom) Liliana Deyanova : Kritična teorija supermodernega kapitalizma in ideologija človeškega kapitala (Zoom) Ivica Lj. Đorđević : Kritika sedanje družbeno-ekonomske paradigme za ohranitev človeštva (Zoom)
11.30–12.00	RAZPRAVA moderator Rade Pantić
12.00–12.30	ODMOR
12.30–13.30	2. del: GOVORNE PRAKSE, STANDARDIZACIJA IN KNJIŽEVNI KANON moderator Luka Culiberg Igor Ž. Žagar : Črna skrinjica argumentacije Milorad Pupovac : Kritika sociolingvistike kot argumenta za vzpostavljanje jezikovnih režimov Igor Kramberger : Subjekt, ki zase predpostavlja ... (Zoom)
13.30–14.00	RAZPRAVA moderator Luka Culiberg
14.00–15.30	ODMOR ZA KOSILO
16.00–17.30	3. del: IDEOLOGIJA moderator Andraž Jež Gal Kirn : Polifoničnost in razredna/partizanska pozicija Močnikove teorije ideologije (Zoom) Marko Đorđević : Izmuzljiva figura fundamentalista v Močnikovi knjigi <i>3 teorije</i> Todor Petkov : Razprava o ideološki interpelaciji med Močnikom in Deyanovom (Zoom)
17.30–18.00	RAZPRAVA moderator Andraž Jež

9.00–10.00	4. del: OBNOVA KAPITALIZMA moderator Milorad Pupovac Carlos González Villa: Predelava Gramscijeve pasivne revolucije ob (post)jugoslovanskem primeru (<i>Zoom</i>) Dimitrije Birač: Vloga države v zgodovinskem lomu 1989/1991: primer Socialistične republike Hrvaške Andraž Jež: Literarna javnost: izraz sistema ali opozicije sistemu?
10.00–10.30	RAZPRAVA moderator Milorad Pupovac
10.30–11.00	ODMOR
11.00–13.00	5. del: DRUŽBENA FORMACIJA moderator Rade Pantić Marko Kržan: Rastko Močnik o kapitalizmu v svetovnem merilu Milan Popović: Kapitalizem-fašizem in socializem (<i>Zoom</i>) Gorazd Kovačič: Koncept revolucije in njegova vloga v Močnikovem pojmovanju politike Boris Buden: Prihodnost srednjega veka: jezik in vednost (<i>Zoom</i>)
13.00–13.30	RAZPRAVA moderator Rade Pantić
13.30–15.00	ODMOR ZA KOSILO
16.00–18.00	6. del: UMETNOSTNE PRAKSE moderator Aldo Milohnić Miklavž Komelj: Partizanska simbolna politika in partizanska umetnost Katja Praznik: Močnikovi poduki: od teorije ideologije do materialnosti nevidnega umetniškega dela (<i>Zoom</i>) Sezgin Boynik: Ideologije sodobne umetnosti (<i>Zoom</i>) Andreja Kopač: Diskurzivni 'krogotok' performativnega: problematika poimenovanja in izpeljave
18.00–18.30	RAZPRAVA moderator Aldo Milohnić

SOBOTA, 21. september, predavalnica št. 18

11.30–13.30	7. del: EPISTEMOLOGIJA moderator Gorazd Kovačič Nikola Dedić: Delo v Aristotelovi <i>Metafiziki</i> : prispevek k teoriji simbolnih formacij Aldo Milohnić: Od 'historičnosti strukturalizma' do materialističnega koncepta historičnosti Primož Krašovec: Julija Primic in ChatGPT: ali generativna umetna inteligenca potrebuje čustva?
13.30–14.00	RAZPRAVA moderator Gorazd Kovačič
14.00–15.30	ODMOR ZA KOSILO
16.00–17.00	8. del: IDEOLOGIJA moderator Andraž Jež Rade Pantić: Pravna ideologija in Močnikov koncept protislovne institucionalne zahteve Luka Culiberg: Močnikova teorija institucije in <i>bušido</i> kot domačinska ideologija Japoncev
17.00–17.30	RAZPRAVA moderator Andraž Jež
17.30–18.00	Rastko Močnik: ZAKLJUČNA BESEDA IN SKLEP KONFERENCE
18.00–21.00	VEČERJA

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

THURSDAY, September 19, conference room no. 18

9.00–9.30 REGISTRATION

9.30–10.00 WELCOME SPEECHES

Assoc. Prof. Dr Sašo Jerše, Associate Dean of Doctoral Studies and Research, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

Assist. Prof. Dr Primož Krašovec, Head of the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

Amelia Kraigher, Editor in Chief, Založba /*cf. publisher

10.00–11.30 **Part 1: EPISTEMOLOGY**

Chair Rade Pantić

Alpar Lošonc: Economic theory with ideology (*Zoom*)

Liliana Deyanova: The critical theory of supermodern capitalism and the ideology of human capital (*Zoom*)

Ivica Lj. Đorđević: Critique of the current socio-economic paradigm in order to preserve humanity (*Zoom*)

11.30–12.00 OPEN DISCUSSION

Moderator Rade Pantić

12.00–12.30 COFFEE BREAK

12.30–13.30 **Part 2: SPEECH PRACTICES, STANDARDISATION AND LITERARY CANON**

Chair Luka Culiberg

Igor Ž. Žagar: Argumentation's black box

Milorad Pupovac: Critique of sociolinguistics as an argument in establishing language regimes

Igor Kramberger: An entity that supposes for itself... (*Zoom*)

13.30–14.00 OPEN DISCUSSION

Moderator Luka Culiberg

14.00–15.30 ORGANISED LUNCH

16.00–17.30 **Part 3: IDEOLOGY**

Chair Andraž Jež

Gal Kirn: Polyphony and the class/partisan position of Močnik's theory of ideology (*Zoom*)

Marko Đorđević: The elusive figure of the fundamentalist in Močnik's book *Three Theories*

Todor Petkov: The Močnik-Deyanov debate on ideological interpellation (*Zoom*)

17.30–18.00 OPEN DISCUSSION

Moderator Andraž Jež

FRIDAY, September 20, conference room no. 18

9.00–10.00	Part 4: RESTAURATION OF CAPITALISM Chair Milorad Pupovac Carlos González Villa: Stirring Gramsci's passive revolution through the (post)Yugoslav case (Zoom) Dimitrije Birač: The role of the state in the historical break of 1989/1991: The case of the Socialist Republic of Croatia Andraž Jež: Literary public: An expression of the system – or of its opposition?
10.00–10.30	OPEN DISCUSSION Moderator Milorad Pupovac
10.30–11.00	COFFEE BREAK
11.00–13.00	Part 5: SOCIAL FORMATION Chair Rade Pantić Marko Kržan: Rastko Močnik on capitalism on a world scale Milan Popović: Capitalism-fascism and socialism (Zoom) Gorazd Kovačič: The concept of revolution and its role in Močnik's understanding of politics Boris Buden: The future of the Middle Ages: Language and knowledge (Zoom)
13.00–13.30	OPEN DISCUSSION Moderator Rade Pantić
13.30–15.00	ORGANISED LUNCH
16.00–18.00	Part 6: ARTISTIC PRACTICES Chair Aldo Milohnić Miklavž Komelj: Partisan symbolic politics and partisan art Katja Praznik: Močnik's lessons: From theory of ideology to materiality of invisible art work (Zoom) Sezgin Boynik: Ideologies of contemporary art (Zoom) Andreja Kopač: The "discourse circuit" of the performative: The problem of naming and derivation
18.00–18.30	OPEN DISCUSSION Moderator Aldo Milohnić

SATURDAY, September 21, conference room no. 18

11.30–13.30	Part 7: EPISTEMOLOGY Chair Gorazd Kovačič Nikola Dedić: Labor in Aristotle's <i>Metaphysics</i> : Contribution to the theory of symbolic formations Aldo Milohnić: From the "historicity of structuralism" to the materialist concept of historicity Primož Krašovec: Julija Primic and ChatGPT: Does generative artificial intelligence need emotions?
13.30–14.00	OPEN DISCUSSION Moderator Gorazd Kovačič
14.00–15.30	ORGANISED LUNCH
16.00–17.00	Part 8: IDEOLOGY Chair Andraž Jež Rade Pantić: Legal ideology and Močnik's concept of contradictory institutional request Luka Culiberg: Močnik's theory of institution and <i>bushidō</i> as the "native ideology" of the Japanese
17.00–17.30	OPEN DISCUSSION Moderator Andraž Jež
17.30–18.00	Rastko Močnik: CLOSING REMARKS AND CONCLUSION
18.00–21.00	ORGANISED DINNER

**PARTICIPANTS
(IN THE ALPHABET ORDER)
ABSTRACTS**

Dimitrije BIRAČ

Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb

THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN THE HISTORICAL BREAK OF 1989/1991: THE CASE OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

My contribution is based on the theses in Rastko Močnik's foreword to the Slovenian edition of Carlos G. Villa's book *Nova država za novi svetovni red* (A New State for a New World Order, Založba /*cf., 2017]: I will apply them to the case of the Socialist Republic of Croatia. I have also used the concept of "historical break", based on the work of Michael Freeden and Reinhart Koselleck, who have shown how the political-economic concept of transition has transformed and how it reflected the realities of that time.

