

50 let maja '68,
75 let Jugoslavije

*May '68 at 50,
Yugoslavia at 75*

Mednarodni kolokvij / *International Colloquium*

Program in povzetki / *Program and Abstracts*

11.–12. oktober 2018

Prešernova dvorana SAZU (Novi trg 4, Ljubljana)

11–12 October 2018

Prešeren Hall SAZU (Novi trg 4, Ljubljana)

Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU &

Slovensko društvo za primerjalno književnost

Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies, ZRC SAZU & Slovenian

Comparative Literature Association

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

316.4(082)
94(4)"1968"(082)

ZNANSTVENORAZISKOVALNI center SAZU. Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede. Mednarodni kolokvij (2018 ; Ljubljana)

[Petdeset]

50 let maja '68, 75 let Jugoslavije : program in povzetki = May '68 at 50, Yugoslavia at 75 : programme and abstracts / Mednarodni kolokvij Inštituta za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU, 11.-12. oktober 2018 = International Colloquium of the Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies, ZRC SAZU, 11-12 October 2018 ; [urejanje, prevajanje Jernej Habjan]. - Ljubljana : Slovensko društvo za primerjalno književnost = Slovenian Comparative Literature Association, 2018

ISBN 978-961-93774-6-8

1. Habjan, Jernej
296722944

PROGAM / PROGRAMME	4
UVOD / INTRODUCTION	6
POVZETKI / ABSTRACTS.....	10
Suman GUPTA: <i>The University as Contested Site and the Poverty of Student Life</i> [Univerza kot prostor boja in beda študentskega življenja]	10
Vladimir GVOZDEN: <i>Protests of 1968: The Politics of Memory or the Memory of Politics?</i> [Protesti leta 1968: politika spomina ali spomin na politiko?]	12
Ivana PERICA: <i>Aesthetic 'Traditions and Perspectives' and the Politics of Yugoslav 1968</i> [Estetske »tradicije in perspektive« ter politika jugoslovanskega leta 1968]	14
Rastko MOČNIK: <i>Mao after 1968</i> [Mao po letu 1968].....	16
Marko JUVAN: <i>Co-presence or Interaction? Theory, Literature and Politics of the Long '68 and the Issue of Centre/Periphery</i> [Sobivanje ali interakcija? Teorija, literatura in politika »dolgega leta 68« ter problem centra in periferije].....	18
Andraž JEŽ: <i>Traces of Cold-War Propaganda in Recent Interpretations of 1968</i> [Sledovi hladnovojne propagande v današnjih interpretacijah leta 1968].....	20
Rok BENČIN: <i>Distant Immediacies: Badiou and Rancière on the Consequences of May '68</i> [Odmaknjene neposrednosti: Badiou in Rancière o posledicah maja '68].....	22
Antonia BIRNBAUM: <i>Decentring or Recentring Proletarian Politics? A Paradox of French Maoism</i> [Razsrediščiti ali ponovno osrediščiti proletarsko politiko? Paradoks francoskega maoizma]	24
UDELEŽENCI /-KE / SPEAKERS	26

PROGRAM / PROGRAMME

Četrtek, 11. oktobra / *Thursday, 11 October*

14:45 Uvod / *Introduction*

Jernej HABJAN, soorganizator kolokvija / *co-organiser of the colloquium*

15:00–15:45

Suman GUPTA:

The University as Contested Site and the Poverty of Student Life
[Univerza kot prostor boja in beda študentskega življenja]

15:45–16:30

Vladimir GVOZDEN:

Protests of 1968: The Politics of Memory or the Memory of Politics? [Protesti leta 1968: politika spomina ali spomin na politiko?]

16:30–17:00 Diskusija in odmor za kavo / *Discussion and coffee break*

17:00–17:45

Ivana PERICA:

Aesthetic 'Traditions and Perspectives' and the Politics of Yugoslav 1968
[Estetske »tradicije in perspektive« ter politika jugoslovanskega leta 1968]

17:45–18:30

Rastko MOČNIK:

Mao after 1968 [Mao po letu 1968]

18:30–19:00 Diskusija / *Discussion*

Petek, 12. oktobra / Friday, 12 October

10:00–10:45

Marko JUVAN:

Co-presence or Interaction? Theory, Literature and Politics of the Long '68 and the Issue of Centre/Periphery [Sobivanje ali interakcija? Teorija, literatura in politika »dolgega leta 68« ter problem centra in periferije]

10:45–11:30

Andraž JEŽ:

Traces of Cold-War Propaganda in Recent Interpretations of 1968 [Sledovi hladnovojne propagande v današnjih interpretacijah leta 1968]

11:30–12:00 Diskusija in odmor za kavo / *Discussion and coffee break*

12:00–12:45

Rok BENČIN:

Distant Immediacies: Badiou and Rancière on the Consequences of May '68 [Odmaknjene neposrednosti: Badiou in Rancière o posledicah maja '68]

12:45–13:30

Antonia BIRNBAUM:

