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Abstract: Although increasingly controversial, Slavoj Žižek remains a superstar public intellectual in the West associated with the political Radical Left. Most of the Western media who promote him have no idea that in his native Slovenia he is a principle figure of the neoliberal party that ruled for most of Slovenia’s era independence and committed the notorious “electronic ethnic cleansing” and that he is perceived as a reactionary. This article examines Žižek’s work closely to unmask what is revealed as a mere veil of socialist and communist allegiances. Žižek’s techniques of deception and indirection are shown to derive from the inaugural text of right wing pseudo-socialism, The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. The conclusion here drawn is that Žižek’s project is a continuation of its model’s fascist mission—to infiltrate and usurp left wing discourse to advance reactionary politics in progressive and revolutionary disguise—just as its propagandistic rhetorical gambits are the same as those inventively deployed in the famous forgery of the Czarist secret police.
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Proudhon had anatural inclination for dialectics. But as he never grasped really scientific dialectics he never got further than sophistry. This is in fact connected with his petty-bourgeois point of view. Like the historian Raumer, the petty bourgeois is made up of on-the-one-hand and on-the-other-hand. This is so in his economic interests and therefore in his politics, religious, scientific and artistic views. And likewise in his morals, IN EVERYTHING. He is a living contradiction. If, like Proudhon, he is in addition an ingenious man, he will soon learn to play with his own contradictions and devel-
op them according to circumstances into striking, ostentatious, now scandalous now brilliant paradoxes. Charlatanism in science and accommodation in politics are inseparable from such a point of view. There remains only one governing motive, the vanity of the subject, and the only question for him, as for all vain people, is the success of the moment, the éclat of the day. Thus the simple moral sense, which always kept a Rousseau, for instance, from even the semblance of compromise with the powers that be, is bound to disappear. – Karl Marx, Letter to J B Schweizer “On Proudhon” (Marx and Engels 1962)

In 2008, as a mysterious “crisis” of the LIBOR spreadswas transformed into the pretext for a massive transfer of wealth from state treasuries and workers to the ruling class (the so-called “bailouts” of banks and insurance companies) bourgeois media enjoyed a season of cinematic apocalypticism. (Hudson 2011) Cameras planted on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange swiveled nauseously as if they were on the deck of a storm-tossed ship, observing Wall Street traders like doomed sailors staring up at the stock ticker as into an annihilating tidal wave, recalling the gazes of September 2001 lifted to the burning World Trade Center towers.

Like Sadam’s WMD in 2002, the threat posed by the tightening credit of 2008 was made to seem infinite for being undefined, but this time the terrible menace just below the horizon was global, and the fabric of reality itself, now daily called “capitalism” in the world media heretofore shy of this term, was threatened with extinction: without any real reportage, newscasts disseminated narratemes from Hollywood disaster films presaging total obliteration of the familiar. Strife was promised in terrifying and titillating epic visions – of a period of riotous turbulence, of systems crashing and structures imploding, of reigning isms lying in ruin and our species’ hubris chastised, of hedonistic society abruptly repentant in the wake of cataclysm, of wastelands of Darwininan struggle, all lying just around an epochal bend – but first, with special vividness, of perilously inadequate economic plumbing, suggesting that if the “toxic assets” “clogging the system” were not cleared without delay, at any moment the world would be submerged in deep financial shit. (Scott & Taylor, 2009)

Fittingly then, at the center of all this managed spectacle in the
dry-ice-and-laser-showGotterdammerung style could be found the exceedingly strange figure of SlavojŽižek, the Slovene “intellectual charlatan” (WSWS 2010) who has been international director of London’s Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities for some years. Appropriately for the nature of the headline story,Žižek had become famous principally for riffs on scatological themes – chocolate laxative¹ as a metaphor for liberalism, toilet design as keys to national character conceived psychoanalytically, the fabled shortages of toilet paper in former Communist Europe, a Muslim prohibition of toilet paper as the crux of their alien indigestibility for the Enlightened West – all this passed off as mind-blowing philosophical insights. (Žižek 1997; Žižek 2015m) Before becoming a global celebrity, Žižek was the chief ideologist of the anti-communist, pseudo-left, ethnic separatist Liberal Democratic Party of Slovenia, (Bjelić 2011b) but over the 1990s he transformed himself for the Anglophone market into a vaudeville Communist. (Slapsak 1999) This he accomplished by simply declaring himself a “Stalinist” and then proceeding to recycle Hitlerian anti-communist propaganda and vent Hitlerian complaints about liberal-

