

Bogdana Koljević Griffith*

Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade, Serbia

AFTER NEOLIBERALISM – RUSSIA AND EUROPEAN VALUES IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Abstract

In this article, the author first analyzes the political and social consequences of the “neoliberal turn” as exemplified not only in the policy of US exceptionalism but likewise in the project of the EU, their common signifier being the politics of NATO expansion and hegemony. Moreover, it is argued how Europe’s self-cancellation of its own system of values began with the first contemporary European wars i.e., the wars against Serbs. This biopolitical militarism of the West has been further exemplified by a series of wars – from Iraq, Libya, Syria all the way to Ukraine. However, different phases of neoliberal biopolitics are outlined, i.e., the movement from “humanitarian interventionism” to neocolonialism and finally neo-Nazism as the truth of neoliberalism. In the second part of the article, the reinterpretation of Russia is articulated as the question of the transition of epochs and “the end of American century” as well as a potentiality for a new political-philosophical discourse of equality and true democracy. Simultaneously, this process appears as a renewal of the Aristotelian relation between ethics and politics vs. the neo-Hobbes of the West and as a possibility for “the rest” to realize new practices of the self-determination of the people enabled by a theory of subjectification, i.e., sovereignty, otherness,

*bogdana.koljevic@ips.ac.rs

and pluralism. Finally, the question of twenty-first century Europe at the crossroads is presented as a chance for the rebirth of its best traditions.

Key Words: *neoliberalism, biopolitics, European values, reinterpretation of Russia, equality, true democracy, politics of the people.*

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE END OF EUROPEAN VALUES

Indisputably, the neoliberal turn in its political, social, and economic aspects corresponded precisely with US hegemony and the creation of a unipolar world, beginning in 1989, while its first most relevant political articulation – as the politics of *American exceptionalism* – can be traced back to the 1992 Wolfowitz doctrine (Tyler 1992). Or, more precisely, the concepts of not only superpower status and US primacy but likewise that of unilateralism that downplays the value of international coalitions as well as the doctrine of preventive intervention have been formulated and later on reaffirmed in, for example, the Bush doctrine as well, which Kennedy described as “a call for 21st century American imperialism that no other nation can or should accept” (Gaddis 2002). The policy of *US exceptionalism* has most notably been exemplified by full political implementation of the concepts of *hegemony* and *extraordinariness* and *per se* referred to exclusion of *otherness*, *difference*, as well as *equality*. In this way – in direct opposition to the ultimate proclamation of *democracy as the highest value* – US politics presented a *structural totalitarian impulse*, one which, moreover, has been inscribed in the heart of *the neoliberal system*.

This impulse is precisely why Fukuyama was able to declare “*the end of history*” and why the goal was to *spread neoliberalism on global scale via globalism* or, why, for instance, Brzezinski’s project from the beginning of the 1990s has been full control of Europe by the US (Brzezinski 1997). Therefore, Monnet’s technocratic vision of the project of the EU corresponded precisely to *the crux of the neoliberal system*, i.e., to the dominance of what Badiou has named as the *materialistic paradigm* (Badiou 2012) and Rancière described as *a conformism and an atomism* which, in final instance, produced even *the hatred of democracy* (Rancière 2007).

Thus – based on the lack of *European values per se* – the EU has been able to, in coalition with the US, launch *the first contemporary European wars*, i.e., the *NATO bombing of the Republic of Srpska* in 1995 and the *war against Serbia* in 1999 (Badiou 2012). Neoliberalism, therefore, manifested itself in direct opposition to the *proclaimed politics of perpetual peace* in the destructive attitude and aggression of the entire West. Moreover, launching such wars in the heart of Europe demonstrated *the lack of European autonomy* and, most relevantly, *how the EU has been constructed as the US project par excellence*. From the perspective of European values these wars presented not only a brutal violation of international law, and therefore the end of diplomacy and dialogue, but likewise a radical movement away from *principles of justice, equality, freedom, democracy, and political subjectivity*.