The paper will focus on Močnik's thesis that the state played a dual role in this period. First, by constituting itself as a "bourgeois state", it suspended the processes of socialist self-management, while at the same time, as a nation state, it carried out the expropriation of labour. I will look at the analyses by Croatian economists on the process of transformation and privatisation in the 1990s, and on the multiparty elections of spring 1990. Reviewing the works of Croatian economists, political economists and sociologists, we see that there was a high degree of consensus – transformation and privatisation were necessary for Croatia's exit from the crisis and its development. Contrary to this, my thesis is that the process of conversion and privatisation was essentially the restoration of capitalism through primitive accumulation of capital. What has been referred to as "wild capitalism", "cronyism" and "tycoon capitalism" was, in fact, the normal process of the emergence and development of capitalism on Europe's periphery. By analysing the specific dual role of the state as the creator of the system and the ruling class, rather than a passive agent created by the new elite, it is possible to understand the paradox of Croatia as one of the countries that entered the process of transformation and privatisation under the most favourable conditions, only to emerge as one of the greatest failures.

V svojem prispevku se bom oprl na teze Rastka Močnika iz njegovega predgovora h knjigi Carlosa G. Ville *Nova država za novi svetovni red*

(Založba /*cf., 2017), ki jih bom uporabil na primeru Socialistične republike Hrvaške. Ob tem bom uporabil tudi koncept »zgodovinskega preloma« Michaela Freedena in Reinharta Kosellecka, ki sta pokazala, kako se je politično-ekonomski koncept tranzicije spreminjal in kako je odražal takratno realnost.

Osredotočil se bom na Močnikovo tezo, da je država v tem obdobju odigrala dvojno vlogo. Prvič, s tem ko se je konstituirala kot »buržoazna država«, je prekinila procese družbenega samoupravljanja, hkrati pa je kot nacionalna država izvedla razlastitev delavstva. Obravnaval bom tudi analize procesa transformacije in privatizacije v 90. letih, ki so jih izvedli hrvaški ekonomisti, ter večstrankarske volitve spomladi 1990. Po pregledu del hrvaških ekonomistov, političnih ekonomistov in sociologov lahko ugotovimo, da je obstajala visoka stopnja konsenza glede tega, da sta (bili) transformacija in privatizacija nujni za izhod Hrvaške iz krize in njen razvoj. Nasprotno pa menim, da je bil proces transformacije in privatizacije v svojem bistvu restavracija kapitalizma prek primitivne akumulacije kapitala. To, kar se je imenovalo »divji kapitalizem«, »crony« kapitalizem in »tajkunski kapitalizem«, je bil pravzaprav običajni proces nastanka in razvoja kapitalizma na evropski periferiji. Z analizo specifične dvojne vloge države kot ustvarjalke sistema in vladajočega razreda, ne pa pasivnega akterja, ki ga je ustvarila nova elita, je mogoče razumeti paradoks Hrvaške kot ene od držav, ki je v proces transformacije in privatizacije vstopila v najugodnejših pogojih, a je iz njega izšla kot eda največjih poraženek.

Dimitrije Birač, after graduating at the Faculty of Economics, University of Zagreb in 2012, Birač worked there as a demonstrator for the courses on the history of economic theory, the history of Croatian economic theory, and the political economy of post-transition countries. Afterwards, he was an adjunct faculty member for courses on the history of economic theory and the history of Croatian economic theory. Since 2019, he has been a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Political Science, focusing on Croatian politics. He graduated with a thesis on Marx's theory of surplus value, while the topic of his PhD dissertation is "The influence of economic theory on the political changes in the Socialist Republic of Croatia in 1989/1991". His articles were published in several journals, among them Ekonomski pregled, Politička misao, Političke perspektive, Revija za sociologijo, Tragovi, etc. He also works in the archives department of the Serb National Council in Zagreb.

Dimitrije Birač, leta 2012 je diplomiral na Ekonomski fakulteti Univerze v Zagrebu, nato je tam delal kot demonstrator pri predmetih zgodovina ekonomske teorije, zgodovina hrvaške ekonomske teorije in politična ekonomija posttranzicijskih držav. Po tem je bil zunanji sodelavec fakultete pri predmetih zgodovina ekonomske teorije in zgodovina hrvaške ekonomske teorije. Od leta 2019 je doktorski kandidat na Fakulteti za politične vede v Zagrebu, smer hrvaška politika. Diplomiral je z nalogo o Marxovi teoriji presežne vrednosti, tema njegove doktorske disertacije pa je »Vpliv ekonomske teorije na politične spremembe v Socialistični republiki Hrvaški v letih 1989/1991«. Njegovi prispevki so bili objavljeni v več znanstvenih revijah, kot so Ekonomski pregled, Politička misao, Političke perspektive, Revija za sociologijo, Tragovi itd. Zaposlen je v arhivskem oddelku Srbskega narodnega sveta v Zagrebu.

Sezgin BOYNIK

Rab-Rab Press, Helsinki

IDEOLOGIES OF CONTEMPORARY ART

In my presentation I will deal with Rastko Močnik's theoretical and systematic approach to the ideology of contemporary art. By looking at Močnik's elaborations of artistic concepts such as *l'art pour l'art*, form, autonomy and references varying from the avant-garde to socialist-realism, or from Manet to Duchamp, I will discuss these art historical digressions as an excuse to work with theory critical of capitalism and its institutions. One such theoretical examination is about the consequences of the disavowal of the avant-garde, which he explains by studying the effects of Duchamp.

The renunciation of the avant-garde, Močnik convincingly argues, has given an alibi to the classical heritage of bourgeoisie culture, to its transhistorical tradition, and to the strengthening of its own existence, in other words, it has given an ideological pretext for the artistic institutions of capitalism.

Močnik's writings on contemporary art uses theory to take a second look at what might be considered a well known artistic fact. The conclusion of this operation is a very radical and challenging thesis: the specificity of the ideology of contemporary art is that it transfers the artwork and its responsibilities wholly over to the art institutions, regardless of whether it is a formal experiment, ideological interpellation, or the subversion of any kind.

The historical-materialist theory of Močnik can be used as a tool to oppose both the alleged formal simplicity of politically engaged art and, also, to depict the classical, traditionalist, and thus conservative dimensions of existing contemporary art institutions and practices.

Sezgin Boynik is a writer, editor and publisher based in Helsinki. He founded Rab-Rab Press, an independent publishing platform in Helsinki that combines experimental art and leftist politics with scholarly rigour and a punk attitude. He also co-founded Pykë-Presje in Prizren, Kosovo, an independent space using archives to oppose the nation-state narratives. Boynik is also involved in the editorial work of OEI, a Stockholm based magazine dedicated to expanded poetry. Among Boynik's recent publications are critical editions of Karel Teige's writings on the art market, the Russian Formalists' studies of Lenin's language,

the politics of conceptual art, the historical materialist study of visual poetry in Yugoslavia, and the objective form of contemporary art, among others. Boynik also exhibited in the Museum of Contemporary Art in Ljubljana, The Showroom in London, the 14th edition of Manifesta Biennale in Prishtina, the 3rd edition of Autostrada Biennial in Prizren, Kalasataman Seripaja Gallery in Helsinki, Agit in Berlin, and SALT in Istanbul (forthcoming).

Boris BUDEN

Karlsruhe University of Arts and Design (HfG Karlsruhe)

THE FUTURE OF THE MIDDLE AGES: LANGUAGE AND KNOWLEDGE

The unstoppable retreat of national language back to the vernacular sphere of our social, cultural and academic life – where it emerged from during the Renaissance – is a deeply contradictory process with unforeseeable consequences. The erosion of national sovereignty, global division of labor, migrations, digital technology, commodification of cultural production and education, are only few of the features of the historical condition in which this transformation takes place. Most of the European national languages, according to the recent research of the European Union, won't survive the digital age. Even the most powerful among them, German and French, cannot escape this fate. They too are losing today the prestige and domination they once enjoyed in their respective national cultures, economies and state institutions to the so-called global English. Is it possible to stop this process, or we will in a near future fully abandon working, learning and thinking in our national languages?

Boris Buden is a writer and cultural critic based in Berlin. He studied philosophy in Zagreb and received his PhD in cultural theory from Humboldt University in Berlin. In the 1990s he was editor in the magazine *Arkzin* in Zagreb. Among his translations are some of the most important works by Sigmund Freud. His essays and books cover the topics of philosophy, politics, cultural and art criticism. He has participated in various conferences and art projects in Western and Eastern Europe, Asia and USA, including Documenta XI. Buden is permanent fellow at The European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies in Vienna, and teaches at various universities in Europe. His most recent book is *Transition to Nowhere: Art in History After 1989* (Berlin, 2020).