¹ A This is a motif Žižek, repeats constantly, in books as well as articles and lectures. (Žižek 2006a) In its deployment here to describe the financier George Soros, who is the Rathenau and Rothschild figure for today’s resurgent anti-Semitism, it is plain to see what is sometimes less obvious, that this chocolate laxative theme, along with the motif of the “decaffeinated Other” is a “comical” adaptation of the complaints in Mein Kampf:

There is a chocolate-flavored laxative available on the shelves of US stores which is publicized with the paradoxical injunction: Do you have constipation? Eat more of this chocolate! – i.e. eat more of something that itself causes constipation. The structure of the chocolate laxative can be discerned throughout today’s ideological landscape; it is what makes a figure like Soros so objectionable. He stands for ruthless financial exploitation combined with its counter-agent, humanitarian worry about the catastrophic social consequences of the unbridled market economy. Soros’s daily routine is a lie embodied: half of his working time is devoted to financial speculation, the other half to ‘humanitarian’ activities (financing cultural and democratic activities in post-Communist countries, writing essays and books) which work against the effects of his own speculations. – Žižek(Žižek 2006a)

Socially, what is most toxic is the foreign Neighbor—the strange abyss of his pleasures, beliefs and customs. Consequently, the ultimate aim of all rules of interpersonal relations is to quarantine (or at least neutralize and contain) this toxic dimension, and thereby reduce the foreign Neighbor—by removing his otherness—to an unthreatening fellow man. The end result: today’s tolerant liberal multiculturalism is an experience of the Other deprived of its Otherness—the decaffeinated Other who dances fascinating dances and has an ecologically sound holistic approach to reality while features like wife beating remain out of sight….This vision of detoxification of the Neighbor presents a clear passage from direct barbarism to barbarism with a human face. – Žižek(Žižek 2010b)

In order to mask his activity and lull his victims, however, he talks more and more of the equality of all men without regard to race and color. The fools begin to believe him. Since, however, his whole being still has too strong a smell of the foreign for the broad masses of the people in particular to fall readily into his nets, he has his press give a picture of him which is as little in keeping with reality as conversely it serves his desired purpose. His comic papers especially strive to represent the Jews as a harmless little people, with their own peculiarities, of course-like other peoples as well—but even in their gestures, which seem a little strange, perhaps, giving signs of a possibly ludicrous, but always thoroughly honest and benevolent, soul. And the constant effort is to make him seem almost more ‘insignificant’ than dangerous. – Hitler (Hitler 1941)
ism to the already confused audiences of the imperial core university circuit. (Žižek2015l; Žižek 2015a; Žižek 2015n; Žižek 1998)