Furthermore, the NATO bombings and the involvement of the EU in this practically displayed *how there is no structural difference between NATO and the EU*, i.e., that they are – in Baudrillard’s terms – *the other of the same*. In final instance, what lies at the heart of this logic is *the militant, conquering and totalitarian aspect* which operates on *the friend-enemy distinction, binarism, and Manichean divisions* (Bernstein 2006). Simultaneously, this reveals the Foucauldian structure of *biopolitics as neoliberalism* at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries exemplified precisely in the political and military institutions such as the EU and NATO, as well as economic institutions such as the IMF and World Bank. Moreover, the so-called “*humanitarian interventions*” of the West – as well as the practically infinite “*wars against terrorism*” – present contemporary biopolitical phenomena *par excellence* and political practices of “*exporting democracy*” (Koljević 2015). In the first two cases, the biopolitical movement is mostly exemplified through *the de-humanization and criminalization of the enemy, the other who does not act as an obedient subject to the neoliberal system and its projected totalization* while in the third case the presupposition is *the hierarchical division between more and less “civilized” peoples*, i.e., the political existence of barbarians to whom democracy *must be exported* for the sake of their own as well as global prosperity.

In any retrospective analysis of how neoliberalism de(con)structed practically all European values, a special emphasis needs to be put on the fact that *the Western wars against Serbs* appeared as the beginning of *biopolitical militarism*, i.e., that the wars in Iraq, Libya, Syria as well

as the “Arab Spring,” the “Orange Revolution” in Ukraine, proxy wars, hybrid wars and different types of political interventions aiming at regime change were *a logical continuation of one and the same process*. Finally, if the war against the Serbs presented *the first contemporary EU war*, then the war in Ukraine – first and foremost caused by *hegemonic politics of NATO expansion*¹ and the *Nazification of Ukraine and then of the West as well* – appears as a *second contemporary EU war*, which closes the circle of *neoliberalism as the biopolitics of the EU*, i.e., *its beginning and its politically logical end as the self-realization of its concept*.

Certainly, the entire creation of – in Hegelian terms – an *upside-down world* in which the *master/slave dialectic* enabled reversing the roles of *oppressor* and *oppressed* would not have been possible to such an extent had it not been for the previous destruction of the system of values replaced by a *media-dominated society*. Or, more precisely, the establishment of a *parallel, illusory world* and creation of a *society of the spectacle* (Debord 2002) in recent decades took on many forms – from Orwell’s *1984* all the way to Huxley’s *Brave New World* – in such a way that even Clausewitz’s formula according to which *war is a continuation of politics by other means* – as well as Foucault’s inversion of it – became outdated because *war literally became peace* and *vice-versa*. Along the same lines, *slavery appeared as freedom* and *the quest for autonomy as aggression* and ignorance, even more, manifested as strength.

In this light, one can also recall how Simone Weil emphasized that an impulse of Nazism and fascism played a relevant role in Western history, culture, and everydayness *en générale* and that, in such a way, the figure of Hitler was a radical manifestation of a *persistent Western phenomenon* (Weil 2015). This view is also expressed by W. E. B. Du Bois, who underlined how there is *no such Nazi crime that Europe has not practiced against people of color all over the world a long time before* (Du Bois 1997). Or, indeed, Sartre’s well-known speech, “Genocide,” articulates how the war between the US and Vietnam follows Hitler’s pattern precisely (Sartre 1968). The key point, therefore, which different intellectuals addressed in their own ways is that *biopolitics has a prehistory in Europe*, i.e., that *the imperialism and colonialism of the West were present for centuries* and are inseparable from their *racism*, exemplified in the belief of the superior race determined to rule the world.

¹ In 1997, Brzezinski wrote how NATO expansion should take place in phases, i.e., how the first to join the alliance should be Eastern European countries such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, but that then the process should continue (Brzezinski 1997).