Decentring or Recentring Proletarian Politics? A Paradox of French Maoism [Razsrediščiti ali ponovno osrediščiti proletarsko politiko? Paradoks francoskega maoizma]

13:30–14:00 Diskusija / *Discussion*

UVOD / INTRODUCTION

50 let maja '68 še zdaleč ni prvi letošnji simpozij s tem naslovom. Je pa bržkone edini simpozij, ki temu naslovu dodaja *75 let Jugoslavije*. Toda zakaj bi v naslov simpozija tlačili ne le eno, pač pa kar dve obletnici? V primeru dogodka s teoretsko ambicijo je že ena preveč. Obletnica je vendar nenavadna in vsekakor predteoretska zmes dogodkovnega in konjunktornega: dogodek v Braudelovem pomenu je, ki pa ga od nas oddaljuje braudelovska konjunktura. V tem smislu 50 let maja '68 ni ne dogodek ne konjunktura, temveč dogodek, od katerega je minila že cela konjunktura. S 75 leti Jugoslavije pa seveda ni nič bolje.

A če *75 let Jugoslavije* dodamo *50 letom maja '68*, vse skupaj ni nujno enkrat slabše. Če namreč na to, kar se je leta 1968 začelo v Parizu, pogledamo z gledišča tega, kar se je leta 1943 začelo v Jajcu, tj. z vidika ustanovitve socialistične Jugoslavije, se lahko vsaj osvobodimo tako dogodkovnega kakor konjunktornega in se približamo strukturnemu, ki je dejanski cilj Fernanda Braudela.

In res že besedna zveza *50 let maja '68, 75 let Jugoslavije* postavlja vprašanja, ki so v zadnji instanci strukturna, kolikor navsezadnje zadevajo *longue durée*, dolgo trajanje, ki sega vse do zgodnjemodernih začetkov kapitalizma, ki se jim posveča Braudelova prva knjiga. Zunaj teorije jugoslovanski socialistični eksperiment in njegov zagovor med jugoslovanskim majem '68 problematizirata razširjeno mnenje, da so se maja '68 na Zahodu borili za socializem, na Vzhodu pa proti njemu. Znotraj teorije pa jugoslovanska neuvrščenost in samoupravljanje problematizirata razširjeno braudelovsko predstavo o letu 1968 kot upor tako zoper ZDA kakor zoper SZ. Oba obča kraja o maju '68 zaplete maj '68 v Jugoslaviji, kjer je oblast doživela kritiko v imenu njenih lastnih idealov samoupravljanja in neuvrščenosti. Proti mnenjskim voditeljem je treba reči, da jugoslovanski protestniki niso protestirali proti socializmu kot takemu, čeprav so protestirali na t. i. Vzhodu; braudelovce pa je treba opozoriti, da so ti protestniki protestirali proti marsičemu, ne le proti izsiljeni izbiri med ZDA in SZ

(kar so med drugim zmogli prav zato, ker niso protestirali proti socializmu).

V nasprotju s temi razširjenimi mnenji bo simpozij *50 let maja '68, 75 let Jugoslavije* analiziral naše predpostavke o maju '68 onstran ločnic med Zahodom in preostalim svetom, politiko in kulturo, kulturo in kontrakulturo ter umetnostjo in kritiko. S tem bo lahko postavil ključna vprašanja, vključno z vprašanjem o tem, zakaj je bil maj '68 sploh potreben v družbi, ki je vodila gibanje neuvrčenih in eksperimentirala s samoupravljanjem kot alternativo tako kapitalizmu kakor realsocializmu? S tako potujene perspektive utegne dejstvo, da se je maj '68 zgodil tudi Jugoslaviji, celo vplivati na to, kaj si mislimo o maju '68 drugod po svetu. V tem primeru se bo izkazalo, da se *50 let maja '68* in *75 let Jugoslavije* dejansko spleča postaviti skupaj.¹

¹ Ta brošura je nastala na ZRC SAZU v okviru raziskovalnega projekta »Maj 68 v literaturi in teoriji: zadnja sezona modernizma v Franciji, Sloveniji in svetu (J6-9384)«, ki ga vodi Marko Juvan, financira pa Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije. Soorganizator simpozija je Slovensko društvo za primerjalno književnost.

May '68 at 50 is certainly not the first conference with this title this year. But it might be the only one that has *Yugoslavia at 75* in the title as well. This begs the question, Why use, not one, but two anniversaries in the title of a conference? One is bad enough for an event that has theoretical ambitions, but two? After all, an anniversary is a bizarre and certainly pre-theoretical mix of the evental and the conjunctural; it is what Fernand Braudel would call an event, but an event removed from us by what he might call a conjuncture. In this respect, May '68 at 50 is neither an event nor a conjuncture; it is an event that happened a whole conjuncture ago. And Yugoslavia at 75 is of course no better.