What exactly was supposed to be communist about Žižek all these years nobody has ever been able to say. Advanced initially as a Yugoslavian native informant prepared to (Žižek 1990) deliver the brand new US propaganda myths for NATO’s illegal assault on Yugoslavia by a New Left Review (at the time under the guidance of socialist apostates Quentin Hoare and Branka Magas) then championing the neo-Ustase Croat separatist and negationist Franjo Tudjman, (Ali 2008) Žižek presented himself at first as a Lacanian post-Marxist loosely associated with the post-structuralist moment although engaged in a particular mission to rescue it from superstition, relativism and obscurantism (his caricature of the anti-imperialism in thought and deed of the global working class) with a revived neo-Kantian “Politics of Truth” capable of combating “the demise of symbolic efficiency.” (Žižek 2007; Žižek 2000). (Despite being first promised over a quarter of a century ago, nothing actually constituting this new Enlightenment-flavored politics of truth has ever appeared, in fact, although Žižek is still declaring the need for it on account of the ongoing degeneration of authority he attributes to the malign “hegemony” of “liberal multiculturalism.”) (Ahmed 2009; Žižek 2015d) His unmistakably imperialist, right-wing affects and preoccupations had been noted fairly early in his celebrity in the West, for example by one of his first enablers, Ernesto Laclau, (Laclau 2006; Bowman 2005 p.2) whose populist politics (his support for Chavism in Venezuela, for example) Žižek in revenge attacked tu quoqueas inherently fascist. (Žižek 2015b) After about a decade of American fame for his “radical” “provocations,” Žižek’s imperial white supremacist and fasciod hostility to the whole range of protagonists of the “New Left” Social Movements, (feminism, African diaspora freedom struggle, anti-colonial endeavor, LGBT/queer politics, environmentalism) seemed about to be sent down the pipe with his chocolate laxatives; his routine was wittily dispensed with (in, among other approaches, a mockery of his own fatuous psychoanalytic “readings”) by Leigh Claire La Berge, Paul Bowman and colleagues in the 2005 volume The Truth of Žižek that ought have ended his career, at least in academia, but mysteriously did not. (Bowman 2005) (It’s failure to do so certainly had something to do with a sudden massive push of crossover product popularizing him – the unctuous fan documentary Žižek! by Astra Taylor, the BBC TV series A Pervert’s Guide to Cinema, both 2006, and other masscult merchandise and mainstream hype). For the most part, however, his critics have been anti-communist progressives and select liberals who, unwittingly it seems, fulfill Žižek’s own project of charade and manipulation by portraying him as the threat of a resurrected Stalinist Totalitarian Tyranny® suggesting the need for lustration.
Since his big hit pamphlet of 2001 Welcome to the Desert of the Real, in which his pro-war harangue was presented as “contrarian,” Žižek has been hawking a flashy superhero comic book version of Huntington’s discredited Clash of Civilizations thesis offered, in mournful wrapping paper, as the regrettable concession to hard truth of a diehard red fugitive from the ashes of Yugoslavia, a kind of masquerade AleksiiAntedilluvianovichPrelapsarianov (Kushner 1993) but with ostentatiously repulsive manners and childish habits of thought. Promoted by the mainstream liberal establishment in “the West” variously as their favorite “radical leftist,” “Marxist,” or “Stalinist” – like the harmlessly mad neighbor in a situation comedy – this Central Casting blowhard turns up everywhere there is a popular “Left” event to declare himself – as both a Fascist and a Stalinist -- prophet and savior come to revitalize the Jacobin Spirit of a Left gone soft with what in the 90s he named “vulvoliberality,” (Vezjak 2007) and variously insults as “political correctness,” “multiculturalism,” “identity politics,” “localism,” “direct democracy,” “culture studies,” “feminism,” and “fidelity to the name Jew” (interchangeable euphemisms for uppity non-Aryans), recognizably that figure of Nietzsche’s slave revolt which his confrères without masks like Andras Behring Breivik of late call “cultural Marxism.” (Gilbert 2005) His sub-Rabelaisian preoccupation with earthy muck matched to his grandiose, avowedly somatophobic project of “reviving German Idealism” is designed to elicit that frisson of charming bathetic incongruity (Mafioso in psychoanalysis, drug lord in marketing 101) that tickles youthful hipsters in their entertainments. (Bowman 2005)

Within months of the commencement of the spectacular dramaturgy of “credit crisis” and “austerity” response -- which sham crash would be followed by the sham rebellions of the “movements of the squares” and “Arab Spring,” -- Žižek’s thirty-first book in English had appeared, purportedly to address this latest catastrophe, the last of the Bush regime and the first of the historic Obama Presidency. It was called, with endless wells of irony, First as Tragedy, then as Farce, and while like all the previous it was announced as the definitive, reinvigorated “Marxist” analysis of the global crisis of the moment, it was, like all the others, an incoherent, patchwork tract, composed (like TristramShandy trying to reach the moment of his birth to begin the proper narrative of his

---

2 e.g.SlavojŽižek, “The Jacobin Spirit: On Violence and Democracy,” Jacobin Magazine. Thismagazine, run by figures associated with the Democratic Socialists of America, launched under the spiritual aegis of Žižek and his enablers; their biography of contributor SlavojŽižek describes thusly: “a maverick philosopher, is the author of over 30 books and has been acclaimed as both the ‘Elvis of cultural theory’ and the ‘most dangerous philosopher in the West.’ He is today’s most controversial public intellectual.” (Žižek 2011c)

3 These are the situations in the HBO dramedies The Sopranos and The Wire.
life) entirely of digressions from a spine of argument that is always promised and never delivered, and featuring Žižek's usual abundant liberal platitude, disinformation and fascist innuendo such as the insistence that the world's economic woes were the result of the bizarre, alien, anti-social essence embodied in Bernard Madoff (whose traditional Ponzi scheme was actually destroyed by the Bush regime's daring multi-trillion dollar swindle). (Žižek 2009b pp.35-38)