This way, it becomes clearer how, at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries, it was possible for European political and theoretical discourses to practically become the *politics of NATO expansion*, i.e., a *politics of hegemony par excellence*, as the project of *transatlantic elites* which *politically, socially, and economically turned even against their own people*. Finally, a paradigmatic example of how *the war in Ukraine* appeared as *the ultimate carrier of contemporary “European values”* – and then, respectively, *as the end of Europe per se* – is found in Žižek’s article, “The Heroes of the Apocalypse,” in which one of Europe’s leading intellectuals outlines unconditional and uncritical *support for neo-Nazism* and, after which, it becomes plausible *how neo-Nazism appears as the truth of neoliberalism* (Žižek 2022). Or, more precisely, contemporary events clearly affirmed Foucault’s thesis of *biopolitics as neoliberalism* and *vice-versa* and how *neoliberal governmentality* – which has included *interventionism, terrorism, “wars against terrorism”, migration crisis, economic crisis, security paradigms* and more *biopolitical phenomena* – now appears as *biopolitics proper*, i.e., *as neo-Nazism*.

In this way, the war in Ukraine exemplifies the final phase of a movement from the ideology of “*the end of history*” to *counter-history per se* – *as the ultimate phase of the self-destruction of the West*. This movement means a full revisionism of both First World War and then the Second World War. Moreover, this process simultaneously manifests itself as a revival of *racism in Europe*. In the final instance, if the beginning of neoliberal totalitarianism was marked by so-called “*humanitarian interventionism*” and a *selective politics of human rights* – as accurately described in Douzinas’s *Human Rights and Empire* (Douzinas 2007) – and the second phase *neocolonialism*, the third and final stage of *neoliberal Europe* is the movement to “*selective humanism*” and then “*transhumanism*.”

Moreover, inasmuch as the contemporary West – and especially the EU – has recently been deepening the division between “*civilized*” peoples and states, and “*the rest*” – which, therefore, are perceived as *barbarians*, European values appear all the more *dislocated*. Or, more precisely, the more Brussels elites refer to Europe as a “*colorful garden*” – as different from “*the planet of the jungle*” – the racism of the “*collective West*” is becoming more and more transparent. In this way, in the name of free speech, both freedom of speech as well as Russian culture are cancelled in Europe, the continent which respectively turns to its own

self-cancellation. Furthermore, all of this is just an example of *liberal democracy as post-democracy* i.e., as *hatred of democracy* and, in such a way, as a *hatred of politics*, i.e., as the *nihilism of post-politics per se*.

REINTERPRETATION OF RUSSIA AND EUROPEAN VALUES

From such a political-philosophical perspective, the reinterpretation of Russia in the twenty-first century appears as much more than a relevant geopolitical analysis of its new role and the country's greatest challenges in building a new reality. Or, more precisely, world transformations which are currently taking place on the one hand signify a *transition of epochs* (Koljevic Griffith 2021) and therefore mark a new era of multipolarity and *the end of the American century* (Hoffbauer 2023) in which *new strategies will be necessary* (Haass, Kupchan 2023). In this sense, one can speak of *structural turbulences* which appear as a *new world map with new centers of power restructuring several decades of US dominance*. However, because this transition refers equally to *the end of neoliberalism as biopolitics* – and in such a way to *the end of post-politics and post-democracy* – the transformations most notably include *new political, economic, social and ethical models*.

This transition is precisely how the *reinterpretation of Russia* is deeply interwoven with the issue of *European values per se* and – in practically direct contrast to the *hyper-production of anti-Russian hysteria in the West* – the multiple ways in which it has to do with the rebirth of the most decisive values. Moreover, it is possible to articulate how the fact that contemporary Russia is reemerging as a relevant new world power, one which will greatly influence the twenty-first century, first and foremost comes forth from *its creation of a new discourse after biopolitics*.

This is to say that the irreplaceable character of Russia's aspirations lies in what Rancière calls *politics of equality* (Rancière 2007b) or what Marx names *true democracy* when speaking of a *self-determination of the people* (Marx 2016). The crucial issue at stake in Russia's new political discourse is the concept of the *equality of states and peoples* and their right to decide their own norms and choose their own destiny. Simultaneously, in the heart of this new logic is the opposition to every form of the *politics of interventionism*, which presupposes a clear stance against *neocolonialism and neototalitarianism*. In this way, the new

political discourse has an Aristotelian echo in it, i.e., it reminds us of the inseparable line *between politics and ethics* or, rather, *the ethics of infinity inscribed in the heart of politics* (Critchley 2007).