However, adding *Yugoslavia at 75* to *May '68 at 50* doesn't necessarily make thing twice as bad. If we look back at what started in Paris in 1968 from the perspective of what happened in Jajce in 1943, namely the establishment of socialist Yugoslavia, this at least gives us a chance to move from both the evental and the conjunctural and grasp the structural, the real interest of Fernand Braudel.

Indeed, the title *May '68 at 50, Yugoslavia at 75* poses questions that ultimately are structural, insofar as their ultimate horizon is the *longue durée* that goes all the way back to the early modern origins of capitalism, the object of Braudel's first book. Outside theory, Yugoslav socialist experiment and its defence during Yugoslav May '68 belie the commonplace that May '68 fought for socialism in the West and against socialism in the East. And within theory, Yugoslav non-alignment and self-management pose a problem for the popular Braudelian account of 1968 as mostly a revolt against both the US and the USSR. Both these commonplaces about May '68 are complicated by May in Yugoslavia, where the regime was criticised in the name of its own ideals of self-management and non-alignment. *Contra* opinion-makers, Yugoslav protesters did not protest against socialism as such, despite protesting in the so-called East; *pave* Braudelians, they protested against more than just the forced choice between US and the USSR (not least because they did not protest against socialism).

Beyond these commonplaces, *May '68 at 50, Yugoslavia at 75* will rethink our assumptions about May '68 across such divides as the West and the rest, politics and culture, culture and counterculture, and art and

critique. As such, the conference will create an opportunity to pose such fundamental questions as, Why was May '68 necessary at all in the country that led the Non-Aligned Movement and experimented with self-management as an alternative to both capitalism and state socialism? Estranged in this way, the fact that May '68 did take place even in Yugoslavia can begin to have consequences for what we think about May '68 globally. If this is so, it does indeed make sense to put *May '68 at 50* and *Yugoslavia at 75* together.²

² This booklet was edited at the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts in the framework of the research project 'May '68 in Literature and Theory: The Last Season of Modernism in France, Slovenia, and the World (J6-9384)', which is led by Marko Juvan and financed by the Slovenian Research Agency. The co-organiser of the symposium is the Slovenian Comparative Literature Association.

Suman GUPTA

Univerza kot prostor boja in beda študentskega življenja

Referat polemično primerja konceptualizacije univerze s konca šestdesetih let 20. stoletja in iz današnjega časa (zlasti iz zadnjega desetletja). Izhaja iz situacionističnega pamfleta *De la misère en milieu étudiant* (O bedi študentskega življenja), v katerem so leta 1966 študenti in študentke Univerze v Strasbourgu predstavili dvojico nekoliko protislovnih teženj študentskih gibanj s konca šestdesetih let: da je univerzo treba zasesti od znotraj in demokratizirati; in da je univerzo treba opustiti v prid novim vrstam radikalne pedagogije in prakse. Obe usmeritvi sta univerzo obravnavali kot abstraktno in obenem konkretno institucijo – institucijo, ki zaseda ideološki in hkrati fizični *prostor*. Ta prostor je bilo mogoče bodisi »zasesti« ali pa »opustiti/ukiniti«. Ta koncepta sta bila seveda blizu študentskim gibanjem v Evropi in ZDA, ki sta kontekst večine tovrstnih razprav pa tudi tega referata. A referat obenem ti središči in tamkajšnje odmeve »leta 1968« sofisticira z vpeljavo indijske levičarske politike. Tako v sklepu pokaže, kako se koncept univerze kot ideološkega in fizičnega prostora razvija v novejšem času in predvsem v zadnjem desetletju. Tudi tej problematiki pa uvodoma omenjeni situacionistični pamflet iz leta 1966 (nemara nevede) ponuja dragocene zglede in koristno izhodišče.

Suman GUPTA

The University as Contested Site and the Poverty of Student Life

This presentation offers a polemical comparison between conceptualisations of the university in the late 1960s and now (let's say, the last decade). It draws upon the Situationist pamphlet *On the Poverty of Student Life* (1966) produced by University of Strasbourg students to trace two somewhat contrary directions taken in late-1960s leftwing student movements: that the university should be occupied from within and democratised; that the university should be abandoned in favour of new kinds of radical pedagogy and practice. For both directions, the university was understood as both an abstract and a concrete institution – which occupied an ideological and physical *site*. This site could be 'occupied' or 'abandoned/abolished'. These concepts were obviously germane to student movements in Europe and the USA, and those contexts are, as is usual, centred in this presentation. However, such centrings, and the resonances of '1968', are also complicated here by bringing Indian left politics into the picture. How the concept of the university as an ideological and physical site has fared more recently, over the last decade, occupies the latter part of the presentation. For this line of enquiry too, the 1966 Situationist pamphlet offered some (perhaps unwittingly) prescient gestures and is a useful point of departure.

Vladimir GVOZDEN

Protesti leta 1968: politika spomina ali spomin na politiko?

