

یعنی می‌بینی به جاهای از یه موضوع کمترین اطلاعات رو Slavoj Žižek Violence: Six Sideways Reflections می‌ده، و اینطوری وانمود می‌کنه که این اطلاعات کل اطلاعات و داشته‌هاست و بر اساس همون اطلاعات نظریه‌ش رو مطرح می‌کنه و نتیجه‌گیری می‌کنه تا شوکه‌ت کنه. توی متن یه سری ارجاعات به نظریه‌های فیلسوفای مختلف داره که اگه چیزی از نظرات اون فیلسوف ندونی شاید دستگیرت نشه که چیه ماجرا. 0312427182 یادآوری به آقای ژیزک! کتاب «خشونت، پنج نگاه زیرچشمی» نوشته اسلاوی ژیزک کتابی خواندنی است از فیلسوفی که شاید ستیهنده ترین منتقد لیبرال سرمایه داری باشد. (1) و چند نمونه از اعتراضهای غربی را مثال میزند برای این که بگوید نظامهای غربی و رسانه هایشان در برخورد با این اعتراضات هیچ ملاحظه اخلاقی را رعایت نمیکنند. (3) مسئله «انتخاب آزاد» را حلاجی و نقد میکند و نشان میدهد که فرهنگ غربی هیچگاه خودش منصفانه با انتخاب آزاد برخورد نکرده است. (5) یادآوری میکند که رسانه ها با دروغگویی و بزرگنمایی مسائل ذهنی ما را تعیین میکنند (6) و همه ما دچار این ضعف هستیم که در برابر تصویر دلخراش گزارش شده فریب اخلاقی بخوریم (7) مخصوصا وقتی فرد تنها در برابر تارنمای جهان گستر را در نظر بگیریم! (8) با همه این مقدمات اگر روی این کره خاکی یک نفر، فقط یک نفر پیدا میشد که باید در برابر گزارش رسانه های غربی از وضعیت ایران طی یک ماه گذشته سکوت اختیار میکرد کسی نبود جز آقای ژیزک! وقتی از خودم میپرسم چرا ژیزک در پیام ویدئویی از اعتراضات ایران حمایت کرده چند جواب به ذهنم میرسد که هم از این کتاب ارزشمند خودش آموخته ام و هم سرنخ را از همان ویدئوی خودش کشف کرده ام. در این ویدئو و در نامه اش ژیزک میگوید پیر و بیمار است و نمیتواند در کنار معترضان باشد (تا جایی که میدانم به فرانسه هم نرفت تا در کنار جلیقه زردها باشد) گویا بیشتر تبدیل به فرد بی دفاع در برابر تارنمای جهان گستر شده و ساده تر فریب میخورد. اما از آن مهم تر او مدام تکرار میکند غرب چیزی برای آموختن به معترضان ایرانی ندارد چون فمینیسم غربی بالا آورده بنابراین ژیزک به اعتراضات ایران چشم دوخته بلکه یک فمینیسم آبرومند از دل آن (metoo) افتضاحی مثل می تو بیرون بیاید. به قرینه مثالهایی که از نقض حقوق زنان در کشورهای اسلامی میزند گمان میکنم فکر میکند هنوز ختنه دختران به طور گسترده در ایران انجام میشود (از قضا کردستان بیشتر با این مشکل دست به گریبان است!) به همه اینها باید افزود افتادن در تله اطاعت را. خیلی جالب است که ژیزک در این کتاب توضیح میدهد چگونه این فضای سرکوبگر که ظاهری دموکراتیک اما ماهیتی اروولی دارد و جایگزین ایده برادر بزرگتر شده است هیچ نظر مخالفی را برنمی‌تابد. مگر میشود ارسطو را به خاطر زن ستیزی و حمایت از برده داری، داستایفسکی را به خاطر یهودستیزی و هایدگر را به خاطر حمایت از نازیسم کنار گذاشت؟ اتفاقا امروز باید همه ما (مخصوصا اگر وسوسه میشویم به خشونت مشروعیت و میدان بدهیم) این کتاب ارزشمند را بخوانیم و درس بزرگی که ژیزک در مقدمه و موخره کتاب بر آن تاکید کرده را بیاموزیم: «ما امروزه وقتی خودمان را زیر رگبار تصویرهایی می بینیم که رسانه ها از صحنه های خشونت بار ارائه میکنند باید یک گوشه خلوت پیدا کنیم و «بیاموزیم، بیاموزیم و بیاموزیم» که علت این خشونت ها چیست. «... گزیده های کتاب «خشونت، پنج نگاه زیرچشمی» نوشته اسلاوی ژیزک: (1) سرنوشت کل اقشار جامعه و گاه کل کشورها را رقص بورس بازانه و «خودمدارانه» سرمایه ای می تواند رقم بزند که با نوعی بی تفاوتی لعنتی نسبت به این که جابه جایی اش چه تأثیری بر واقعیت اجتماعی خواهد گذاشت هدف خودش را که سودآوری است دنبال می کند. خشونت سیستمی اساسی سرمایه داری که به مراتب غریب تر از هرگونه خشونت اجتماعی - ایدئولوژیک مستقیم پیشا سرمایه داری است در همین رقص خودکار سرمایه نهفته است. مردمی که در تنگنای مادی به مراتب بدتری گرفتار بوده اند - چه رسد به اینکه تنها دچار سرکوب فیزیکی و ایدئولوژیک باشند - قادر بوده اند خودشان را در قالب سازمان هایی سیاسی با دستور کار روشن یا حتی آشفتهای سازمان دهند. (3) به یقین، بی نظمی و خشونت واقعی بود که جرقه احساس خطر را زد: به مجردی که توفان از نیواورلئان گذشت به راستی چپاول و غارتگری آغاز شد. اما واقعیت (محدود) جنایت ها به هیچ وجه «گزارش هایی» را توجیه نمی کند که درباره فروپاشی تمام عیار نظم و قانون ارسال می شد، نه از آن رو که این گزارش ها «اغراق آمیز» بود، بلکه به دلیلی به مراتب ریشه ای تر از این: حتی اگر تمامی گزارش های موجود در باره خشونت و تعرض جنسی واقعیت داشت و درست بود حکایت های نقل شده درباره آنها باز هم بیمارگون، و نژادپرستانه بود زیرا محرک این حکایت ها واقعیت نبود بلکه پیشداوری نژادپرستانه بود؛ احساس رضایت خاطر کسانی بود که می توانستند بگویند «می بینید! سیاه پوستان در واقع این جوری هستند، وحشیانی خشونت طلب که زیر لایه نازکی از تمدن پنهان شده اند». به دیگر سخن، این جا با چیزی سروکار داریم که می توان آن را دروغ گفتن در پوشش حقیقت خواند: حتی اگر آنچه می گویم از نظر