Therefore, the system of values which Russia is attempting to affirm is structurally based on *equality, freedom, and justice* as well as on *plurality and the respect for differences and multiplicities, contra the globalized uniformity* which has been a constitutive part of numerous *neoliberal and postmodern theories and practices in recent decades*. In this light, most relevant concepts of the new system are at the same time *sovereignty and pluralism* – as concepts which are not only mutually interrelated and permanently reaffirmed in discourse and politics, but are also unthinkable without their common signifier, i.e., without *subjectivity*. This is the case with practically all forms of individuality and collectivity because the recognition of *otherness via otherness* (Levinas 1969) is precisely *the path of subjectification and self-determination and vice-versa*. Furthermore, all the decisive concepts of the new political framework form a set of relations between themselves, i.e., *equality, freedom, justice, sovereignty, pluralism, and subjectivity* are reimagined as *the basis of a new politics of the people as true democracy*.

Indisputably, in the contemporary setting such a discourse finds a fertile ground both in terms of *Realpolitik* and of new theories in *practically all the non-Western world* in the West-created dichotomy or binarism of “*the West*” vs. “*the rest*.” Since “*the rest*” have been stigmatized by hegemonic neoliberalism as “*the Third world*,” i.e., as “*uncivilized*” and “*barbarians*,” basic political logic entails that they appear as *the ultimate carriers of new politics of the people*. This issue is exemplary because it demonstrates how the reinterpretation of Russia through its newly founding discourse is not simply a matter of its *self-reinterpretation* but rather a *political, economic, social, cultural and philosophical expression of the act of refusal and the right to say “no” to the neocolonial status quo*. Or, more precisely, the majority of the world’s populations, states, and peoples *reject the hierarchical divisions* reentering the processes of *subjectification, sovereignty, and democratization*.

In this respect, a relevant part of this new discourse is likewise a rejection of the *historical revisionism* which became a foundational structure of Western public, media, but also academic mainstream discourse – as exemplified, for instance, in Snyder’s work (Snyder 2012). Moreover, this rejection always already presupposes comprehending how the path to one’s own *self-development* and future progress – be it

individual and/or collective – rests on *the acceptance of objective history as the issue of truth coming into being*. Or, in other words, *the precondition of the appearance of the subject qua subject* is the abandoning of *the neoliberal “eternal present,”* i.e., the understanding of *past and future and the intertwining between them*. It is only from such a perspective that *the rebirth of politics, ethics, and society can take place* and the chance for this is emerging precisely with *twenty-first-century multipolarity*. Furthermore, doing so is exactly how the *reinterpretation of Russia* becomes, *first, the issue of political subjectivity of “the rest”* – in the rediscovered *dictum* of the Enlightenment, “to have the courage to use one’s own reason” – and then the issue of *political subjectivity per se*.

What is in play here is both *bios* and *zoe* precisely because what is at stake for the great majority of humankind is the issue of both *bare life*, i.e., *survival*, and, respectively, of *dignified life*. These two issues fall into one in the *metaphorical* and *normative* but likewise *factual reinterpretation of Russia*, which refers to *the potentiality of a new world system*. Therefore, this is a process in which *the many of the world* are attempting to reaffirm the *crisis*, i.e., the insight that every crisis presents a chance for *a new beginning*, with the awareness that the most relevant issue is *the rebirth of the political*. Furthermore, such a theoretical and political movement *eo ipso* carries the reference to the ancient *polis* and the *agora* as its center in which *the free discussion of equals is realized*. Because, if the war between “*the West*” and “*the rest*” exemplifies a contemporary version of a Hegelian *master-slave dialectic* – *as a real struggle for recognition* from which the right to *freedom* and *political subjectivity* emerge – then it is precisely *the ancient and modern rearticulation of European values* which appears as a *proper response*. In such a way, inasmuch as Russia is successful in the discursive and practical foundations of these values, it will arise *as their ultimate carrier par excellence*.