O »maju 1968« (če naj uporabimo nedolžno ime daljšega političnega procesa) ne manjka informacij, a razprave v veliki meri obvladujejo stereotipi, molk in nekritična nostalgija. Ne manjka ne poročil prič študentskih protestov iz leta 1968 ne razprav iz najrazličnejših strok, pa vendar dogodke same le težka okvirimo v uradno zgodovinopisje in še težje umestimo v širše politične narative. Od tod tudi pomanjkanje izrazov za opis dogodkov iz leta 1968, tako da nam preostanejo le ideološko in intelektualno omejeni klišeji, kot so *keriza*, *stavka*, *upor*, *revolucija*, *konflikt* ali *zarota*. Na drugi strani so izrazi, ki utegnejo biti koristnejši, skoraj popolnoma pozabljeni: nihče na primer danes ne bi tem dogodkom rekel »eksplozija utopičnih sanj«. Pa vendar te dogodke marsikaj približuje našemu času: bili niso ne pričakovani ne predvidljivi; mobilizacija protestnic in protestnikov je bila spontana in nenadna; anti-imperializem je bila ena glavnih tem; maj je bil »apoteoza mimeografa« (Reader); sestanki, demonstracije, letaki so postali del protestniškega vsakdana, ki je s tem postal zmes anarhističnega liberalizma in praktičnega organiziranja. Pomen maja je v intuiciji, da je čas starih političnih koncepcij minil (Badiou), pa tudi v tem, da je slepo iskanje nove politične koncepcije obrodilo varljive sadove. Izziv repolitizacije se torej kaže kot osrednja dediščina »protislovnega vrenja« iz maja 1968. Ob obravnavi študentskih protestov v SFRJ in njihovih odmevov bo referat osvetlil strukturne razloge za neujemanje med kompleksnostjo dogodkov in bedo izkustva oziroma med politiko spomina in spominom na politiko.

Vladimir GVOZDEN

Protests of 1968: The Politics of Memory or the Memory of Politics?

There is plenty of information about ‘May 1968’ (let’s take it as an innocent name of a longer political process), but it seems that the discussion is dominated by stubborn stereotypes, silence or uncritical nostalgia. There are many first-hand accounts of student protests in 1968 as well as many expert accounts in various research fields, but the events themselves are difficult to open to official historiography and it is even more complicated to place them in wider political narratives. This follows also from the fact that there are no real terms to describe events of 1968, only ideologically and intellectually simple labels such as *crisis*, *strike*, *rebellion*, *revolution*, *conflict* or *conspiracy*. On the other hand, terms that may be more useful are almost out of use: for example, today nobody would call these events ‘the boom of utopian dreams’. However, several aspects seem to make these events relevant even in our time: the 1968 events were neither expected nor foreseeable; mobilisation of the protesters was spontaneous and sudden; anti-imperialism was a major topic; May was an ‘apotheosis of the roneo’ (Reader); meetings, demonstrations, leaflets entered the everyday life of the protesters, characterising it with a mix of anarchistic liberalism and practical organisation. The importance of May lies in the feeling that the old political conception came to an end (Badiou), as well as in the fact that a blind and cursory search for a new political conception yielded deceptive results. Therefore, the challenge of repolitisation seems to be the main heritage of the ‘contradictory ferment’ of May 1968. In my paper, I will focus on the student protests in the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia and their subsequent echoes in order to touch on the structural reasons for this discrepancy between the complexity of events and the poverty of experience, or between the politics of memory and the remembrance of politics.

Ivana PERICA

Estetske »tradicije in perspektive« ter politika jugoslovanskega leta 1968

Medtem ko tako zagovorniki kakor kritiki priznavajo različne kontinuitete med kulturno revolucijo iz leta 1968 in sodobno emancipatorično mislijo, post-zgodovinsko zgodovinopisje veliko težje obravnava kontinuitete med literaturo, povezano z letom 1968, in njenimi medvojnimi predhodnicami. Raje namreč govori o letu 1968 kot o radikalni »točki preloma«. Ker so bila razmerja med procesi, ki so vzniknili v šestdesetih letih 20. stoletja, ter političnimi in kulturnimi gibanji iz prve polovice stoletja deležna zelo selektivne obravnave, referat razvije tezo, da pogled na leto 1968 z gledišča medvojnega obdobja bistveno spremeni oceno ne le političnih horizontov iz leta 1968, ampak tudi sodobne »imaginarijske politike«. Elaboracijo implicitnih vertikalnih kontinuitet med medvojno književno politiko in njenimi nasledki iz leta 1968 referat tako dopolni s horizontalno razširitvijo zgodovinopisja t. i. (kapitalističnega) prvega sveta (ki še vedno obvladuje spomin na leto 1968) z gledišči t. i. (socialističnega) drugega sveta. Jugoslovanska povojna apropiacija nekdanjih socialdemokratskih, kulturalističnih ali »evolucijskih« perspektiv nam narekuje upoštevanje dialektičnega značaja teh vertikalnih in horizontalnih (dis)kontinuitet. V navezavi na dialektične pristope Vlada Mađarevića, Enverja Redžića in Branimirja Jakovljevića referat predstavi različne razsežnosti (r)evolucionarnih kontroverz in ideoloških premen v opusu Ota Bihalja-Merina, soustanovitelja založbe Nolit (1928–), sourednika berlinskega medvojnega časopisa *Die Linkskurve* (1929–1933) in glavnega urednika večjezičnega časopisa *Jugoslavija* (1945/1949–1959).