واقعیات حقیقت داشته باشد انگیزه هایی که ما را وادار به گفتن آن کرده است نادرست و کاذب است. (4) تنها فرهنگ سرمایه داری غربی نو است که خودمختاری و آزادی فردی را والاتر از همبستگی جمعی، ارتباط، مسئولیت شناسی در قبال دیگرانی که به ما وابسته اند و وظیفه احترام گذاشتن به سنتها و عرفهای جامعه خود می داند. زنان اجازه دارند مقنعه به سر کنند مشروط بر اینکه انتخاب آزاد خودشان باشد و نه گزینه ای که همسر با خانواده شان به آنها تحمیل کرده باشد. اما همین که زنان مقنعه را برای اعمال انتخاب آزاد فردی شان مثلاً برای تحقق معنویت خودشان به سر کنند معنای مقنعه به سر کردن کاملاً تغییر می کند. تفاوت این دو همان تفاوت میان کشاورزی چینی که غذای چینی می خورد چون از خیلی قدیم مردم روستای شان چنین کرده اند و شهروندی در یکی از کلان شهرهای غربی است که تصمیم می گیرد شام را در یک رستوران چینی محلی بخورد. به همین دلیل است که در جوامع عرفی ما که اساس آن را انتخاب آزاد تشکیل می دهد افرادی که تعلق مذهبی چشمگیری دارند موقعیت فرودست تری دارند. به مجردی که آنان اعتقادات شان را علناً به همان معنایی که برای خودشان دارد مثلاً به عنوان نشانه تعلق اساسی شان جار بزنند متهم به «بنیادگرایی» می شوند. این معنایش آن است که «سوژه انتخاب آزاد» در معنای «تساهل گرایانه» چندفرهنگی غربی تنها می تواند در نتیجه روند فوق العاده خشن کننده شدن از زیست جهانی خاص و بریدن از ریشه های خود سر برآورد. (6) وقتی رسانه ها ما را با «بحران های بشری» که ظاهراً پیوسته در سراسر جهان پدیدار می شوند بمباران می کنند همواره باید به خاطر داشته باشیم که هر بحران خاصی تنها در نتیجه تقلایی پیچیده یکباره در کانون توجه رسانه ها قرار می گیرد. (7) می توان گفت که آدم امروزی که روی تارنمای جهان گستر تنها در برابر صفحه نمایشگر رایانه شخصی خود نشسته و موج سواری میکند، هرچه بیشتر به فردی جوهری تبدیل شده است که هیچ پنجره مستقیمی رو به واقعیت در اختیار ندارد و تنها با پیکره های مجازی روبه روست و در عین حال بیش از هر زمان دیگری در نوعی شبکه جهانی ارتباطات غرق شده است. (8) می توان گفت که آدم امروزی که روی تارنمای جهان گستر تنها در برابر صفحه نمایشگر رایانه شخصی خود نشسته و موج سواری میکند، هرچه بیشتر به فردی جوهری تبدیل شده است که هیچ پنجره مستقیمی رو به واقعیت در اختیار ندارد و تنها با پیکره های مجازی روبه روست و در عین حال بیش از هر زمان دیگری در نوعی شبکه جهانی ارتباطات غرق شده است. 0312427182 جمله ای معروف از لنین بود که دقیق یاد نمی آید اما مضمونش چنین چیزی بود: دموکراسی برای کدام طبقه؟ در دنیای دموکراتیک امروز که بیش از همه ای اعصار، بشریت - همان ۹۹ درصد که الان احتمالاً شده ۹۹.۵ درصد - پرولتاریزه! شده، نگرانی دولت ها نه از مخالفت یا مثلاً رأی دادن مردم به فلان کاندید، که از انفعال سیاسی مردم هست. هشتگ بزیند، راجع به ضریح لیبسی و پدوفیلی تتلو جنبش مجازی راه بندازید، علیه اون ها که شمال می رن و ماسک نمی زنن فحش نامه تنظیم کنید، از ترس روی کاراومدن بدتر برای بد رأی جمع کنید اما سکوت نکنید که همانا بی تفاوتی کشنده ترین اسلحه ست. ژیزک در این کتاب از انواع خشونت می گه و توضیح می ده که چه طور خشونت هایی فعالانه مثل حوادث تروریستی و غارت فروشگاه و امثالهم خودشون نتیجه ی خشونت دیگه - خشونت سیستمی و نمادین - هستند که البته مثل مورد اول رسانه ای نمی شن! به قول بودریار فعالیت رسانه در حیطه ی خشونت آگاهی بخشی نیست، بلکه کارکردش نمایاندن آشوب دنیایی هولناکه و وظیفه ی دادن حس امنیت به مخاطب رو به عهده داره؛ احتمالاً در همین موردی که این روزها داره اتفاق می افته، واکنش مخاطب سی ان ان، رأی ندادن به ترامپی هست که باعث و بانی نژادپرستی در تمام تاریخ ایالات متحده ست! و یک ماه بعد از انتخابات هم فراموش می شه که اصلاً اعتراضی بود. علی ایحال، به قول ژیزک - که خودش از لنین نقل قول می کنه - در مواجهه با رسانه و اخباری که هر روز و هر ساعت ما رو با خشونت و قتل و فجایع انسانی روبه رو می کنه و از ما انتظار It's not all here by a long shot. و واکنش سریع و دست روی دست گذاشتن داره، بخزیم به کنجی و سه کار انجام بدیم: آموختن، آموختن، آموختن