The revival of *political subjectivity* – of *the political per se* – is precisely the revival of Europe’s best traditions: *antiquity, Christianity, and modernity*. Or, rather, *the opposition to neoliberal biopolitics in political, social, economic and cultural terms* most notably refers to the issue of a *true democracy* inseparable from *sovereignty* because both concepts are intrinsically linked with *autonomia*. Moreover, as *the politics of the many* or, rather, the *politics of multiplicities* – that are structurally divergent from *politics of the one*, i.e., the *politics of totality* – they always already presuppose respect for *otherness* and *differences*,

both internally and externally. Therefore, the call for *the equality of all in international politics appears as the end of the politics of hegemony*, presenting a potentiality for a creation of an *international system* in which there would be no *exclusivity* and no *exceptionalism*.

The reaffirmation of the *polis* as the space of dialogue and equal participation, i.e., of free speech and world debate, simultaneously discloses the perspectives of the renewal of the Aristotelian relation between politics and ethics. This is the act of practically direct opposition to *the neo-Hobbesian stance of the West* and, likewise, incorporates the rebirth of the concept of *virtue as measure*. At the same time, the new normative framework of Russian discourse constitutively includes the principles of justice and freedom, and therefore the entire philosophical path from Rousseau to Marx's true democracy, which explains how *a state is democratic inasmuch as it is the live presentation of self-determination of the people*. In opposition, therefore, to *the neoliberal return to the state of nature* and, consequently, to the framework of *the obedient subject* – which is, in fact, *objectified in its core* – the affirmation of new *status civilis* comes forth precisely from the idea of *equality*.

Such is how, seemingly paradoxically, European values have the potentiality of being reborn *first in Euro-Asia* which – both conceptually and geopolitically – does not *per definitionem* exclude the idea of *Greater Europe*. Or, more precisely, not only is it the case that from the principle position of its new discourse – and in difference to current EU practices – Russia is not banning European culture, but it is *structurally opposing biopolitics* as, in Foucault's terms, “*one regime of truth*.”

In this way, Russia is likewise standing against all processes which Rancière names the “*medicalization of thought*” (Rancière 2015) and this means a non-judgemental approach to populations, peoples, and states in their choices.² Therefore, the discourse Russia is attempting to affirm is articulated against the structural set of relations between *the body*, i.e., the *politization of the body as biopolitics*, as well as what Badiou calls “*democratic materialism*” as the contemporary paradigm. Moreover, this set of relations further includes *fear* – as the dominant emotion of *the obedient subject* turning it into an *object of dominance* – and then *slavery* which signifies the final capturing of the subject. At the same time, this net incorporates *tutoring* – as the model applied to *the*

² In “Democracy and Its Doctors” Rancière elaborates how Western discourses in various ways attempted to demonstrate to the people, i.e., to their own populations, how they are a “sick population” if they believe they can really choose.

objectified subject – and, finally, the *medicalization of thought* – as the final instance which disables *critical thinking and autonomous action*. Now, this set of relations i.e., *the body-fear-slavery-tutoring-medicalization of thought*, leads to the unraveling of its further consequences which are, namely, the *permanent state of war* or, rather, the indistinguishable state between *war and peace* and *vice-versa*, that at the same time appears as a “*oneness*,” i.e., the *totality of post-democracy* – and the final logical implication of this is precisely the *politics of neo-Nazism* as the *politics of thanatos*.

On the other hand, a structurally different conceptual chain is being reconstructed, i.e., one of *subject-freedom-equality-true democracy and the polis*. This way, the new *zoon politikon* superseeds “*the therapeutic Leviathan*” while perceiving that *the true political subject* – the one which *overcomes biopolitics* – is *the people*. Furthermore, it is only in this way that the theoretical and political affirmation of *logon didonai* can take place, enabling, therefore, both *a new philosophical framework and a world communicative practice of a completely divergent system*. Finally, *the rebirth of the political* at the same time refers to a potentiality of a *rethinking of power*, i.e., to a discursive movement towards a conception of power articulated either along Arendtian or Foucauldian lines – a *power* not equalized with *force* but realized as a *power of subjectivities* and then, further, as a *power of collaboration*. Such “*humanization of power*” would, on the one hand, mean its manifestation through *speech and dialogue*, the co-existence of “*the one*” with “*the other*” and then “*the third*,” i.e., the functioning of *society* (Levinas 1969). At the same time, in the domain of *political science and international relations*, this rethinking of power would signify “*the realistic stance*” according to which power is always already present or, rather, *in play*, and there is no utopian escape from it – but what can be achieved in concrete practice is, in Foucault’s terms, *the realization of power “with a minimum of domination”* (Foucault 2003). Furthermore, such a discourse on power enables different world powers to adopt and manifest in practice the concepts of *limited* and *divided power*, which would be fundamentally different from the neoliberal hegemonic, i.e., *limitless power of the one*.