Luka CULIBERG

Department of Asian Studies, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts

MOČNIK'S THEORY OF INSTITUTION AND BUSHIDŌ AS THE "NATIVE IDEOLOGY" OF THE JAPANESE

MOČNIKOVA TEORIJA INSTITUCIJE IN BUŠIDO KOT DOMAČINSKA IDEOLOGIJA JAPONCEV

The concepts that Professor Močnik developed in his theoretical work cannot simply be ignored without consequences in practically every field of knowledge in the social sciences and humanities, at least not without the fear that this field will remain a field of "knowledge", i.e. a spontaneous ideological field that is overdetermined by the ruling ideology and does not take the most difficult step – the transition to theory. Whether in sociology, anthropology, political science, linguistics or the arts, in all these fields of knowledge Močnik has been developing the conceptual tools that enable the production of a theoretical problem field and thus the transition from knowledge to theory.

When I started attending Professor Močnik's lectures in sociology of culture at the Faculty of Arts, his book *3 teorije: ideologija, nacija, institucija* (Three Theories: ideology, nation, institution, Založba /*cf., 1999) was published and immediately became an important point of reference in my intellectual development. From then on, my central concern in intellectual work was the endeavour to distinguish ideological notions from theoretical concepts and to criticise the spontaneous ideology of disciplinary structures through the lens of these concepts. In this sense, I became a "Močnikian".

In this paper I will try to show how I understand Močnik's elaboration of one of the fundamental concepts for the production of the theoretical field in the area of social practises and their native representations – the theory of institution – and what implications this has for anthropological and historical work on the concrete example of native understanding, the so-called ideology of the samurai "code" or "way of the samurai" – *bushidō* 武士道.

I will analyse *bushidō*, a heterogeneous set of social practises and ideological representations to reinforce the hierarchical social structure of feudal Japan,

through the lens of Močnik's concepts of institution and ideology. I will try to uncover what political strategies and interests determined the interpretations and reinterpretations and what role they played in the process of reinstitutionalising the bushidō during the transition from feudalism to a national society (and also discuss *hara-kiri* as a complementary institution that emerges from the logic of the structure and resolves the internal contradictions of the bushidō). In this way, I will attempt to demonstrate the efficacy of Professor Močnik's concepts for theoretical work in the field of historical anthropology, while also addressing the gaps that arise in the application of these concepts to concrete historical and anthropological material.

Konceptov, ki jih je v svojem teoretskem delu razvijal profesor Močnik, ni mogoče brez posledic preprosto prezreti na praktično nobenem vednostnem polju družboslovja in humanistike, vsaj ne brez bojazni, da to področje ostane področje »vednosti«, torej spontano ideološko področje, nadoločeno z vladajočo ideologijo, in ne naredi najtežjega koraka – prehoda v teorijo. Naj gre za sociologijo, antropologijo, politologijo, jezikoslovje ali umetnost, na vseh teh področjih vednosti je Močnik razvijal konceptualno orodje, ki omogoča produkcijo teoretskega problemskega polja in torej prehod iz vednosti v teorijo.

V času, ko sem začel obiskovati predavanja profesorja Močnika na študiju sociologije kulture na Filozofski fakulteti, je izšla njegova knjiga *3 teorije: ideologija, nacija, institucija* (Založba /*cf., 1999), ki je nemudoma postala ključna referenčna točka mojega intelektualnega razvoja. Od tedaj naprej je moja osrednja preokupacija pri intelektualnem delu prizadevanje za poskus razmejevanja ideoloških pojmov od teoretskih konceptov in kritika spontane ideologije disciplinarnih struktur skozi prizmo teh konceptov. V tem smislu sem postal »močnikovec«.

V pričujočem prispevku bom poskušal prikazati, kako razumem predvsem Močnikovo izpeljavo enega temeljnih konceptov za produkcijo teoretskega polja na področju družbenih praks in njihovih domačinskih predstav – teorijo institucije, in kakšne so implikacije za antropološko in zgodovinsko delo na konkretnem primeru domačinskega umevanja, tako imenovane ideologije samurajskega »kodeksa« oziroma »poti samuraja« – *bushidō* 武士道.

Bušido, heterogen sklop družbenih praks in ideoloških predstav za utrjevanje hierarhične družbene strukture fevdalne Japonske, bom analiziral skozi prizmo Močnikovih konceptov institucije in ideologije. Poskušal bom

razkriti, katere politične strategije, kateri politični interesi so določali interpretacije in reinterpretacije in kakšna je bila njihova vloga v procesu reinstitucionalizacije bušida v prehodu iz fevdalizma v nacionalno družbo (in še nekaj o *harakiriju* kot dopolnilni instituciji, ki izhaja iz logike strukture in razrešuje notranja protislovja bušida). S tem bom poskušal prikazati uspešnost konceptov profesorja Močnika za teoretsko delo na področju historične antropologije, hkrati pa bom poskušal zapolniti vrzeli, ki se pokažejo pri aplikaciji konceptov na konkretno historično in antropološko gradivo.

Luka Culiberg is Assistant Professor at the Department of Asian Studies, University of Ljubljana. He graduated in Sociology of Culture and Japanese Studies at the University of Ljubljana, studied at the University of Tsukuba and after graduation continued his research at Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo as a scholarship holder of the Ministry of Education and later the Japan Foundation Fellowship. His main research interests are theories of ideology, culture and modernity, all with a focus on Japan, and research on epistemology in the social sciences and humanities in general. He is a member of the editorial board of the journals *Asian Studies* and *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, and of the editorial board of the *Sophia* publishing.

Nikola DEDIĆ

Faculty of Music, University of Arts, Belgrade

LABOR IN ARISTOTLE'S METAPHYSICS: CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY OF SYMBOLIC FORMATIONS

The 18th century outlined a specific way of thinking that rests, among other things, on one historically unique abstraction – labor. With the birth of political economy, Labor became an abstraction, in a similar way as the categories of Art, Man, Being, Substance, Idea or Reason. With the birth of modern science, those enlightenment terms, which are often capitalized, were presented in an abstract form, as universals. Political economists saw labor as a universal category, completely separated from any concrete form of work. This was a relationship to labor that never existed before the emergence of classical political economy – ancient thought, for example, did not even have a special, unifying word to connect different forms of concrete work. To say that political economy treats labor as a universal category, i.e. as an abstraction, it does not mean that this abstraction is the product of pure intellectual speculation, that abstraction takes place exclusively in theoretical thought, through thinking about labor as a generality rather than as a concrete work process. On the contrary, the abstraction of labor from its concrete determinations is a consequence of the capitalist mode of production as such. Through a comparative analysis of the concept of labor as it exists in Adam Smith, on the one hand, and Aristotle, on the other, we will try to problematize the connection between symbolic and material production or to use a slightly different formulations of this problem – the connection between theory and economy, ideas and social reproduction, intellectual and manual labor, thought and production. With this, we will try to further elaborate Močnik's theory of symbolic formations.

Key words: Theory of symbolic formations, critique of political economy, capitalist mode of production, theory of pre-capitalist social formations, Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Aristotle.

Nikola Dedić graduated in Art History at the Faculty of Arts in Belgrade, and completed his PhD in Art and Media Theory at the University of Arts in Belgrade. He works as a professor at the Faculty of Music in Belgrade, where he teaches art history and applied aesthetics. He is the deputy editor-in-chief of the AM Journal or Art and Media Studies. He is a member of AICA (Association Internationale des Critiques d'Art). He works in the fields of Althusserian Marxism, Marxist critique of political economy, theory of ideology and 20th century art and theory of art.

Liliana DEYANOVA

Institute for Critical Theories of Supermodernity, Sofia

THE CRITICAL THEORY OF SUPERMODERN CAPITALISM AND THE IDEOLOGY OF HUMAN CAPITAL

What is the logic of the theories of labour power as ‘human capital’ and how could some of these be used to analyse the series of European reforms to ‘maximise human capital’ in a ‘knowledge based society’? Why is it that Rastko Močnik, in thematizing the ‘aporia of theory as practice’ and the ‘theoretical reach of the epistemological rupture’, considers concepts such as ‘knowledge-based society’ and ‘cognitive capitalism’ as ‘pseudo-concepts’? Starting with these questions, the paper focuses (through Močnik’s reformulation of Althusser’s theory of ideology and ‘subjectivation’) on the way in which Michel Foucault reads Karl Marx, and ‘reformulates’ the Althusserian problem of ‘ideological state apparatuses’ in order to demonstrate how ‘the growth of capitalist economy requires a specific modality of disciplinary power’, and how ‘[d]isciplines [are] apparatuses of accumulation and transformation of time into capital’. This was posed in *Discipline and Punish*, but Foucault later (in *The Birth of Biopolitics*) remobilizes Marx’s theory of labour power (by demonstrating its difference from Ricardo’s view) in his significant critique of the theory of human capital. Therefore I am interested in those Foucault’s lectures that are dedicated to ‘the redefinition of *homo oeconomicus* as entrepreneur of himself’, by analyzing ‘one of the aspects of the neoliberal order, utopian focus and method of thought – the theory of human capital’. I am interested also into the concept of ‘danger quotient’ (*coefficient de menace*) inherent both in underestimating the theory of human capital by T. Schultz and H. Becker and in that theory’s primary premises and consequences (in the era when new relations between the disciplinary dispositif and the dispositif of security are becoming more vivid, the latter is becoming increasingly more sensitive to those risky individuals who don’t invest in producing themselves as ‘employable’). Discussing this Marx-Foucault problematic and the underestimating, also by many Marxists, of the distinction of ‘productive consumption’ and ‘consumptive production’ in Marx’s Introduction to *A Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy*, is a result of many years of interpretative work on understanding

critically Marx's theory of surplus value: D. Deyanov posed it in "Schumpeterizing Marx and Marxicising Schumpeter".