Ivana PERICA

Aesthetic ‘Traditions and Perspectives’ and the Politics of Yugoslav 1968

While the continuities between the 1968 cultural revolution and contemporary emancipatory thought are undisputed among both its proponents and its critics, posthistorical historiography seems to be reluctant to consider the continuities between the 1968 literature and its interwar precursors. Instead, it more often assumes a radical ‘fracture point’ of 1968. As the relations between the developments commencing in the 1960s and the political and cultural movements of the first half of the twentieth century have been most selectively perused, I put forth the thesis that a view at 1968 taken from the interwar period essentially changes not only the estimation of the political horizons of 1968 but also of our contemporary ‘imaginal politics’. In my paper, elaboration on the tacit vertical continuities between interwar literary politics and their 1968 successors is supplemented by horizontal extensions of the First World (capitalist) historiography (which still dominates the memory of 1968) with Second World (socialist) perspectives. Given especially the Yugoslav postwar appropriation of formerly social democratic, culturalist or ‘evolutionary’ perspectives, it is necessary to take into consideration the dialectical character of these vertical and horizontal (dis)continuities. Taking my cue from dialectical perspectives put forth by Vlado Mađarević, Enver Redžić and, most recently, Branimir Jakovljević, I will present the various dimensions of the r/evolutionary controversy and the ideological turnabouts in the work of Oto Bihalji-Merin, co-founder of the publishing house Nolit (since 1928), coeditor of the Berlin interwar journal *Die Linkskurve* (1929–1933), and later chief editor of the multilingual journal *Jugoslavija* (1945/1949–1959).

Rastko MOČNIK
Mao po letu 1968

V času po letu 1968 je mnoge izmed nas potreba po teorizaciji propada revolucije in morebitnih pozitivnih prelomov usmerila k intenzivnemu teoretskemu delu. Teoretsko konjunkturo v Jugoslaviji je tedaj obvladovala obsežna in nelagodna figura heideggrovstva, pojmovanega kot anti-humanizem in anti-aktivizem; frankfurtska šola in njeni odvodi so bili poznani, praxisovski marksizem pa se je zdel močno nezadosten, če že ne ideološki. Derridajev prihod na prizorišče je omogočil spoprijem s Heideggrom in prakticiranje strukturalizma brez davka scientizmu. Althusserjev prihod je bil bolj diskreten, a sčasoma vse očitnejši: njegova afirmacija historičnega materializma proti marksizmom je preoblikovala prizorišče. Althusserjeva koncepta dominacije/določenosti in naddoločenosti sta nas spodbudila k branju tekstov Maa Cetunga o protislovju, velika proletarska kulturna revolucija pa se je zdela še posebej upravičen odziv na krizo, ki ji je komunistična politika zapadla po zavzetju pravno-političnih aparatov. Že pred vpeljavo »tržnega socializma« so številni opazili in kritizirali procese obnove kapitalizma, a tovrstna kritika je bila omejena na ideološke razsežnosti. Ni nam uspelo upoštevati Maove misli, da ideološka protislovja odsevajo objektivna protislovja. Ker nismo opravili materialističnih analiz objektivnih protislovij v jugoslovanskem socializmu, smo bili nepripravljeni, ko sta nastopila kriza osemdesetih let in njen krvavi razplet.

Rastko MOČNIK
Mao after 1968

In the aftermath of 1968, an urgent need to theorise its failure and its eventual positive breakthroughs led many of us towards intensive theoretical commitments. The theoretical conjuncture in Yugoslavia was that of a massive and uneasy presence of Heideggerianism, understood as anti-humanism and anti-activism; the Frankfurt School and its progeny were historically perused, and Praxis Marxism seemed severely insufficient, if not outright ideological. The irruption of Derrida upon the scene made it possible to confront Heidegger, and to practice structuralism without succumbing to scientism. Althusser entered more discretely, but his presence has not ceased to grow: his affirmation of historical materialism against Marxisms transformed the scene. Althusser's concepts of domination/determination and over-determination led us to read Mao Zedong's texts on contradiction, while the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution seemed a particularly just response to the crisis of communist politics after the seizure of the juridical-political apparatuses. Although many detected and criticised processes of capitalist restoration even before the introduction of "market socialism", the critique remained confined to ideological aspects. We failed to follow Mao's indication that ideological contradictions reflect objective contradictions. The lack of materialist analyses of objective contradictions in Yugoslav socialism left us unprepared to confront the crisis of the eighties and its bloody denouement.