POST SCRIPTUM: TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY EUROPE AT THE CROSSROADS

In such a way, the new discourse which Russia is attempting to conceptualize and affirm, precisely through *the rebirth of European values* presents *a specific potentiality for twenty-first-century Europe to overcome neoliberalism in theory and practice*. Or, more precisely, the Old Continent is currently at the crossroads where, on the one hand, *the project of the EU is appearing in its self-destructive political shape* while, on the other hand, *a new beginning is yet to be articulated*. Contemporary Europe is therefore at the stage of entering *a process of dissolution and political, economic, and social fragmentation* and, moreover, this is the case with *“the collective West” en générale*, most notably with the US. These are politically logical consequences of the fact that the neoliberal system is falling apart, and this *fall* is simultaneously *destructive and self-destructive*. In the case of Europe, the final implication will most likely be *further disintegration of the EU on practically all levels*. However, it is exactly this fundamental crisis that *presents Europe’s chance in the twenty-first century*, i.e., for the reappearance of the *polis* in the plural, as a rebirth of both the political and multiplicities, and as *a return of true democracy and a political subjectivity of the people*.

The *ethical-political political perspective*, therefore, for the possibilities of a new Europe lies in its creation of discourses of *equality, justice, and freedom* in which, *eo ipso*, *a return to history* will take place as well, as inseparable from the path to the future. Simultaneously, this will mean a new self-awareness of how the welfare state collapsed in Europe, i.e., how such a collapse corresponds to the disappearance of European values. Therefore, it is precisely the neoliberal hegemony in Europe and the prevalence of profit as the ultimate value where the gap between *the Brussels crypto-elites* and *the people* was formed and deepened with time. This is the proper *topos* of dissolution of European values, while perhaps the irreplaceable irony lies in the fact that exactly in time of dominance of what Badiou’s as *democratic materialism* – which refers to a materialistic paradigm *per se* – the differences between classes become broader while the discourses on *equality and justice* were replaced with those on *globalism and prosperity*. Indisputably, protests across Europe will continue to grow and expand, which is *la chance* for *overcoming biopolitics in a rebirth of democracy*. Furthermore, the end of neoliberal biopolitics in Europe will also be the end of *both regulation*

and control of the population and will, relevantly, appear as the process in which *the masses become the people*, i.e., *a political subject*.

Doubtless, in its own return to European values, different European peoples will *per defintionem* reframe the propagandist and revisionist political-philosophical interpretation of Russia – such as most notably exemplified in the work of Prozorov (Prozorov 2022) – in the process of *reinterpretation* in which it also becomes clear *how Russia is Europe and vice-versa*.³ Simultaneously, this reinterpretation presupposes the re-articulation how the *topos* of European values lies in the new Russian discourse, which is a chance for true multiplicities in Europe to emerge. As a movement, in Leviansian terms, from *totality to infinity*, or as, in Critchley's terms, an *infinitely demanding ethics*, this process would manifest itself as an original openness for *the other via other*. Moreover, in such a shift from the materialistic paradigm, i.e., from *democratic materialism*, the Hobbesian *fear for life* diminishes as the prevailing emotion and is replaced by *the will for collaboration, autonomy, and individual and collective self-determination*. Therefore, *the rebirth of the political* signifies precisely *how the neoliberal philosophy of fear* – as exemplified by Hobbes – overturns to *a new philosophy of freedom* and this movement is inseparable from the entire philosophical tradition from Rousseau to Hegel and Marx. The recreation of *polis* in different European countries in the twenty-first century is precisely the act of the *self-becoming of the demos* and, simultaneously, this is the only way *a polis can exist qua polis*. Or, more accurately, in opposition to the permanent state of nature, the renewal of *political topoi* represents *the politics of the people as the proper name for twenty-first-century politics*.