Liliana Deyanova holds a PhD and habilitation in General Sociology. Until 2021 she was Associate Professor and Professor of General and Historical Sociology at the Department of Sociology, University of Sofia "St. Kliment Ohridski". She is a member of the Institute for Critical Theories of Supermodernity. She wrote several books and articles, among them: *Sociology of symbolic forms*, *Lineaments of silence: Historical sociology of collective memory*, *Sociology as a chance (anthology)*, *Max Weber et la sociologie du postcommunisme*, "The new names of university knowledge – segmentation and self-fulfilling inequalities", and "From Memory to Canon: How Historians Remember Communism".

Ivica Lj. ĐORĐEVIĆ

Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade

CRITIQUE OF THE CURRENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC PARADIGM IN ORDER TO PRESERVE HUMANITY

The current civilizational paradigm has lived up to and over its potential. Instead of searching for a new model for the organization of the emerging global society after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Western oligarchy is returning to the outdated forms of functioning of the capitalist system. Returning to the old practice gives already seen results, which leads to the fact that the current geopolitical situation is very similar to the conditions that Europe faced in times before the beginning of the Second World War.

The significance of Močnik's analysis of the effects of the functioning of modern capitalist system on social relations is invaluable. Entering the essence of socio-economic relations, professor Močnik, through a critique of the current capitalistic ideology, offers alternative perspectives on the transformation and democratization of the system. In the search for a more human social model, Močnik in the concept of human security recognizes the potential that can contribute to a qualitative transformation and overcome the crisis we face.

Key words: Rastko Močnik, social-economic paradigm, concept of human security.

Ivica Đorđević holds a master's degree in international economics from the Faculty of Economics, and a PhD in security science from Faculty of Security Studies, at the University of Belgrade. He is an interdisciplinary researcher/educator in the field of security studies (personal, community, and global security). Since 2006, his area of expertise is human security. He begins working as an associate professor at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Security Studies. In addition to his work with students, he publishes several monographs devoted to the impact of the current economic paradigm on the security of people and their communities; he has published dozens of scientific and expert articles and participated in a number of international conferences and projects in the field of human security.

Marko ĐORĐEVIĆ

Independent theorist and political organizer

THE ELUSIVE FIGURE OF THE FUNDAMENTALIST IN MOČNIK'S BOOK *THREE THEORIES*

As conceived in Močnik's well-known book *Three Theories*, the "fundamentalist" or the "fanatic" is an indispensable companion of his three theories on the institution, the nation, and the state. The fundamentalist is an atypical ideological subject who, unlike the ideological subject of Močnik's institutions, cannot interpret an ideological message via multiple ideologies. We find four problems here. First, we question our understanding of any and all ideological subjects that fall outside of Močnik's meaningful/meaningless divide. How do these subjects subvert the situation of communication? The second problem concerns the specific way in which Močnik conceptualizes the figure of the fundamentalist. We find that, while this figure is accounted within the conceptual field of the three theories, he is never considered as someone who subverts the situation of the communication. The third problem arises from a historical analysis of chains of institutional supplementation breaking down. We attempt to explore where the fundamentalist stands in relation to these situations. The fourth and final problem is that we can't think of a concept such as a nation as zero-institution being populated by singular fundamentalists. The final problem will lead us to conceptualize fundamentalist institutions and enrich the existing conceptual problematic further.

Key words: Ideology, fundamentalism, institution, nation, interpellation.

Marko Đorđević is an independent theorist and political organizer. He earned his BA degree in art history at the Belgrade Faculty of Arts in 2012. Afterwards, he acquired an MA degree with the thesis "Institutional Critique and the Problem of Subjectivization in Contemporary Art" from the Department of Theory of Art and Media at the University of Arts in Belgrade in 2014. In 2021 he acquired his PhD at the Faculty of Media and Communications in Belgrade. He has written and published papers in the fields of art theory, theory of ideology, critique of political economy of art, political theory and film.

Carlos GONZÁLEZ VILLA

Faculty of Legal and Social Sciences, University of Castilla-La Mancha

STIRRING GRAMSCI'S PASSIVE REVOLUTION THROUGH THE (POST)YUGOSLAV CASE

In my contribution I will discuss the many angles of Gramsci's passive revolution. The most obvious is that Yugoslav dissolution was an addition of local passive revolutions.

However, I think this approach limits the analysis. On the one hand, historical examples of passive revolution in Gramsci's work (*risorgimento*, *americanismo-fordismo* and fascism) were processes leading to unification, not to fragmentation. Local dominant classes had a national plan and a strategy for their countries. Post-Yugoslav dominant classes were, on the contrary, subservient to an external strategy. For this reason, I would suggest that local processes leading to Yugoslav dissolution were anti-passive revolutions, and Slovenia, in particular, played the role of an "inverted Piedmont". As such, it marked the rules of the game and future steps for all local actors in the region (all secessionist processes tried to mirror Slovenia, also in the final objective of joining EU). In this context, the actual passive revolution was taking place in Maastricht. The lack of ruling capacity of the West European dominant classes was compensated through a massive reform of their states and financial instruments. The basis of the EU that we know today. Finally, *history repeats itself as farce* – the current passive revolution will involve a new wave of enlargements, which will be even more challenging for European dominant classes than in 2004.

Approaching the problem from the perspective of passive revolution requires tackling the role of revolutionary forces – that was the whole point for Gramsci. I specifically thought that, for the post-Yugoslav left (or whatever that means – it is not an easy task to define this), embracing the notion of passive revolution would not be revolutionary, certainly, but would be positive. While dominant classes do not believe in their own countries' internal forces, the left's assignment would be to assume a national reconstruction programme by invoking all internal social forces.

Carlos González Villa is an Associate Professor in Political Science at the University Castilla-La Mancha (Toledo, Spain). His research focuses on political and social change in Southeast Europe after the end of the Cold War, US foreign policy and global geopolitical transformations. He is the author of three books on these subjects, including *Nova država za nov svetovni red – Mednarodni vidiki osamosvojitve Slovenije* (first published by Založba /*cf., 2017). He has conducted research stays at the Johns Hopkins University Graduate School of International Studies in Washington, DC, the University of Ljubljana and the Center for Advanced Studies-South Eastern Europe at the University of Rijeka, among other institutions.

Andraž JEŽ

Department of Slovene Studies, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, and

Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU)

LITERARY PUBLIC: AN EXPRESSION OF THE SYSTEM – OR OF ITS OPPOSITION?

LITERARNA JAVNOST: IZRAZ SISTEMA ALI OPOZICIJE SISTEMU?

Descriptions of the decades after World War II in the three currently used schoolbooks for literature as part of the Slovenian language—even more than schoolbooks for history—in the last year of high schools interpret complex social processes clearly one-sidedly. Yugoslav socialism is in these schoolbooks criticized in toto as an anti-intellectual period that suffocated and sanctioned culture in general and literature in particular; its achievements are being systematically ignored or minimized. Today's schoolbooks for literature portray the literary development as a struggle with the political system in stages until the final victory, i.e., the return of the capitalist domination. Thus, high school student cannot understand, why only the period of Yugoslav socialism brought an unprecedented flourishing of literature in Slovenian language. If the postwar policies and the political infrastructure were so devastating for literature, why such a quantity and diversity of literature and literary translation, not to mention a remarkably expanded literary public, did not develop in the previous capitalist century? On the first glance, it seems like the agonistic juxtaposition of the political and the literary profile of the same country is a neoliberal revisionism, encouraged with the—actually anti-intellectual—European restoration of 1989–1991. However, even a brief peek into Slovenian public cultural polemics from half a century ago, encouraged and massively disseminated by the political organs, shows that a myth about literature's struggle in stages to liberate itself fully from the shackles of politics is notably older – and that by the early 1970 it already found its place in the official Slovenian daily media, as well as the referential literary historiography by state publishing houses, while the politicized attempts of disciplining it were largely dismissed in public as outdated. What seems as the confirmation of the schoolbooks'

agonistic view, thus requires additional reflection: a political system, though often in an uneven (and for today's standards fully incomprehensible) conflict with several important literary figures, relied heavily on (and also referred to) the important literary authors, contemporary and historical. Literature was consequently seen as an important social agent, and its tendencies towards constantly greater autonomy from the politics were being taken seriously by all political agents and the official infrastructure.