يطرح جيجك في هذا الكتاب الكثير من الأسئلة ويحاول الإجابة على بعضها، على مدار ستة فصول - 0312427182 So what? عاقداً لمقارنات كثيرة بين الرأسمالية الحالية والشيوعية السابقة، الإيديولوجيات المتعددة، الإرهاب، القتل الجماعي، علم النفس، الإصولية وغيرها من المفاهيم - يفرق جيجك بين ثلاثة أنواع من العنف: الذاتي (إطلاق نار على شخص ما) والموضوعي (سياسي، اقتصادي) والرمزي (لغة، موروث ثقافي) ويبدأ بتحليلها وسوق القرائن والأمثلة العديدة من الحياة الواقعية (أحداث فرنسا 2005، أحداث 11 أيلول، بيل غايتس) ومن الروايات والأفلام ومسرح بريخت وغيره. - في الختام يخلص جيجك الى تفنيد الدروس المستقاة من الكتاب، وينهي كتابه بجملة إن عدم القيام بأي تحرك يكون أحياناً، أقوى التحركات التي يمكن القيام بها - قرأت

الكتاب على فترة 10 أيام، بعض الأفكار في كيفية اختباء العنف وراء قناع من التسامح والمصالح الإقتصادية والسياسية كان واضحاً وجيداً لكن في المقابل كنت اعيد بعض الفقرات عدة مرات لأحاول فهم كيفية الربط خصوصاً مع إدخال نظريات هيغل ولاكان وطروحات بنيامين. لكنني لم انجح للأسف ولم اقتنع بمعظم الذي اورده ووجدته معقداً أكثر مما يجب! لذلك ربما يحتاج لإعادة قراءة مرة أخرى. – بعض الإقتباسات: ان معنى التعاطف الإنساني في حالات الطوارئ مفرح، ومبالغ فيه بالفعل، جراء اعتبارات سياسية واضحة ما علينا فعله اليوم عندما يقصفنا الإعلام بوابل من صور العنف هو ان نتعلم ثم نتعلم ونتعلم أيضاً، للوقوف على الأسباب الكامنة وراء العنف. والإحسان هذا هو القناع الإنساني الذي يخفي وجه الإستغلال الإقتصادي يجري اغراقنا بوابل من الانباء السارة للقلوب عن الغاء ديون معينة او عن حملة انسانية كبرى لإستئصال هذا الوباء او ذاك، يكفي ان تحرك البطاقة البريدية قليلاً كي تلتقط الشخصية الداعرة للشيواعي الليبرالي في غمرة العمل خلف الستار. ما الذي يمكن ان يجعل كيسنجر الذي امر بقصف كمبوديا قصفاً كثيفاً ومركزاً أدى الى هلاك مئات الآلاف من البشر، أقل إجراماً من أولئك المسؤولين عن انهيار برج التجارة في نيويورك؟ أليس سبب ذلك متمثلاً في كوننا ضحايا نوع من الوهم الأخلاقي؟ اذا كان اصوليو هذه الأيام المزعومون مؤمنين بأنهم اهدتوا الى الحقيقة، فما الذي يضطرهم الى الشعور بأنهم مهددون من غير المؤمنين؟ ما الداعي الى ان

0312427182 [يחסدوهم](#) The Poetry of Dominance Violence is a necessary if regrettable condition of civilisation. Such violence appears overtly from time to time but it exists continuously in subtle forms of coercion that sustain relationships of domination and exploitation which are what constitute civilisation. I accepted that story even after my father punched me in the face (while we were boxing) and my head hit a similar corner in what was then our house; it took seven stiches to close the cut. I accepted that story even after my father fucked up my back by pulling a dangerous wrestling move on me (he was a high school wrestling champ in Upstate NY) when I made the mistake of putting him in a playful full nelson. I accepted that story when he knocked me into our shoe closet with a punch that permanently scarred my mouth; it took 6 internal stiches and fourteen external stiches to repair the damage. He really does believe (and shouldn't you? and don't you?) that it is the objective violence underlying and enabling the smooth functioning of a peaceful neoliberalism that needs to be destroyed. But what about those of us who for decades have fought neoliberalism and then once more found ourselves taken hostage and voting happily for the slime? I first started reading Zizek after having that experience being blackmailed (again) into voting for Obama. 0312427182 Here is a slightly patronizing way of summarizing the methodology of Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Zizek; address a relevant social issue (such as violence) and certain ideological perspectives that have been applied to it cut and paste seemingly disparate examples of high and low culture arbitrarily throughout the text draw reaching connections between the two and hopefully attempt to arrive at an intelligible conclusion or thesis. It starts out with the relatively lucid premise or distinction of three types of violence; subjective (clearly identifiable direct) symbolic (language or forms of) and systemic (objective; political and economic). Approaching surface-level logical assessments of violence with paradoxical and ironic reasoning Zizek rambles on about subjects such as the Paris riots of 2005 Bill Gates and subversive entrepreneurship torture religious fundamentalism atheism and Benjamin's concept of Divine Violence. One second he is criticizing Sam Harris and his controversial but rational opinions on political torture then he suddenly makes the transition into the Judeo-Christian-Freudian (ugh) weight of the concept of the Lacanian notion of the Neighbor and the significance of the physical distance and proximity of this Neighbor (the Other being tortured) to the level of ease with which one is able to torture. He writes on many topics including the Iraq War fundamentalism capitalism tolerance political correctness globalization subjectivity human rights Lenin myth cyberspace postmodernism multiculturalism post marxism David Lynch and Alfred Hitchcock. Drawing from his unique cultural vision Žižek brings new light to the Paris riots of 2005; he questions the permissiveness of violence in philanthropy; in daring terms he reflects on the powerful image and determination of contemporary terrorists. Violence Žižek states takes three forms--subjective (crime terror) objective (racism hate-speech discrimination) and systemic (the catastrophic effects of economic and political systems)--and often one form of violence blunts our ability to see the others raising complicated questions. Does the

advent of capitalism and indeed civilization cause more violence than it prevents? Is there violence in the simple idea of the neighbour? And could the appropriate form of action against violence today simply be to contemplate to think? Beginning with these and other equally contemplative questions Žižek discusses the inherent violence of globalization capitalism fundamentalism and language in a work that will confirm his standing as one of our most erudite and incendiary modern thinkers.