Marko JUVAN

Sobivanje ali interakcija? Teorija, literatura in politika »dolgega leta 68« ter problem centra in periferije

Kristin Ross zavrača prepričanje *La pensée 68*, da je bil »antihumanizem« strukturalizma (pozneje globaliziranega kot »francoska teorija«) »mislak revolte leta 68, in poudari, da sta bili teorija in revolta sočasni, a ločeni. Je torej zavezništvo (post)strukturalistične teorije, radikalne politike in modernističnih literarnih praks preprosto retrospektivna utvara?

Ljubljana kot del jugoslovanske vmesne periferije je vendarle proizvedla interakcijo med polji, ki so bila v tedanjem Parizu domnevno le sobivajoča, če ne ločena. Tudi modernistične in neoavantgardne literarne prakse, ki jih obravnave revolte zapostavljajo, so bile pomemben diskurz političnega boja. V skladu z Andersonovim pojmom modernizma kot »kulturnega polja sil«, ki ga določa »imaginativna bližina revolucije«, lahko eksperimentalno literaturo, proizvedeno v družbeno-politični konjunkturi šestdesetih let, označimo za zadnjo sezono modernizma. Prav tedaj se je modernizem v Sloveniji sinhroniziral s Parizom, »greenwiškim poldnevnikom modernosti« (Casanova). Po Morettiju so periferije v svetovnem literarnem sistemu primorane v zapoznili kompromis domačih perspektiv z globaliziranimi formami iz metropol. Tu pa je slovenska literatura prav zaradi perifernosti ustvarila inovativen politični preplet teorije z literaturo.

V šestdesetih in sedemdesetih letih je ljubljanski študentski časopis *Tribuna* objavljala izvorno in uvoženo modernistično literaturo, (post)strukturalistično teorijo in protisistemske politike. Že gola kontigviteta teh diskurzov na straneh *Tribune* je zbudila interakcijo med njimi v bralnih dejanjih. Močnejši načini interakcije pa so zaznamovali tudi produkcijo in mediacijo teh diskurzov, npr. da so pisatelji-teoretiki prevajali svežo francosko teorijo ali pa hibridiziranje teorije in literature. Žižkovi zgodnji hibridni teksti razkrivajo vznik teorije kot parazita na telesih literature in filozofije. »Dekonstruirajo« avtorsko funkcijo, ključno za (nacionalno) literarno institucijo. Škandal, ki ga je s tem leta 1967 izzval Žižek, kakor da napoveduje ločitev generacije 68 na teoretsko in literarno frakcijo v sedemdesetih letih.

Marko JUVAN

Co-presence or Interaction? Theory, Literature and Politics of the Long '68 and the Issue of Centre/Periphery

Rejecting the belief of *La Pensée 68* that 'anti-humanism' of structuralism (later globalised as French theory) represented the 'thought' of the '68 revolt, Kristin Ross claims that the theory and the revolt evolved simultaneously yet separately. Is the alliance of (post)structuralist theory, radical politics and modernist literary practices simply a retrospective illusion?

As a site of Yugoslav in-between periphery, Ljubljana produced an interaction of the fields that in Paris were thought to be only co-present, if not separate. Another important discourse was produced by modernist and neo-avant-garde literary practices, which accounts of the revolt tend to neglect. Following Anderson's notion of modernism as 'as a cultural field of force' experiencing the 'imaginative proximity of social revolution', we can view experimental literature of the 1960s as the last season of modernism. This is when modernism in Slovenia synchronised with Paris, 'the Greenwich meridian of modernity' (Casanova). Peripheries in the literary world-system are, for Moretti, forced into a belated compromise of local perspectives with globalised forms emanating from metropolises. In this case, however, it is due to its peripherality that Slovenian literature was able to produce innovative forms of the political interlacement of theory with literature.

In the 1960s and 70s, the Ljubljana student magazine *Tribuna* published modernist literature, (post)structuralist theory and anti-systemic politics. The mere contiguity of these discourses evoked their interaction in the acts of reading. Moreover, stronger modes of interaction characterised their production and mediation, such as writers-theorists translating new French theory or various hybrids of theory and literature. Žižek's early hybrid texts show the emergence of the theory as a parasite on literature and philosophy. They 'deconstructed' the (nationalist) author function. The scandal Žižek provoked in 1967 seems to foretell the split of the '68 generation on the theoretical and literary fraction in the 1970s.