The analysis sees this rather peculiar historical situation, which is omitted from the schoolbooks's descriptions, in close proximity of Rastko Močnik's notions about de-politicization and autonomy of the Yugoslavian so called cultural bureaucracy—that was in charge for the cultural ideological apparatuses for at least a decade before the country's dissolution—from the political one. The schoolbooks took for granted the former cultural bureaucracy's mythicized genealogy, and overlooked a real one: Slovenian literature gained its public prestige as a serious social and sometimes even political agent in the postwar decades during the same political system that schoolbooks portray as literature's demise – and with the literature's mythic victory over this system, its uplifted public status quickly started fading.

Oznake slovenskih desetletij po drugi svetovni vojni v treh trenutno veljavnih srednješolskih učbenikih za književnost pri pouku slovenščine v zadnjem letniku (Svet književnosti, Branja in Umetnost besede) kompleksne družbene procese prikazujejo očitno enostransko. Ta enostranskost presega tisto v učbenikih za zgodovino. Jugoslovanski socializem je v učbenikih za književnost *in toto* kritiziran kot antiintelektualno obdobje, ki je dušilo in sankcioniralo kulturo nasploh, književnost pa še posebno; njegovi dosežki so sistematično ignorirani ali minimalizirani. Današnji učbeniki povojni razvoj slovenske književnosti prikazujejo kot etapni boj s sovražnim jugoslovanskim političnim sistemom do končne zmage, tj. vrnitve kapitalističnega gospodarstva. Dijak tako seveda ne razume, kako da je šele obdobje jugoslovanskega socializma prineslo razcvet literature brez precedensa. Zakaj v kapitalističnem stoletju pred tem ne opazimo tolikšne številčnosti in raznolikosti literature in literarnega prevoda, če so bile povojne politike in infrastruktura za literaturo tako uničujoče?

Na prvi pogled se zdi, da gre pri agonističnem zoperstavljanju političnega in literarnega profila iste države za neoliberalni revizionizem, opogumljen z (dejansko antiintelektualno) evropsko restavratorijo 1989–1991. Toda bežen pogled v javne kulturne polemike izpred dobrega pol stoletja, ki so jih

opogumljale in množično diseminirale uradne institucije, pokaže, da je mit o etapnem boju literature, ki se osvobaja spon politike, občutno starejši – in da je že v začetku 70. let dobil svoj prostor tudi v uradnem slovenskem dnevnem časopisju in etabrirani literarni historiografiji (npr. v Zgodovini slovenske književnosti 8 Jožeta Pogačnika iz leta 1972), medtem ko so bili politizirani poskusi discipliniranja v glavnem odpisani kot anahronizem. Kar se sprva zdi kot potrditev agonističnega učbeniškega pogleda, torej kliče po vnovičnem razmisleku: politični sistem, čeravno pogosto v neenakomernem (in z današnjega stališča povsem nerazumnem) konfliktu s številnimi avtorji, se je čvrsto opiral na pomembe sočasne in starejše literate: pomembne politične figure, neredko politični preganjanci v obdobju pred socializmom, so bile pogosto literati, jugoslovanski socializem pa se je tudi skliceval na progresivno literarno izročilo prejšnjih obdobj. Prav zato je bila literatura prepoznana kot pomemben družbeni akter, njene težnje po čedaje večji avtonomiji od politike pa so vsi politični akterji in uradna infrastruktura jemali resno.

Analiza to specifično situacijo, ki je učbeniki ne omenjajo, pojasnjuje skozi dognanja Rastka Močnika o depolitizaciji in osamosvojitvi kulturne birokracije – ki je v SFRJ že vsaj desetletje pred vpeljavo kapitalizma obvladovala kulturne ideološke aparate – od politične. Zdi se, da učbeniki ponekod nekritično prevzemajo mitizirano genealogijo nekdanje kulturne birokracije in spregledujejo dejansko: slovenska književnost je svoj javni prestiž družbenega akterja v povojnih desetletjih pridobila prav v političnem sistemu, ki ga učbeniki opisujejo kot za literaturo škodljivega – prav hitro po mitski zmagi nad njim pa se je njen privzdignjeni status začel izgubljati.

Andraž Jež, PhD, is a professor in the Department of Slovenian Studies at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, and a research associate at the Institute of Slovenian Literature and Slovenian Studies (ZRC SAZU). He specializes in the social and political history of Slovenian literature of the past two centuries with an emphasis on the pre-March period, interwar period, and long May '68, as well as in the connections between literature and music, especially the avant-garde. Last year, he chaired the 42nd edition of the symposium *Obdobja* (held by the Center for Slovenian as a Second and Foreign Language), titled *Slovenian Literature and Art within Social Contexts*.

Gal KIRN

Department of Sociology, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts

POLYPHONY AND THE CLASS/PARTISAN POSITION OF MOČNIK'S THEORY OF IDEOLOGY

One of the major contributions of Močnik's theoretical work has been in elaborating Marxian and Althusserian theory of ideology. Following Althusser, should we suppose the field of ideology to be distinguished from politics and science (of history)? But then again, how do we account for Marx's own discovery being invested in critique of ideology, which seems to not lead us to a facile conclusion: to just draw an epistemic cut between the ideological and other fields. Should we rather depart from an openly polyphonic nature of the theoretical approach to ideology, which in Močnik's teachings was composed of anthropological, literary, discursive, historical-materialist as well as psychoanalytical insights? Is it possible to move from such a polyphonic position to a class/partisan position that envisions possibility of ideological counter-interpellation? I will point to some interesting spots and concrete analyses from Močnik's oeuvre, which will sketch this complex field of study.

Gal Kirn is a research associate and assistant professor of sociology of culture at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. He is affiliated with Södertörn University (Sweden) with a research project *Distrusting Monuments*. He published two monographs: *Partisan Ruptures* (Pluto Press, 2019) and *Partisan Counter-Archive* (De Gruyter, 2020).

Miklavž KOMELJ

Freelance researcher, writer and translator, Ljubljana

PARTISAN SYMBOLIC POLITICS AND PARTISAN ART

In my paper, I will retrospectively look back on my dialogue with Rastko Močnik's text "Partisan symbolic politics" from 2006, which was a very important theoretical stimulus for my book *Kako misliti partizansko umetnost* (How to think partisan art, Založba /*cf.) from 2009. I will try to show how Močnik's discussion was groundbreaking for the understanding of partisan art in the entire Yugoslav space, as it recognized the importance of this art in the new positioning of art in the social structure; when the revolution established a new relationship between art and society, it revolutionized both art and society. In doing so, I will try to confront Močnik's problematization of the relative autonomy of art in bourgeois society with Lenin's conception of the uprising as art, which, in contrast to this relative autonomy as a social function, presupposes a certain autonomy of art that is not a social function – and which precisely as such can radically intervene in society.

Miklavž Komelj holds a PhD in history of art; he is a freelance poet, writer and painter from Ljubljana. He has published seventeen books of poetry, one novel, three books of short prose, one dramatic poem, two collections of essays, a scientific monography *Kako misliti partizansko umetnost* (How to Think Partisan Art, Založba /*cf., 2009) and several other works. He was the co-curator of the exhibitions *How to think partisan art?* in the Mala galerija in Ljubljana and presentation of partisan art in the context of the exhibition *Political Practices (post)Yugoslav Art in the Museum of Yugoslavia in Belgrade*. In the Museum of the Modern Art in Ljubljana, he was also one of the curators of the permanent exhibition *Continuities and Breaks*.

Andreja KOPAČ

Self-employed in culture, and

Performing Arts Grammar School Ljubljana (SVŠGUGL)

THE “DISCOURSE CIRCUIT” OF THE PERFORMATIVE: THE PROBLEM OF NAMING AND DERIVATION

»DISKURZIVNI KROGOTOK« PERFORMATIVNEGA: PROBLEMATIKA POIMENOVANJA IN IZPELJEVANJA

The paper is a kind of “wild” view, which comes from autonomus articulation of the field of *performative* in contemporary performing arts and converts some established concepts. In the core of the discussion is the relationship between the performer and the viewer, starting from the perspective of the latter. It is a specific communication process (situation of viewing) that takes place in a circular manner and in the back of which there is always a certain movement of extra-discursive structures. In the core of the discussion is the model of communicative action, or selected relational relations, whereby I refer (among others) to the concepts of Rastko Močnik regarding the communication circuit and discursive formation. In the paper, I will focus on the problem of naming and deriving (the performative) through moving the starting point of the discourse from the text to the context, highlighting temporality as a key category of the field, introducing the statement as the basic unit of meaning, which at the same time reflects a neoliberalist form in which the declarant is both a subject and object of declaration, and finally I will introduce the concept of the “discursive level”.