Violence: Six Sideways Reflections I don't want to assert that 'the rock star of cultural theory' is full of shit but y'know Slavoj Žižek seems to me to be kind of full of shit. Me: Hey Mr Žižek! What did you think of the last season of Lost? Žižek: Well in the context of a Hegelian dialectic this work must be considered ultimately a usurpation/derivation of Freud's pathetic death drive mythos if you get me. I mean I don't really read philosophy so what the fuck do I know right? I read this in the back seat of a car on a two-day trip from Oakland to Camp Trans Michigan and then on the two-day trip back with an adorable little dog bouncing around the car and a bunch of Atmosphere on Micah's iPod. But I mostly tuned the other stuff out because what's the point of reading a dense book of cultural theory if you can't really take it in right? (Well except for the joke where the dog is sleeping and you pretend that passages from said cultural theory are a bedtime story and you read them out loud to her. But for every really good moment like that there's at least one moment where he goes 'hey guys masturbation is stupid' or talks kind of aimlessly and pointlessly (and briefly) about the plasticity of gender in the context of sex-change operations (nice terminology rock star) and you think that maybe he's saying transsexuality is stupid (since he thinks everything else is stupid [except annoyingly atheism; since the explosion of angry books espousing atheism in the last couple years I am very over having people shove atheism down my throat] so probably) so you get pissed at him for just touching on it instead of really saying anything about it. These institutions dominate not only the individuals whom they employ but the governments which depend upon corporate employees health and well-being to fund their democratic elections and to fulfil their political promises of prosperity and security. Avarice is not greed in the sense of desiring the acquisition of an excess of certain things - food shelter warmth physical care - but the accumulation of nothing in particular merely more of whatever it is that others have. But despite his erudition and numerous literary sociological and philosophical insights I think he still doesn't understand today's world for what it is: namely governed everywhere by corporate interests which are impervious to any equivalent countervailing power including poetry. It is their alienation from the corporate world not from capitalism that is most apparent from both their geographic locations and their gripes about being effectively ejected from their secure corporate existence. Postscript: My wife has reminded me that in fact poetry may indeed be just the thing needed and quoted this from memory: I Am the Only Being Whose Doom by EMILY BRONTË I am the only being whose doom No tongue would ask no eye would mourn; I never caused a thought of gloom A smile of joy since I was born. I was running down the hallway in our apartment I was wearing socks rib shots (which have led to arthritis where my ribs join my sternum) spankings with paddles (with holes drilled in them to lower the resistance and increase the speed of the blow) humiliations and slaps. He'd grab our hands take a little run and swing his legs out and we (me and any other adult I happened to be with) would swing him and set him down as many times as he liked. Why had I gone to stay with my grandparents for a little while after the damage was done? Where was my Dad when it happened? What if it wasn't me who was to blame at all? Did I really do it when my Dad was at work? I wanted to know; I still want to know but I never will. Even if she didn't cover up a fractured skull even if I really did slip into the corner of the wall even if a wispy four year old's weight and inertia was somehow enough to literally crack his skull even if my father had no hand in that long ago wound she did know about many of the others. -- which is fine but and I for one would have liked this book better had he focused his mind blowing brain on the everyday

acts of violence that are at the root of it all: تو عنوان اصلی اومده که کتاب شیش تا نگاه مختلف به خشونت کرده اما ما تو فارسی پنج نگاه زیر چشمی می خونیم. مترجم هم توضیحی نداده که اون به نگاه کجا رفته و چرا حذف شده: من نگاه ژیزک رو دوست دارم که از همه چی آشنایی زدایی می کنه، ایرادش اینه که با رندی از غفلت و احتمالن دانش کم خوانندهش استفاده می کنه که مبهوتش کنه، او در این کتاب مثالهای فراوانی از شکل های مختلف خشونت آفرینی توسط نظام سرمایه داری را