Andraž JEŽ

Sledovi hladnovojne propagande v današnjih interpretacijah leta 1968

Današnje mainstreamovske humanistične in družboslovne študije 20. stoletja sebe pogosto pojmujejo kot nepolitične ali celo kot politično nevtralne. A natančnejšemu pogledu ne uide njihova politična agenda. Čeprav so napisane v navidezno sveži in aktualni formi, ki dolguje domnevno subverzivni postmodernistični retoriki, ostajajo zveste tradicionalni pozitivistični historiografiji. Tudi ta je sebe pojmovala kot politično nevtralna praksa, a je bila neposredno apologetska do politične hegemonije svojega časa. To trenje med samorazumljeno nevtralnostjo ter neposrednimi in konformističnimi političnimi implikacijami bomo analizirali na treh primerih sodobne mainstreamovske obravnave revolucionarnih gibanj iz leta 1968: na primeru obravnave t. i. praške pomladi; študentskih protestov v zahodnih kapitalističnih centrih; in leta 1968 v Jugoslaviji. V zadnjem primeru sta trčila dva modela upora, tj. zahodni in češkoslovaški, današnje ideološke prezentacije prav teh dveh modelov pa se zapletajo v nemara najočitnejša protislovja. Vsi trije primeri bodo pokazali, kako lahko kritičen pogled na nekatere osnovne predpostavke in dognanja današnjih mainstreamovskih študij te razkrije kot teoretsko nekonsistentne in oddaljene od politične nevtalnosti. Naš namen bo pokazati, da v obravnavah levice iz leta 1968 – in predvsem režimov t. i. realno obstoječega socializma – današnje mainstreamovske študije jasno izkazujejo sledove hladnovojne propagande. Ta pa je tudi temelj sodobne neoliberalne ideologije, zato bomo v neoliberalizmu prepoznali naddoločujoči element današnjih mainstreamovskih študij in njihove samorazumljene nevtalnosti.

Andraž JEŽ

Traces of Cold-War Propaganda in Recent Interpretations of 1968

Recent mainstream studies of the twentieth century often understand themselves as unpolitical, if not politically neutral. A closer look, however, can uncover their political agenda. Although they are written in a seemingly fresh and fashionable form reminiscent of a supposedly subversive postmodernist rhetoric, they remain faithful to traditional historiographic positivism. This positivism understood itself as politically neutral as well but was, in fact, directly apologetic of the political hegemony of its day. This friction between the self-perceived neutrality and the conformist political implications will be analysed in three cases studies of recent mainstream academic treatment of the revolutionary movements of 1968: the so-called Prague Spring; the student protests in Western capitalist centres; and the Yugoslav 1968. In Yugoslavia, two models of protest, the Western and the Czechoslovak, collided, and it is recent ideological presentations of these models that are arguably most contradictory of all. All three cases, however, will betray theoretical inconsistency and political bias. The aim of the paper is to demonstrate that mainstream studies of May '68, and especially of the regimes of the so-called really existing socialism, exhibit traces of Cold-War propaganda. As this propaganda also represents the foundation of today's neoliberal hegemony, the paper sees neoliberalism as ultimately the overdetermining element of recent mainstream studies and their self-perceived neutrality.

Rok BENČIN

Odmaknjene neposrednosti: Badiou in Rancière o posledicah maja '68

Kot nenehno opozarja Alain Badiou, lahko o dogodku sodimo le po njegovih posledicah. Celo samo dejstvo, da se je nekaj zgodilo, lahko za nazaj potrdimo le sodeč po posledicah. Toda kaj šteje kot posledica? V očeh kritikov maja '68 z vseh strani političnega spektra dogodki v Franciji niso imeli nobenih posledic (namesto revolucije so prišle volitve s prepričljivo zmago desnice) ali vsaj ne političnih posledic, temveč le kulturne (spremembe v življenjskem slogu), ali pa so sicer imeli politične posledice, a v obratno smer od tistih, ki so jih imeli v mislih njihovi akterji (dogodki niso prispevali k padcu kapitalizma, ampak k tistemu, kar bi danes označili za njegovo neoliberalno prenovo). Vprašanje je torej v tem, kaj nam omogoča kot posledico dogodka videti nekaj drugega, nekaj kar ohranja neposrednost boja in kar kljub temu, da ni bilo nikoli do konca realizirano, še vedno zahteva zvestobo. Z drugimi besedami, bližjimi tistim, ki jih uporablja Jacques Rancière, kakšne so oblike vzročnosti in časovnosti, ki nam v efemerni neposrednosti preloma, ki se je zgodil maja '68, omogočajo videti del še vedno žive politične tradicije. V prispevku bom na ta vprašanja poskušal odgovoriti z obravnavo pogledov na maj '68 in njegove posledice, kot ju podata Badiou in Rancière – dva francoska filozofa, ki v tem dogodku še vedno vidita ključen političen in teoretski preobrat.

Rok BENČIN

Distant Immediacies: Badiou and Rancière on the Consequences of May '68

As Alain Badiou never tires of repeating, an event can only be judged based on its consequences. Even the event's very existence can only be retroactively determined by way of its consequences. But what counts for a consequence? In the eyes of the critics of May '68 from all sides of the political spectrum, the events of May '68 in France have been accused of having no consequence at all (instead of a revolution, there was an election with a landslide right-wing victory), of having no political but merely cultural consequences (lifestyle changes), or of producing political consequences that were opposite to the intentions of its actors (the events have not contributed to the fall of capitalism but to what would now be labelled as its neoliberal reform). The question is, then, what allows us to see something else as a consequence of the event, something that preserves the immediacy of the struggle, something that, without ever being fully realised, still demands fidelity today. In other words, closer to the terms used by Jacques Rancière, what are the forms of causality and temporality that allow us to see the ephemeral immediacy of the rupture that occurred in May '68 as part of a political tradition that we can continue to draw on and add to today? In an attempt to answer this question, I will examine the accounts of May '68 and its aftermath offered by Badiou and Rancière – two French philosophers for whom the event in question remains a crucial political and theoretical turning point.