Prispevek je nekakšen »divji« pogled, ki izhaja iz samosvoje artikulacije polja *performativnega* na področju sodobni scenskih umetnosti in sprevača nekatere uveljavljene koncepte. V osišče razprave postavljam relacijsko razmerje med izvajalcem (performerjem) in gledalcem, pri čemer izhajam iz perspektive slednjega. Gre za specifičen komunikacijski proces (situacijo gledanja), ki poteka krožno in v ozadju katerega vselej stoji določeno gibanje zunajdiskurzivnih struktur. V središču obravnave je model

komunikacijskega dejanja oziroma izbranih relacijskih razmerij, pri čemer se (med drugim) navezujem na koncepte Rastka Močnika glede komunikacijskega krogotoka in diskurzivne formacije. V prispevku se bom osredotočila na problematiko poimenovanja in izpeljevanja (performativnega) skozi premestitev izhodišča diskurza iz teksta v kontekst, izpostavitve časovnosti kot ključne kategorije polja, vpeljevanje izjave kot osnovne enote smisla, ki obenem odraža neoliberalistično formo, v kateri je izjavljalec hkrati subjekt in objekt izjavljanja ter na koncu uvedla pojem »diskurzivne ravnine«.

Andreja Kopač is a publicist, writer, editor, menthor and dramaturge in the field of contemporary dance and theatre. In addition to that she is holding an M.A. in the Linguistics of Speech and Theory of Social Communication at the ISH, Ljubljana Graduate School of the Humanities. In 2016 she finished her PhD of Sociology of Culture at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. As a publicist she writes for newspaper Delo and Rast magazine. She has recently been engaged as a dramaturge; between 2009 and 2024 she has been participating in more than 100 performances, collaborating with a number of local and international authors. She works as a teacher on High school in Ljubljana (theater and dance department) and at AMEU Alma Mater Dance Academy Ljubljana.

Gorazd KOVAČIČ

Department of Sociology, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts

THE CONCEPT OF REVOLUTION AND ITS ROLE IN MOČNIK'S UNDERSTANDING OF POLITICS

Rastko Močnik has been theoretically productive in several areas, and his critical analyses of modern and contemporary society have been characterized by the perspective of revolution. This is present in his texts in several different ways: as a viewpoint that enables an epistemological break, as a proposed solution to the analysed social structural contradictions, and as a yardstick for judging past or present policies. In my contribution, I will analyse which topics (in the sense of what could be the subject of revolution in society) and which political practises Močnik's concept of revolution implies. In doing so, I will consider a number of texts in which the author does not explicate his concept of revolution, but uses an idea of it that is not theoretically articulated but implied by historical references and associations. I will also analyse Močnik's understanding of politics as it results from the role of his concept of revolution and from his understanding of society as a structure of class domination. Močnik's conception of politics differs from the hegemonic liberal conception, which is characterized by liberal constitutionalism, the protection of private interests and electoral democracy, as well as from an alternative republicanist current that emphasises the role of political participation and political action. Močnik's perspective of revolution, which (should) transform production and other social relations bypassing established political bodies and representation, rejects both frameworks of political theory, accusing them of maintaining the existing social relations through the use of legal fetishism and the sphere of political institutions separate from the real social relations, and thus of being counter-revolutionary.

Gorazd Kovačič is assistant professor of sociology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. His research focuses on economic and political sociology, theoretical sociology, political theory and studies on political ideologies. His doctoral thesis dealt with Hannah Arendt's concept of society. He headed the Trade Union of Higher Education at University of Ljubljana for seven years and the national umbrella Trade Union of Higher Education for three years.

Igor KRAMBERGER

Retired university teacher, University of Maribor, Faculty of Arts

AN ENTITY THAT SUPPOSES FOR ITSELF..

I will speak about how I tried, as a student, to overcome the nescience that gripped me again and again after Rastko Močnik's lectures. I thought it was necessary to first connect what I heard with my previous studies and then especially with my special interest in editorial work with texts and in the production of books.

Three notions have accompanied me since then: difference, dispositive and transverse function. I still only assume that they are three dimensions that are a necessary component of what we call a concept – and what thus becomes part of a theory. But I was always attracted to all three as a kind of tool. With them, I did not move away from my material, which is supposed to be the decisive move of the theory, but I went deeper into it and processed it with their help.

The confusion was caused by the fact that theoretical derivations were performed in the lectures on excerpts from Prešeren's poems. I wondered how the lecturer Močnik knew how to turn something that was in plain sight in the poem so that it became a stunning interpretation and at the same time an illustration of concepts that seemed to me to be taken from linguistics and psychoanalysis at the same time – and had been until then completely unknown to me. The lostness was recognizable in the feeling of incapacity to repeat something like this on some other passage from Prešeren's opus – that is, to transfer it and use it independently.

In the summer of 1993, I defended my dissertation under the supervision of Rastko Močnik. At that time, 15 years had passed since the moment I found myself at his lectures for the first time – as a guest, as an optional listener. The titles of the master's thesis and doctoral dissertation were my attempts to conceptualize the substance of my cognitive interest. Together, they form a set of concepts that could be conditionally characterized as dispositive: sociology, material carrier, effects, classicism, writer, philology, publishing and institution.

Among them, three decades later, I would devote the most critical comments to the concept of material carrier. I would insert two levels between

it and the effect: the carrier of the text or the script and the carrier of the script or the medium of the writing, which guarantees the text that recording, reproduction and reading can take place at different times and often even in different places. To Prešeren in the signifier and in (Slovene) literary studies I would therefore add Prešeren in his publications.

Igor Kramberger graduated in comparative literature and holds a PhD in Sociology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. He was employed at the Marksistični center Univerze v Mariboru (1981–1987) and worked as Assistant and assistant professor for sociology of culture at the Faculty of Education / Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor (1993–2015).

JULIJA PRIMIC AND ChatGPT: DOES GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE NEED EMOTIONS?

The attitude of generative artificial intelligence (AI) towards emotions could be summarised with a paraphrase of the iconic partisan martyr (Končar 1942): “I do not seek emotions, nor would I give them to you.” Cave (2023) disagrees: “Songs arise out of suffering, by which I mean they are predicated upon the complex, internal human struggle of creation and, well, as far as I know, algorithms don’t feel. Data doesn’t suffer. ChatGPT has no inner being, it has been nowhere, it has endured nothing, it has not had the audacity to reach beyond its limitations, and hence it doesn’t have the capacity for a shared transcendent experience, as it has no limitations from which to transcend. ChatGPT’s melancholy role is that it is destined to imitate and can never have an authentic human experience [...]”

Cave’s reaction is nothing special, rather it is a typical example of a general tendency in the attitude of literati and humanists towards intelligent technologies: an anthropocentrism that sets up a naive (self-)understanding of human experience and emotions as the norm, in relation to which any other intelligence can only be an aberration. This paper will be a critique of anthropocentric critiques of generative AI, with my key inspiration being Močnik’s (2006) insight that poetry is not Trkaj’s (2004): “true emotions poured out on paper”, but that Prešeren’s feelings for Julia (even if they existed at all) were irrelevant to his poetry. Such take destroys the basic criterion of the humanist critique of generative AI *avant la lettre*. Moreover, generative AI can actually be intelligent not only without emotions, but also without consciousness and understanding.

Key words: Generative AI, writing, emotions, consciousness, understanding, anthropocentrism.

Primož Krašovec is an assistant professor at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, where he teaches courses on epistemology, ideology, theory of technology and digital cultures. His current research areas are: capitalist automation and real subsumption, artificial intelligences, and new media cultures. In 2021 he published his first book *Tujost kapitala (Alien Capital, Sophia)*.

Marko KRŽAN

Freelance researcher and translator, Ljubljana

RASTKO MOČNIK ON CAPITALISM ON A WORLD SCALE

During his long-time career, Rastko Močnik dealt with many fields of historical materialism and enriched many of them with his original concepts and findings. As a student I first encountered his theories of ideology and language and their applications to contemporary ideological phenomena.

It was at that time that Professor Močnik began to systematically study the fundamental structure of capitalist societies, for example by re-reading Marx's critique of (English) classical economists and the third volume of Marx's *Capital*. As usual, he included his current research into his lectures for undergraduate and graduate students.

Since capitalism has been a global phenomenon from its inception, Professor Močnik also studied and lectured on theories of the world system in the broadest sense, especially authors such as Giovanni Arrighi, Immanuel Wallerstein and Samir Amin, and applied them to social change. He published his (preliminary) findings in the book *Svetovno gospodarstvo in revolucionarna politika* (World economy and revolutionary politics, Založba /*cf., 2006) where he defined a "research program" with the following main problems: changes in the capitalist mode of production after the Second World War on a global scale; social effects of these changes in central and (especially) peripheral societies; anti-capitalist movements and the resulting societies/states; the restoration of capitalism in European post-capitalist societies; the (coming) systemic crisis of capitalism on a global scale.

In my paper I will try to summarize the results of this "research program" that has been going on for almost 20 years now. I intend to collect the concepts he adopted, refined and developed; to analyse their results in explaining social changes, especially those that we see today more clearly than Professor Močnik could at that time. Above all, I would like to define the open questions that his work raises. It is precisely from these questions that it is possible to extract what is most important in theoretical work: namely, the theoretical problematique, a matrix of pertinent questions regarding the social situation (as opposed to ideological questions),

which can generate theoretically valid answers (answers with cognitive, not only ideological effect).