ذکر میکند: از جمله اعتراضات حومه پاریس (2) و وضع اسفبار و غارتگرانه نیواورلئان بعد از طوفان کاترینا: (4) و اتفاقاً برخورد غرب با انتخاب آزاد در قضیه حجاب را مثال میزند. چقدر ناراحت خواهد شد اگر بداند ما هم اینجا یک می تو رونوشت برابر اصل غرب داریم، و چه قدر دلش خواهد شکست وقتی برهنه شدن پتیاره ها را در خیابان ببیند. تله ای که انبوهی از چهره های شناخته شده را وادار کرد از نظر اکثریت تبعیت کنند: (9) اما کسی نباید از اندیشمندان چیزی به دل بگیرد. رقص متافیزیکی خودکار سرمایه صحنه گردان نمایش است و کلید تحولات و مصیبت های زندگی واقعی را به دست می دهد. (2) معترضان با این که عملاً محروم و کنار گذاشته شده بودند به هیچ وجه افرادی گرسنه نبودند، همچنین به سطح بقای محض نیز سقوط نکرده بودند، پس این واقعیت که در پشت آتش افزوی های حومه پاریس هیچ برنامه ای وجود نداشت خود نیازمند تفسیر است. این واقعیت بیانگر حقایق فراوانی درباره وضع ایدئولوژیک - سیاسی ناجوری است که در آن گرفتار آمده ایم، این رفتارها از دزدی بی شرمانه تا گشتن به دنبال ضروریات زندگی را در بر می گرفت: بنابراین خود لیبرالیسم برای فرهنگ خاصی امتیاز قائل است: فرهنگ غربی نو. در ارتباط با آزادی انتخاب هم، لیبرالیسم دچار جانبداری شدیدی است. لیبرالیسم تحمل نمی کند که به افراد دیگر فرهنگ ها آزادی انتخاب داده نشود. (5) محدودیت های نگرش لیبرالی جا افتاده به زنان مسلمانی که مقنعه به سر می کنند نیز این جا نمایان است: دیگر مقنعه نشانه تعلق آنان به جمع مسلمانان نیست بلکه نمود فردیت خاص خودشان است. حتی اگر آنان اجازه یابند اعتقادات شان را حفظ کنند: این اعتقاد (فقط) به عنوان انتخاب یا عقیده شخصی خاص خودشان «تحمل می شود»: علی القاعده در این جا نقش ملاحظات واقعه بشر دوستانه کم اهمیت تر از ملاحظات فرهنگی، ایدئولوژیک - سیاسی و اقتصادی است: (9) بسیاری از داستان هایی که درباره آینده پرداخته شده است حول چیزی مانند «برادر بزرگتر» جورج اورول دور می زند. ولی به نظر من این نگرشی قرن بیستمی به جباریت است، جباریت امروز دارد چهره Violence: Six Sideways Reflections 0312427182 بود که یک نگاه زیرچشمی به کل حذف شد و موند پنج نگاه: ن : عنوان اصلی کتاب something like 16 Zizek books at this point. So this Itty Bitty Book served as a nice trip down memory lane: في علم الأخلاق لدى الشيوعيين الليبراليين تُوَاجِه آفة الجري المحموم وراء الربح عن طريق الإحسان وعمل: A few of us who enjoy the comforts of civilisation are uncomfortable with that reality: It is the threat of violence which keeps us secure.

Names the ultimate source of systemic violence as Capitalism: And indeed there is good reason to associate the economic inequalities and environmental destruction around the world with what is blithely called global capitalism: But this structure of violent control is as unlike what Marx thought of as Capitalism as what Stalin thought of as Democracy. Marxist theory was obsolete almost as soon as it was formulated. Marx knew about the factory and the factory owner not the corporation and corporate members: Using Marxist theory today to formulate a theory of systemic violence is futile, The world as it exists is neither capitalist in the sense that Marx used the term.

And I smacked my head against the protruding corner of the wall; my skull cracked, I accepted that story even after my father punched me so hard that he knocked me out of the cast I had on my broken hand, I accepted the story after repeated gut shots.

But a lot of it is ; in it's shortened form, The little thing about subjective vs objective violence? Makes it pretty clear why the Z=Man said he'd vote for Trump: So meanwhile he would seemingly have taken it upon himself to commit the subjective violence of voting for Trump, As is becoming increasingly clear ; the only changes Rump is bringing is making sure it all stays the same only more so, This became apparent during my reading of Violence part of Picador's BIG IDEA'S/small books series and what is more or less Zizek's most accessible work to date, After the groundwork is laid out for this commentary on violence Zizek then starts in on his typical fugue-like series of a variety of subchapters. In each of these he'll be bringing up a good deal of Lacan Hegel and Marx, I'm not even going to attempt to paraphrase the respective chapters of Violence and I'll take the deserved criticism for my own lazy criticism here, However I must say that I do this out of a dismissive