World systems theorists like Wallerstein and Amin had been since the destruction of the USSR chronicling an unprecedented ruling class offensive to push forward a transformation out of an obsolescent form of competitive monopoly capitalism to the next shape of class rule; popular dissident economists and social theorists like Robin Blackburn, Michael Hudson, Naomi Klein, David Harey, and Robert Brenner had simultaneously been tracking the increasing precariousness of the financialized post-Bretton Woods arrangements. Indeed Klein had recently published an enormous bestseller The Shock Doctrine which, for all its many flaws, provided a neologism for ruling class praxis that vividly conveyed its premeditated malice, violence and cunning, and which was well suited to advance conversations across social strata and diverse communities about the events unfolding in 2008. But, predictably, despite a substantial array of established public intellectuals ready to deliver demystifying explanations, it was Slavoj Žižek whom the US-owned global mass media and – significantly – many traditional left institutions turned to most, and kept at constant center stage, to voice the “radical left” “anti-capitalist” perspective and deliver the “Marxist” wisdom for which a stunned and frightened public were now clamoring. Judging from his behavior in this spotlight, we can assume his remit from his enablers and sponsors was to help prevent an anti-war, anti-countercultural resistance from forming around this loose consensus covering the altermondialist perspective disseminated by Klein in her bestseller and the spectrum of adherents of a reviving communist project.

Thus in 2008, as the spectacle announced that Act II of History Resumed post-Fukuyama was beginning, it was as though the moment Žižek had been created for had arrived. He stepped forward an already established herald of the Raving Bolshevik Revolutionary Terror bogey of mainstream liberal fairy tale – that monstrously virile specter lying in wait for this opportunity of capitalist weakness to commit some divinely violent Act that would turn the world into a huge gulag for his grotesque satisfaction – only to call everything of that kind off. So far from exhorting his ardent followers to resist, he continued, in exaggerated form, the pantomime of his other persona, the one that is always in the present (contrarily for a professed radical leftist) urging passivity and obedience to the US empire, which after all is “not always the bad guy,”
and excoriating everything the working class undertakes whether it’s anti-racist militancy, wage-protecting labor mobilizations or anti-imperialist policy in government, as primitive, mindless, really complicit with capital, inescapably conservative and/or protofascist, while hinting at future feats of unimaginable epic originality and boldness. (Žižek 2007b; Žižek 2015e; Žižek 2010k; Žižek 2011b; Žižek 2010c; Žižek 2011a)

Immanuel Kant countered the conservative motto “Don’t think, obey!” not with “Don’t obey, think!”, but with “Obey, BUT THINK!” When we are blackmailed by things like the bail-out plan, we should bear in mind that we are effectively blackmailed, so we should resist the populist temptation to act out our anger and thus hit ourselves. Instead of such impotent acting out, we should control our anger and transform it into a cold determination to think, to think in a really radical way, to ask what kind of a society are we leaving in which such blackmail is possible. (Žižek 2009b p. 17)

While the Žižek long announced by his acolytes in the liberal press was a terrifying and thrilling Robespierre and Lenin, and long feared by the Eustonite Decents as a bloodthirsty megalomaniac HitlerStalinMao of liberal nightmare (Johnson 2016), the Žižek who arrived when the curtain went up was, by his own design, not even as uncooperative as the Bartleby the Scrivener (Žižek 2009d pp.342, 381-382) in political matters he had recommended to his audience as model the year before.

“Obey!” Žižek the burlesque Stalin thus commanded his public as the financial crisis erupted into the headlines on the eve of President Obama’s election. “Bush should be nominated for honorary membership in the American Communist Party,” he repeated everywhere he was invited to comment, a move which not only harmonized with the bourgeois media’s spin of the grand heist but was entirely in keeping with his habit of hailing figures like Richard Nixon, Benito Mussolini or the Spartan King Leonidas from the live action cartoon 300, for their admirably “Leninist” “acts”. With regard to the US bailouts specifically, Žižek insisted the actual sums were “sublime” and beyond comprehension, pointless to discuss or investigate. As a limp gesture to criticism, all he could muster was a platitude (a classic “inoculation” as Barthes long ago diagnosed in Mythologies) about the hypocrisy of the imperial managers, suddenly able to find the money “when it really matters” though their pockets are
to let when the funding of public services is required, etc.. (Barthes 1972) For authority, the “radical Marxist” alternative to the NY Times’ Keynesian pundits reached for the inanity of Ayn Rand, another of his guiding lights: “She says money is in a way a means of liberty. In the sense of: we have to divide things, exchange and so on. She says, money means we can do it peacefully. I pay you, you sell it to me only if you want to. If not money, then there has to be some kind of direct domination, brutal extortion, whatever.” The repeated resort to Rand as the (regrettably recognized) prophet of the times grounded his affirmation of the ruling class’ official vision of reality (the Thatcherite There Is No Alternative): “The utopia here is not a radical change of the system, but the idea that one can maintain a welfare state within the system. Here, again, one should not miss the grain of truth in the countervailing argument: if we remain within the confines of the global capitalist system, then measures to wring further sums from workers, students and pensioners are, effectively, necessary.” (Žižek 2010a) This clumsy rhetorical maneuver - in which the official reactionary stance of the capitalist class is advanced as an ultra-left radical rejection of the social democratic charade and a cry of Death to the System -- is one Žižek had enacted many times before and would enact many after, his fans, led by the editors of mainstream centrist press, never seeming to tire of it.