Marko Kržan got his degree in Sociology of Culture and Russian Studies at the University of Ljubljana in 2007. He obtained a PhD in Sociology at the University of Ljubljana in 2016. In 2008–2011 he worked with professor Močnik on an EU research project *Profane Citizenship in Europe*, as well as his assistant at the Department of Sociology, co-teaching *Theories of ideology*. In 2014–2018 he worked as an adviser of the United Left parliamentary club in Slovene parliament. Otherwise, he has been a freelancer working as an editor, translator and publicist. His fields of academic interests include theories of language and ideology, theory of value and social structure and, most recently, contemporary imperialism, which he studies from a Marxist perspective.

Alpar LOŠONC

Department of Social Sciences (Corresponding member), Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU)

ECONOMIC THEORY WITH IDEOLOGY

Recently, at a conference, Močnik showed the stages of the dynamics of modern epistemology, especially confronting the argumentation of Descartes, and the topic of Vico with numerous offered proofs that presented ideological moments that are hidden in modern self-understanding. He realized this with the additional claim that the social sciences could not meet the demands of Galileian science. At the same time, he added that there is one science that had a different direction compared to the social sciences, namely economics. I intend to follow this order of his, that is, to thematize economics as a quasi-Galileian science with the ideology of mathematization and measurement. But first, it must be said that the genesis of economic reflection contains many different paradoxes. Why, for example, did the mathematization of economic reflection begin with a theoretician who had not yet dispossessed the economic discourse with regard to the “political” attribute, namely, with Ricardo who, moreover, still affirmed class-logic? Is this already a source of ideologization? Or why the mathematization of economic discourse gained momentum, but not in post-Fordism, but already in Fordism? Why, then, did Fordism with a certain class composition (technical and political, to use the pairs used by Rastko) condition the paradigm of Galileian science as an exception within the social sciences? Furthermore, using the philosophy of science of the Soviet theoretician from the thirties of the 20th century, namely Boris Hessen, I pose the question of the dynamics of economic reflection with regard to the dialectic of externality (class struggle, etc.) and internality (internal determinations of a given science), I try to situate the outcomes metamorphoses of economic reflection with regard to the status of ideology. Of course, I will take into account the spontaneous functioning of ideology in the economic discourse, especially noting the “imperialism” of the same discourse, which starts from the fact that only economic science can offer a conceptual apparatus for the universal structure of social sciences. As I will consider forms of immunization of economic discourse from ideological questioning. In addition, I will take special account of Močnik’s arguments and prove why economic reflection is a candidate to be the ideological apparatus of the state in Althusser’s

perspective, and why it is a candidate for demonstrating the performative reality of ideology. Here, above all, I mean the key distinction between theory and knowledge, that is, I want to show why measurement as an ideology prevents economic reflection from being a theory, that is, why it necessarily remains at the level of knowledge in capitalism.

Alpar Lošonc studied law, economics, and marxist philosophy. From 1988 he has been working at the Department of Social Sciences of the Faculty of Techniques, University of Novi Sad and from 2005 served as the full professor. From 2018 he is the corresponding member of Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts. His scientific interest is related to critique of political economy and social philosophy. His most important books are *Neoliberalism: choice or destiny* (with Kosta Josifidis, 2007), *Power as social event* (2009), *Resistance and power* (2012), *Heterodox theories of money* (with Mladen Perić, 2016), *Sovereignty, power and crisis* (2006), *Modernity at Colone?* (1998), *Enigma of conservative liberalism* (2023), etc.

FROM THE “HISTORICITY OF STRUCTURALISM” TO THE MATERIALIST CONCEPT OF HISTORICITY

Fifty years ago, Rastko Močnik published an article in the journal *Problemi* about the Serbian translation of the famous *Cours de linguistique générale* by Ferdinand de Saussure (Močnik later included it in the book *Meščevo zlato: Prešeren v označevalcu*). Already in this early article, he pointed out that the arbitrariness of the signifier in Saussure is “complementary to the concept of the systemicity of the system, a concept that is decisive for the later structural method”, since “the structure is structured on the basis of the contradiction absent in it, but always represented, which is its existential condition”. In another article from the same issue of *Problemi* (which is also published in *Meščevo zlato*), he developed the thesis that Saussure’s opposition synchrony/diachrony is a starting point that can lead us to a materialistic concept of historicity – provided that we recognize its inner contradiction and to “refute and discard the linearistic understanding of time and through structure, i.e. through contradiction, we arrive at the concept of contradictory historical temporality”. He returned to this topic in later writings, e.g. at the turn of the millennium in the article “The System of Social Sciences and Its Effects”, later published in his book *Spisi iz humanistike* (Založba /*cf., 2009). The opposition of synchrony/diachrony is, as Močnik says, “one of the common *tópoi* of humanities, which we know very well is (...) through and through problematic. However, the problematic nature of this topos is its advantage: in the humanities, we often establish the *problem* [*problématique*] by pointing to the *problematic* nature of conventional conceptual forms.” One of the problematic dimensions of this “common topos” was already pointed out by Roman Jakobson, who argued that the biggest misunderstandings in humanities, especially in linguistics, come from the mistaken equation of synchrony with static and diachrony with dynamic. Many years ago, I dealt with this problem myself on some examples from Saussure’s structural linguistics, which, in my opinion, confirm both Močnik’s and Jakobson’s propositions. That there may be a language change is, for example, the important simultaneous existence of analogous structures, because it is the dynamics of their mutual interactions that make change possible; by various coincidences, the processes of displacement

and condensation alternate so that an agglutination type of change can occur, etc. Although I wrote a text about it back then, i.e. almost thirty years ago, and Močnik read it in manuscript, some unfortunate circumstances prevented its publication. In *Spisi iz humanistike*, he remembered that text of mine, “which, unfortunately, has not yet been given the chance to see the light of publication”. When the organizers kindly invited me to participate in the *Močnik’s Concepts* conference, it came to my mind to update this text and present it at the conference in the hope that it will finally “see the light of publication” in a supplemented and updated form. I will build on the consideration of my old thesis on the “historicity of structuralism” in a (hopefully) productive dialogue with some of Močnik’s concepts (contradiction of structure, supplementality of institution, lateral causality) and Althusser’s aleatoric materialism.

Aldo Milohnič, PhD, is a professor of the history of theatre at the Academy of Theatre, Radio, Film and Television of the University of Ljubljana and the head of the Theatre and Film Studies Centre. He is the author of the monographs *Theories of Contemporary Theatre and Performance* (2009), *Art in Times of the Rule of Law and Capital* (2016), *Theatre of Resistance* (2021) and *I Worked for 40 Years: Dramatisations and Adaptations of Cankar’s “The Bailiff Yerney”* (2022). He is co-author of several other books, edited volumes, and author of numerous articles in cultural journals. His research interests include the history and theory of theatre and the sociology of culture and arts.

Rade PANTIĆ

Faculty of Media and Communications, Belgrade

LEGAL IDEOLOGY AND MOČNIK'S CONCEPT OF CONTRADICTIONAL INSTITUTIONAL REQUEST

In my contribution, I concentrate on Močnik's attempt to build on and revise Louis Althusser's theory of ideology. According to Močnik there are lacunas in Althusser's theory between concepts of ideological interpellation, of the material existence of ideology in practices of state apparatuses and the concept of dominant ideology as one which harmonizes ideologies of different state apparatuses. Močnik tries to articulate this concept through the theory of contradictional institutional request built on the example of the so-called Cornelian dilemma, which throws individuals into an impossible dilemma whose resolution is monopolized by dominant ideology – the same ideology that produced the dilemma. In my contribution, I try to test Močnik's hypothesis on the example of liberal legal ideology, which according to Močnik produces the dilemma of freedom vs. security. The question I ask is whether legal ideology can be regarded as a dominant ideology in capitalist social formations.

Rade Pantić is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Media and Communications, Singidunum University, Belgrade. He holds a bachelor's degree in Art History from the Faculty of Arts, University of Belgrade (2008). He received his PhD in Theory of Arts and Media from the University of Arts in Belgrade, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies. He is co-editor of the book *Contemporary Marxist Theory of Art* (Orion art/Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Belgrade, 2015) [in Serbian], and the author of *Umetnost skozi teorijo: historično-materialistične analize* (Art through Theory: Historical-Materialistic Analyses, first published by Založba /*cf., Ljubljana, 2019) [in Slovenian]. His main areas of research include political economy, capitalist world system analysis, theory of ideology and theory of art and cinema.

Todor PETKOV

Institute for Critical Social Studies, Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv

THE MOČNIK-DEYANOV DEBATE ON IDEOLOGICAL INTERPELLATION

This presentation is going to summarize the most intensive period (2005-2009) of the so-called Močnik-Deyanov debate on ideological interpellation – a debate that marks an important and fruitful landmark in the development of the study of the logic of practice as it has been done in the University of Plovdiv in the recent decades. Ideological interpellation is a major practical field of empirical input and theoretical inspiration where the logic of practice demonstrates its major categorical incommensurabilities with the 'logic of textbooks', i.e. with those explicit, mathematized, axiomatic formal systems whose development, study, and application is extremely rare in the actual thinking of human beings. Its exploration lies within the so-called praxeological turn in logic which goes from Wittgenstein, Heidegger, Austin and Strawson, through Pierre Bourdieu and Oswald Ducrot, all the way to Rastko Močnik in Ljubljana and Deyan Deyanov in Sofia and Plovdiv.