attitude toward Žižek's writing style. He is like a kid in the candy store of cultural theory; too excited by the endless possibility of example and analogy at hand to really make a focused point, Granted he is still following Harris (sort of) but his point here is so utterly bloated and the ones that follow are even more digressive and trivial. The man basically needs to stick to public lectures and debates and even those can be interminable, Maybe I'm not even making the greatest point about what is wrong with his writing but at around page 170 I was about to throw this book against the wall. He's good for an occasional cultural-studies-type joke but as I've said before the man is a completely shallow thinker: 0312427182 Slavoj Žižek is a Slovene sociologist philosopher and cultural critic: He was born in Ljubljana Slovenia (then part of SFR Yugoslavia), He received a Doctor of Arts in Philosophy from the University of Ljubljana and studied psychoanalysis at the University of Paris VIII with Jacques Alain Miller and François Regnault: In 1990 he was a candidate with the party Liberal Democracy of Slovenia for Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia (an auxiliary institution abolished in 1992). Since 2005 Žižek has been a member of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts: Žižek is well known for his use of the works of 20th century French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan in a new reading of popular culture, He writes on many topics including the Iraq War f Slavoj Žižek is a Slovene sociologist philosopher and cultural critic. He was born in Ljubljana Slovenia (then part of SFR Yugoslavia): He received a Doctor of Arts in Philosophy from the University of Ljubljana and studied psychoanalysis at the University of Paris VIII with Jacques Alain Miller and François Regnault. In 1990 he was a candidate with the party Liberal Democracy of Slovenia for Presidency of the Republic of Slovenia (an auxiliary institution abolished in 1992): Since 2005 Žižek has been a member of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts: Žižek is well known for his use of the works of 20th century French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan in a new reading of popular culture. In an interview with the Spanish newspaper El País he jokingly described himself as an orthodox Lacanian Stalinist: In an interview with Amy Goodman on Democracy Now! he described himself as a Marxist and a Communist: {site_link} Philosopher cultural critic and agent provocateur Slavoj Žižek constructs a fascinating new framework to look at the forces of violence in our world, Using history philosophy books movies Lacanian psychiatry and jokes Slavoj Žižek examines the ways we perceive and misperceive violence, By which I mean it's opposed to Nietzsche's ironic reading of the story of Job but only in letter; not so much in spirit. Me: Are you saying that you think that TV show is stupid?Žižek: Well yes but I am saying it a lot more complicatedly:) Mostly I followed it and mostly what Žižek was doing was going 'here is the complicated place where this phenomenon is situated and here is why it is stupid: There were a couple highlights like when he asserted that the commonality in human culture is mostly the struggle against human culture instead of any kind of altruism or anything: I was engaged and I get why folks are so stoked about him and yes: heck of erudite. But ultimately y'know at least when we are not the recipient of the threat. It is this that constitutes "the invisible background of systemic violence" which is the subject of Žižek's analysis. It is an awkward subject precisely because it is invisible to most of us. We can only see it askance as it were out of the corner of the eye: This kind of violence he calls "the dark matter" of society (I should have preferred 'dark energy'), But we must infer its properties because it can't be observed directly, We are therefore forced into a poetical mode of discourse: "poetry is always by definition 'about' something that cannot be addressed directly only alluded to: "Liberal sympathies says Žižek are with those subjected to overt visible violence never with those oppressed by the invisible violence which assures the comforts of liberality. Yet it is the invisible violence that most often generates the visible. The invisible is systemic violence and by definition it is directed toward those who are perceived merely as potential not actual threats, Social conservatives at least recognise the reality of the use of violence against specific parts of a polity. As I write London as well as other cities around the world are experiencing the protests organised by the so-called Extinction Rebellion. This seems to be a coalition of the somewhat young and the somewhat old to exert pressure for the political awareness of climate change, Yesterday after a week of disruption several protestors were beaten when they interrupted train services in London Docklands: Liberal commentators have been outraged that 'honest' protest has met with such a violent response, But the Extinction Rebellion actions have