In the midst of the furor caused by the global financial crisis and the “necessary” “measures to wring further sums from workers,” with which governments proposed to manage it, cheered on by Žižek (albeit wearing a sad clown face of ostentatious regret), Žižek and his close associate the neo-Platonic former “French Maoist” philosopher, Alain Badiou, seized the opportunity to organize a big academic celebrity conference exploiting “renewed interest in alternatives to capitalism.” It turned out a grand demoralizing heat sink for the fury and alertness that threatened popular mobilization, helping in no small measure to diffuse campus-based response in the UK to the bailouts.

The On the Idea of Communism conference, held first at Birkbeck in 2009 and then taken on the road to a degree, seems to have been modelled on the The Politics of Truth conference the same celebrity ringleaders had arranged in 2001, which had given rise to a popular volume of collected papers from Verso called, in Žižekian masscult referencing style, Lenin Reloaded. The Žižek, Badiou, and StathisKouvelakis contributions in particular would become the grimoires of irrationalist advertising campaigns for fascioïd, ersatz left political movements Syriza in Greece and Podemos in Spain; Maidan and the Umbrellas also echoed the themes and motifs appearing there. The language of both altermondialism and its critique, entwined and fused, accomplished something recognizably described here, in this chart of psyops tactics found among the Snowden leaks:
Conspicuously absent from the 2009 Birkbeck On the Idea of Communism conference was anything resembling a communist. Indeed, everything about the conference had the smell of a ruse with a family resemblance to the pranks that produce colour revolutions, and the sorts of operations Žižek and friends carried off in their project to destroy Yugoslavia. (Žižek 2006b; Žižek 2009e; Kenney 2002) While the conference was hailed – and promoted, amazingly for an academic affair targeting graduate students in the more rarefied realms of humanities, across the British media – as the expression of massive rebirth of socialist militancy, the price of attendance was a positively startling £100 and £45 for students. (Campbell 2009) All twelve of the speakers invited were white; eleven were men. The proposal of the conference was specifically to treat Communism as an Idea, a kind of spiritual dream recommended to people in a messianic ecstasy that could thus be untainted by the human history of the 20th century universally deplored by the participants, a collection of progressive liberals (e.g. Michael Hardt), present and former Trotskyite anti-Communists (Terry Eagleton, Alex Callinicos), anarchistic social democratic post-structuralists (Jacques Rancière), and the acolytes of hosts Žižek and Badiou. (Douzinas 2012)

Although this whites-only, 90+% male, 100% anti-communist line-up might easily have come about by the sheer thoughtless arrogance and insularity of the organizer, things soon developed suggesting it was in itself a kind of classically Žižekian “provocation,” part of his ongoing revanchist project. Talk soon began to circulate that certain students from SOAS (School of Oriental and African Studies) were objecting to both the cost of the event and the lack of diversity of the speakers, though their complaints mostly reached the media sec-
ond hand. (The interest of these student with these objections in the event was never entirely explained; news sources increasingly portrayed the conference as a kind of global left emergency meeting, so it was simply understood that all individuals with leftist concerns already in London would desire to attend.)