Todor Petkov, *Sen. Ass. Prof. PhD, resident in Sofia, Bulgaria, is a translator and a lecturer at the University of Plovdiv, member of the Institute for Critical Social Studies. He graduated in Philosophy and English Language from the University of Sofia in 1991, and has an M.A. in Society and Politics from the CEU, 1992. His major translations include such authors as B. Russell, J. Austin, W. Quine, K. Popper, H. Melville, G. Vattimo, C. Ginzburg, B. Latour and R. Močnik. He works and teaches in formal logic, philosophical logic, analytic philosophy, logic and methodology of the human sciences, logic of practice, philosophy of psychiatry, socioanalysis, ontology of practical worlds, etc.*

Milan POPOVIĆ

University of Montenegro, Faculty of Law, Podgorica

CAPITALISM-FASCISM AND SOCIALISM

I will present the two important Močnik's theoretical and conceptual impacts of on my own work and development.

The first of the two important impacts happened during the post-Yugoslav wars in the dark 1990s. I was in a great dilemma about the real character of the newly arriving post-communist regimes, namely whether they were nascent fascist or nascent democratic regimes. Rastko Močnik's writings and talks from that time helped me to accept finally the first answer.

The second of this two important impacts is much more recent. It happened in 2022, during one extremely interesting postgraduate course devoted to former Yugoslavia and its regime. Thirty years earlier – as a socialist, or, to be more precise, an anarcho-socialist – I qualified (in my PhD) this regime as the so-called socialist and as a kind of statist or (semi)peripheral capitalist regime. Under the influence of Rastko Močnik, and in the light of extremely negative post-communist, or, more precisely, capitalist-fascist development in the last almost thirty years, however, I have partly revised my previous position, remaining on my initial and basic statist or (semi)peripheral capitalist regime diagnosis, but accepting from Rastko Močnik that this regime simultaneously had more socialist achievements and elements than I recognized thirty years ago.

Milan M. Popović graduated at the Law School of the University of Montenegro in 1977. He received the MA degree (*Interest and Political Articulation of Yugoslav Society*) in 1983 and the PhD (*Immanuel Wallerstein's World-System Analysis*) in 1991 at the Law School of the University of Belgrade. He has been working at the Law School of the University of Montenegro since 1977, from assistantship to full professorship, and lecturing the subjects *Comparative Politics*, *Sociology of Politics*, and *International System and Security*. He used to be a Visiting Research Associate at the Fernand Braudel Center, SUNY, Binghamton (1991-1993), and a Visiting Professor in UK, USA, France, Belgium, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia. He published 23 books and 100s of articles.

Katja PRAZNIK

Department of Global Gender and Sexualities Studies, University at Buffalo (SUNY)

MOČNIK'S LESSONS: FROM THEORY OF IDEOLOGY TO MATERIALITY OF INVISIBLE ART WORK

Building on a distinction between a structural and an ideological notion of autonomy of art, the contribution will discuss the relevance of Močnik's work on theories of ideology for a critical deconstruction of the historical understanding of the autonomy of art in relation to artistic labor. Ideology of art as an ideological category separates art and the pragmatics of everyday life and has had a profound impact on the understanding of artistic labor as non-utilitarian activity superior to market relations and pecuniary concerns. However, ideological notion of autonomy of art is based on an equally problematic division on a structural level that separates the sphere of production and reproduction in capitalism. Marxist feminist critique of unpaid reproductive labor importantly complements theories of ideology by pointing out how due to this ideological separation certain forms of labor become invisible and subject to exploitation. In both cases, ideological and structural the historical notion of autonomy of art positions the labor of artists beyond the constraints of subsistence, separates art work from the economic processes and obscures the class provenance of such notions. The contribution will show how the historical definition of the autonomy of art is not just a hallmark of problematic separation of art from life, production and reproduction, but also the ways on which autonomy of art becomes a principle of organizing the field of cultural production that decollectivizes labor, obscures art work as value-generating labor and forces art workers to assume all cost of reproduction. Finally, the contribution will argue for a new definition of autonomy based on a recognition of labor exploitation of art workers that reclaims art workers agency and their collective power to change the power relations.

Katja Praznik is the author of *Art Work: Invisible Labour and the Legacy of Yugoslav Socialism* (University of Toronto Press, 2021) and *The Paradox of*

Unpaid Artistic Labor: Autonomy of Art, the Avant-Garde and Cultural Policy in the Transition to Post-Socialism (*Sophia, 2016*). She is an Associate Professor in the University at Buffalo's Arts Management Program and Department of Global Gender and Sexuality Studies. Her research and political work are dedicated to demystification of creativity and emancipation of art as a form of labor, including labor organizing of art workers. Praznik is the cofounder of the freelance art workers union Zasuk. Her writing is published in edited volumes, peer reviewed journals and numerous international publications dedicated to payment and labor standards for art workers.

Katja Praznik je avtorica knjig *Art Work: Invisible Labour and the Legacy of Yugoslav Socialism* (*University of Toronto Press, 2021*) in *Paradoks neplačanega umetniškega dela: avtonomija umetnosti, avantgarda in kulturna politika na prehodu v postsocializem* (*Sophia, 2016*) ter izredna profesorica na Programu kulturnega menedžmenta in Oddelku za globalne študije spola in seksualnosti na Državni univerzi New York v Buffalu. Njeno raziskovalno in politično delo je posvečeno demistifikaciji kreativnosti in emancipaciji umetnosti kot oblike dela ter organiziranju kulturnih delavcev. Je tudi soustanoviteljica sindikata Zasuk. Njeni članki so objavljeni v akademskih zbornikih in revijah ter številnih mednarodnih publikacijah o izkoriščanju dela ter delavskih in plačilnih standardih za kulturne delavce.

Milorad PUPOVAC

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, University of Zagreb

CRITIQUE OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS AS AN ARGUMENT IN ESTABLISHING LANGUAGE REGIMES

In the area of the post-Serbo-Croatian language, discussions about language identity often see sociolinguistic arguments being transformed into the basis for sociolinguistic claims. With this type of transformation, two things occur: on one hand, sociolinguistics loses sight of the reality of the language and becomes an epistemological cover for establishing language orders/regimes; on the other hand, arguments will be presented in favour of criticizing sociolinguistics as an epistemological cover for establishing and legitimizing language regimes in the post-Serbo-Croatian language area. Such a critique of sociolinguistics as an argument in discussions about the identities of Bosnian, Montenegrin, Croatian, and Serbian aims to refocus sociolinguistics on the practices of the language community.

Milorad Pupovac, PhD, worked as the head of the Chair of Applied Linguistics at the Department of Linguistics (Faculty of Arts) of the University of Zagreb until his retirement in 2021. His main areas of scientific work are sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics and psycholinguistics. He also taught in the areas of psycholinguistics, discourse analysis and linguistic epistemology. Recently, he researches the characteristics of the public language today, linguistic ideologies and ways of managing the language in the post-Croatian-Serbian language area, and the issue of linguistic minorities in the same area.

ARGUMENTATION'S BLACK BOX

Argumentation is supposed to be cognitive and discursive (and trivially so), but once we open our mouth things change radically. It is not only that we “inject” concepts into things (and above all, into their representations, i.e. our representations of them), which were not there before; our arguments can only be understood as arguments if we consider them from the point of conclusion (i.e. as “argumentative blocks”). In other words: argumentation may well be cognitive in its origin, but it is only when we “inject” it into discourse that we can recognize, understand and describe it as argumentation, analyze it into argument(s) and conclusion(s), and evaluate it. The crucial concept in establishing the relation between argument(s) and conclusion(s) is the concept of *topos/topoi*, a concept used by Močnik mostly in his early works. In my paper, I will try to briefly trace the history of *topos/topoi* from the early beginnings in Sophists to its firm conceptualization in Aristotle and “pragmatic adaptation” in Quintillian and Cicero, while concentrating on modern transformations of the concept in Toulmin and especially Ducrot.

Igor Ž. Žagar studied philosophy, sociology, and linguistics in Ljubljana, Paris, and Antwerp. He received his PhD degree in Sociology of Culture from the University of Ljubljana. He is Professor of Rhetoric and Argumentation (University of Primorska), Senior Research Fellow (Centre for Discourse Studies) at the Educational Research Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia, and from 2015 also its director. He has lectured in Belgium, United States, Canada, Italy, China, United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, Russia, Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, Poland, France, and Taiwan. He is especially interested in pragmatics (speech act theory, (critical) discourse analysis), philosophy of language, argumentation and rhetoric, and in the last years in the neuro-cognitive processing of arguments. He is the (co)author and (co)editor of twelve books, more than a hundred articles, and member of several editorial boards (Research in Language, Res Rhetorica, Ontario Studies in Argumentation, Rhetoric Society of Europe ...).



UNIVERZA
V LJUBLJANI

FF

Filozofska
fakulteta

ZALOŽBA

* *cf.*