accomplished something important, They have made visible first the objective systemic violence that they themselves have created (there is no doubt that closing down London Transport is a violent act). And second several of their members have suffered the subjective violence perpetrated by the responding systemic violence of a London mob: Whether the protestors will also be prosecuted with the implicit systemic violence of the state is not yet determined, Žižek I think would appreciate the concrete example of his theory in all its intricacies: Žižek being Žižek that is to say a Marxist of the old school nor freely competitive in the sense that liberal economists use to defend 'efficient' economic arrangements: That is it is ruled by very large institutions whose primary function is to internalise competitive economics and make them personal under rules dictated by the corporation: It is the corporate world not the political or judicial world which has systemic power and controls systemic violence: It maintains this power in a way never contemplated by Marx nor by liberal economic theorists by enrolling individuals into the safety and security of the corporate structure. Having a place in the independent corporate hierarchy insulates its members from personal attack at least regarding the consequences of their professional or economic actions, As a society we enthusiastically want this kind of security even if it implies far less security in society in all its other aspects, To summarise the situation: the dominant modern institution of the corporation has popularised avarice. Capital is now corporate capital which is not owned by anyone. What others do have is position reputation status and reward within the corporation. This is what really counts as the key to all other parts of life particularly to the physical legal and other social aspects of security one might naturally desire, All modern life is corporate life; the corporation we implicitly presume will protect us as the rest of the world goes to hell in a basket. He knows that old fashioned communism is a dead letter in the archives of history: Among other things communism involves at least as much systemic violence as capitalism, Chesterton's *The Man Who Was Thursday* in which the highest police authority is the same person as the super-criminal staging a battle with himself: " We bring systemic violence on ourselves and simultaneously distract ourselves with concerns for the victims of that same violence: But the cause is not the inherent conflict of those who possess capital and those who do not, It is between those who have corporate protection and those who do not, *Žižek's implicit message is that we need to read more especially more poetry and more critically, *This seems to me a rather good theory for explaining the rise of Trumpism. Trumpists would be horrified to find themselves associated with Marx: In secret pleasure secret tears This changeful life has slipped away As friendless after eighteen years As lone as on my natal day, There have been times I cannot hide There have been times when this was drear When my sad soul forgot its pride And longed for one to love me here. But those were in the early glow Of feelings since subdued by care; And they have died so long ago I hardly now believe they were, First melted off the hope of youth Then fancy's rainbow fast withdrew; And then experience told me truth In mortal bosoms never grew, 'Twas grief enough to think mankind All hollow servile insincere; But worse to trust to my own mind And find the same corruption there: Post-postscript: For more On the literary theory of the corporate world see <https://www>: Post-post-postscript: there are a number of fictional accounts of corporate violence; but one of the most moving is this: <https://www>: He raises them then raises some more and asks us to raise questions for every answer we get: That is his genius and that's what makes him worth while: The interrogatives -- Who? What? Where? When? Why? and How? -- are his and our most powerful tools and he challenges us to use them. When I was a 4 year old boy I wore a helmet for a year because I fractured my skull. And then a few years ago my mother and I were coming out of a Mexican restaurant with my twins: Miloš grabbed our hands started his swing and when he reached the apex my Mom's grip gave way. I couldn't hold on and there he went about six feet in the air: His body flipped he turned face first and his head hit the sidewalk at speed with a sickening thud. And we spent a stressful afternoon in the hospital while they observed him and ran tests and interrogated me as a possible abuser. He had a minor concussion a big scrape where he hit the pavement and a goose egg, One of the most horrifying head injuries I had ever been witness to and it was almost nothing. Had I broken it? Or was that just the story I was told? How many times had I heard the comment Brad's got a head like a rock. Nothing hurts that kid? And it seemed to be