Antonia BIRNBAUM

**Razsrediščiti ali ponovno osrediščiti proletarsko politiko?
Paradoks francoskega maoizma**

Akterji dogajanj leta 1968 v Franciji so se sprva izražali v marksističnih diskurzih. Toda njihove antiavtoritarne izkušnje, konflikti in spori so zameglili osredotočenost na proletariat. Kljubovanje kapitalu bo odslej zahtevalo reinvenčijo generične dimenzije politike. Preprosto sklicevanje na že obstoječo politično koherenco, temelječo na univerzalnosti proletarskega načela ni več zadostovalo. Na nenavaden in izkrivljen način je maoističen obrat althusserjancev odprl nove poti razsrediščanju proletarske politike, a hkrati zaprl te iste neznane poti. Ta paradoks lahko razberemo v napetosti med naslednjima formulama: »delavci ne rabijo naše znanosti, ampak naš upor« in »naša naloga je služiti ljudstvu«. S tem paradoksom se bom ukvarjala skozi politično, tako historično kot teoretsko prevrednotenje predzgodovine maoizma.

Antonia BIRNBAUM

Decentring or Recentring Proletarian Politics? A Paradox of French Maoism

The actors of 1968 in France first expressed themselves through Marxist discourses. However, their antiauthoritarian experiences, conflicts, controversies disrupted the focus on the centrality of the proletariat. Challenging capital henceforth called for a reinvention of the generic dimension of politics, rather than for a simple enrolment in a pre-existing political coherence based on the universality of the proletarian principle. In a strange and twisted way, the Maoist turn of the Althusserians both opened new ways that decentred proletarian politics and produced a foreclosure of these unknown paths. This paradox appears in the tension between two formulas: ‘the workers need not our science, but our revolt’ and ‘the task is to serve the people’. I will explore this paradox through a political reappraisal of the pre-history of Maoism, a reappraisal that is both historical and theoretical.

UDELEŽENCI/-KE / *SPEAKERS*

Rok BENČIN

Filozofski inštitut ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, Slovenija /
Slovenia; rok.bencin@gmail.com

Antonia BIRNBAUM

Université Paris 8, Département de philosophie, Francija /
France; antonia.birnbaum@wanadoo.fr

Suman GUPTA

The Open University, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,
Velika Britanija / *Great Britain*; suman.gupta@open.ac.uk

Vladimir GVOZDEN

Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Filozofski fakultet, Srbija /
Serbia; vladimir.gvozden@ff.uns.ac.rs

Jernej HABJAN

Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU,
Slovenija / *Slovenia*; jhabjan@zrc-sazu.si

Andraž JEŽ

Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU,
Slovenija / *Slovenia*; ajez@zrc-sazu.si

Marko JUVAN

Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU,
Slovenija / *Slovenia*; mjuvan@zrc-sazu.si

Rastko MOČNIK

Univerzitet Singidunum, Fakultet za medije in komunikacije,
Srbija / *Serbia*; rastko.mocnik@fmk.edu.rs

Ivana PERICA

Universität Wien, Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften, Avstrija
/ *Austria*; ivana.perica@univie.ac.at

50 LET MAJA '68, 75 LET JUGOSLAVIJE
Mednarodni kolokvij Inštituta za slovensko literaturo in
literarne vede ZRC SAZU
MAY '68 AT 50, YUGOSLAVIA AT 75
International Colloquium of the Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies,
ZRC SAZU

11.–12. oktober 2018
Prešernova dvorana SAZU (Novi trg 4, Ljubljana)
11–12 October 2018
Prešeren Hall SAZU (Novi trg 4, Ljubljana)

Program in povzetki
Program and Abstracts

Urejanje, prevajanje in lektoriranje / *Editing, translation, and proof-reading:*
Jernej HABJAN, Andraž JEŽ, Marijan DOVIČ

Organizacija / *Organisation:*
Inštitut za slovensko literaturo in literarne vede ZRC SAZU
Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies, ZRC SAZU
Slovensko društvo za primerjalno književnost
Slovenian Comparative Literature Association

Finančna podpora / *Financial support:*
Javna agencija za knjigo / *Slovenian Book Agency*
Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost RS / *Slovenian Research Agency*

Založilo / *Publisher:*
Slovensko društvo za primerjalno književnost
Slovenian Comparative Literature Association

Natisnil / *Print:*
Megacop, Ljubljana

Naklada 50 izvodov / *Printed in 50 copies*