REFERENCES

- Badiou, Alain. 2012. *Polemics*. New York: Verso.
- Bernstein, Richard. 2006. *The Abuse of Evil*. New York: Polity Press.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1998. *The Grand Chessboard*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. 1997. "A Geostrategy for Euroasia". *Foreign Affairs*, Sept/Oct. 1997.
- Critchley, Simon. 2007. *Infinitely Demanding*. New York: Verso.

³ This however does not mean that Russia is *just* Europe or, more precisely, one is inclined to say Russia is *both Europe and more*.

- Debord, Guy. 2002. *Society of the Spectacle*. Detroit: Black&Red.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1997. *Black Reconstruction in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2003. *Society Must Be Defended*. New York: Picador.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. 2002. "Grand Strategy of Transformation". *Foreign Policy* 133: 50–57.
- Haass, Richard, Kupchan, Charles. 2023. "The West Needs A New Strategy in Ukraine". *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2023.
- Hofbauer, Hans. 2023. *Slika neprijatelja - Rusija*. Beograd: Albatros Plus. [*The Image Of The Enemy - Russia*].
- Koljević Grifit, Bogdana. 2021. *Promena epoha i Zapad na raskršću*. Beograd: IPS – Catena
- Mundi. [*Transition Of Epochs and The West At The Crossroads*].
- Koljević, Bogdana. 2015. *Twenty First Century Biopolitics*. Frankfurt Am Main: Peter Lang.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and Infinity*. Ann Arbor: XanEdu Publishing.
- Prozorov, Sergei. 2022. *Biopolitics after Truth*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2007a. *Hatred of Democracy*. New York: Verso.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2007b. *On the Shores of Politics*. New York: Verso.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2015. *Dissensus*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1968. "Genocide". *New Left Review* 1/48 March/April 1968.
- Snyder, Timothy. 2012. *Bloodlands*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tyler, Patrick E. 1992. "US Strategy Plan Calls For Insuring No Rivals Develop". *The New York Times*, March 8 1992.
- Weil, Simone. 2015. *Selected Essays 1934-1943*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 2022. "Heroes of The Apokalypse". *Project-syndicate.org*. May 11 2022.

Богдана Кољевић Грифит

Институт за политичке студије, Београд, Србија

ПОСЛЕ НЕОЛИБЕРАЛИЗМА – РУСИЈА И ЕВРОПСКЕ ВРЕДНОСТИ У XXI ВЕКУ

Апстракт

У овом чланку аутор прво анализира политичке и друштвене последице „неолибералног заокрета“ који се препознаје не само у политици америчке изузетности већ исто тако и у пројекту ЕУ, док је заједнички именитељ за оба политика НАТО експанзије и хегемоније. Штавише, аргументише се како је Европа почела да уништава сопствени систем вредности сас почетком савремених европских ратова тј. ратова против Срба. Биополитички милитаризам Запада даље се приказује кроз серију ратова од Ирака, Либије и Сирије све до Украјине. Истовремено се апострофирају различите фазе неолибералне биополитике тј. кретање од „хуманитарних интервенција“, преко неоколонијализма све до нео-нацизма као истине неолиберализма. У другом делу рада питање реинтерпретације Русије артикулише се као питање промене епоха и „крај америчког века“ и као потенцијал за нови политичко-филозофски дискурс једнакости и праве демократије. У исти мах, овај процес појављује се као обнова аристотеловске релације између политике и етике наспрам неохобсовског приступа Запада и као могућност „осталих“ да реализују нове праксе самоодређења народа које извиру из теорије субјектификације тј. суверенитета, другости и плурализма. Најзад, питање Европе у XXI веку која се налази на раскрсници

приказује се као потенцијал за поновно рођење њених најбољих традиција.

Кључне речи: неолиберализам, биополитика, европске вредности, реинтерпретација Русије, једнакост, права демократија, политика народа.