true but for that one time: My Mom died before I worked up the courage to ask her, I wasn't worried about offending her but I don't know if I could have handled the potential lie. My Dad is still alive so I could confront him but he can't be trusted to tell the truth about anything that has to do with me: My grandparents are all dead so I don't know the answer and I will always only suspect. You can see now why I am fascinated by violence and why Žižek's work would call to me: And why the final sentence of Violence Six Sideways Reflections would have a powerful personal impact: Sometimes doing nothing is the most violent thing to do, Which is the act I place squarely in the hands of my mother: I do not exonerate my father and his subjective violence in any way but my mother's embrace of systemic violence shouldn't be ignored either, She knew and she had options (unlike so many women) and she had potential support systems and escape routes (unlike too many women) and she did nothing: And I am fairly sure that even when I was four and had to wear a helmet . Luckily though she and I resolved the issue of her tacit guilt for the acts of violence she knew about before she died: We had a falling out then we had a coming together and we were able to become very close -- closer than we'd ever been, We just never got to what I suspect was the biggest lie of all: that she had covered up the earliest and most dangerous piece of abuse in my life: Quick thought it is Žižek tries to dig into the whys and hows and wherefores of systemic violence, He takes his thought and ours beyond the subjective acts we see and ponders what lies beneath it all, He demystifies our mystification and asks us dispel our own illusions as much as we can, He spends an awfully long time talking about the big moments of violence -- the Holocaust the Collectivisation 9-11 etc. That's my own selfishness talking however and the book is important regardless of Žižek's focus: Next time though I will only come back after I've brushed up on my Lacan and Kant and Hegel and Heidegger and Freud, 0312427182 zizek thinks the village was a good movie 0312427182



[1]

پ خیلی باهاس خوش گذشت. ترجمه هم به جاهایی واقعن اذیت می کرد.پ
 agree with him. I always accepted that story. And I'll be honest with you. Really up front.
 Accelerationist? Sure possibly. What can I say? Zizek knows how it feels. But. Soundtrak ::Two
 Minutes to Midnight <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9qbRH>. Where the Slime
 Live <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F0cn5>. Imaginary Music
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sI_r7. Time's End <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qWKHs>. A
 Lesson in Violence <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7ypbS>. Nazi Trump Fuck
 Off <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=58aSJ>. ' So whatever. Y'know? (Nice sentence structure there
 Imogen. Way to mock the professionals.) Anyway whatever. It must be present for society to exist at
 all. Whatever might disrupt liberal security must be prevented. Liberals fail to connect the dots. The
 world is corporate. Hence Žižek is often blowing stale hot air. He also knows that we are in the
 position of "G. K. I can't deny that this is probably a good idea. [goodreads.com/review/show](https://www.goodreads.com/review/show). And on
 the institution of the corporation itself see
<https://www.goodreads.com/review/show>. [goodreads.com/review/show](https://www.goodreads.com/review/show). 0312427182 One doesn't go
 to Slavoj Žižek for answers. One goes to him for questions. That's the story I grew up with. I

fractured my skull. Miloš loved to swing between us back then. That day my Mom's hands were wet. Miloš went flying. It freaked me out. Freaked him out too of course. Miloš has never wanted to swing again. But he was fine. But that was it. It got me thinking about my fractured skull. And suspect I do. even then when escape and safety was at its easiest . I am fairly sure she did nothing. etc. I will be coming back to this book again. Stop name dropping Slavoj you beautiful sonuvabitch