A larger auditorium than initially scheduled was secured, and a spill-over hall for closed circuit observation. But then an anonymously penned “alternative programme” for the conference appeared and was circulated through the networks associated with the Badiouvian-Žižekian Centre for Modern European Philosophy, Goldsmiths and Birkbeck colleges, Historical Materialism, and the Socialist Worker’s Party, and issued online. This document was purported, by the Žižek acolytes who published it but did not claim authorship of it nor claim to know its provenance, to be a half-serious, half-jesting squib from inexplicably anonymous SOAS students dissatisfied with the scheduled event. (Žižek’s hand is visible there already in the accepted inconsistency of messengers knowing the authors were SOAS students without knowing who they were.) What it was in fact was a multiply disavowed, racist caricature of anticipated critics of Žižek, Badiou and the white supremacist, imperialist, idealist, anti-communist Idea of Communism Žižek was known to promote, and a vicious attack on what remains of a radical left in Anglophone universities.

This prank facsimile of a joke alternative schedule for the grandiose neo-Platonic, unreconstructed Eurocentric, mythologically imperialist pseudo-communist conference encapsulates, as we will explain further below, the psyop that is Slavoj Žižek. Wheels within wheels of disavowal and distancing offer an audience the pleasures of reactionary enunciations with myriad, flexible alibis, and further the re-segregation that divides and demoralizes the spectrum of candidates for a popular front against empire:

The original programme:
Friday March 13
Registration opens at 11.30am
2pm Costas Douzinas Welcome
Alain Badiou Introductory remarks
Michael Hardt “The Production of the Common”
Bruno Bosteels “The Leftist Hypothesis: Communism in the Age of Terror”
Peter Hallward “Communism of the Intellect, Communism of the Will”
Jean-Luc Nancy will be present throughout the conference and will intervene in the discussions.
6 pm End

Saturday March 14
Registration opens at 8.30am
10am Alessandro Russo “Did the Cultural Revolution End Communism?”
Alberto Toscano “Communist Power / Communist Knowledge”
Toni Negri “Communisme: reflexions sur le concept et la pratique”
1pm Lunch
3pm Terry Eagleton “Communism: Lear or Gonzalo?”
Jacques Ranciere “Communists without Communism?”
Alain Badiou ”Communism: a generic name”
6pm End
Drinks Reception – Jeffery Hall
Sunday March 15
10am SlavojŽižek “To begin from the beginning over and over again”
Gianni Vattimo “Weak Communism?”
Judith Balso “Communism: a hypothesis for philosophy, an impossible name for politics?”
Concluding Debate
2pm End

The “alternative” circulated anonymously, but rumoured – also from anonymous sources – to be the work of School of Oriental and African Studies students, representing, supposedly, their real wishes expressed however with satire:
ON THE IDEA OF COMMUNISM
(Updated programme)
13th-14th/15th March 2009
Logan Hall, Institute of Education
20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL

Friday March 13

Costas Douzinas  Welcome to the People
2pm  Stuart Hall  Opening Remarks

Alan Budge  Introductory Remarks
Angela Davis  “Women, race and class”
Michael Hardt  “The Reproduction of the Common”
Lynne Segal  “What Feminism did to Communism”
Bruno Bosteels  “The Postcolonial Hypothesis: Problématized Communism?”
Nancy Hartsock  “The Proliferation of Radical Standpoints”
Peter Hallward  “Communism of the Intended, Communism of the Body”

Jean-Luc Nancy, Christine Delphy and members of migrant and feminist groups will be present throughout the conference and will intervene in the discussions.

6 pm End

Saturday March 14

Registration opens at 8.30am

10am  Stanhuw  “Thinking with worms: Reclaiming the communist soil”
Alessandro Russo  “Did the Cultural Revolution End Communism?”
Subcomandante Marcos  “Interregno: Decentralized Communism”
Alberto Toscano  “Communist Power / Communist Ignorance”
Toni Negri  “Communism: reflections on the practice”
Silvia Federici  “Creating Communities of Care”

1pm  Lunch

3pm  Vandreka Shiva  “Ecofeminism and the challenge to Western Communism”
Terri Eagleton  “Communism: Leonides or Paulina?”
Jacques Ranciere  “Communism without Communists?”
Sheila Rowbotham and How Beynon  “Communists without Communism”
Alain Badiou  “Communism: an empty name”
Hilary and Steven Rose  “Kas, Poor Marx”

6pm  End

Drinks Reception and Street Party – Jeffrey Hall and outside
The message is painfully clear: Here is what would happen were the virile whiteness of the Communist Event tarnished (by people of colour, feminists, or Communists). Some women and people of colour (famous people chosen for the “alternative” solely because their gender and ethnicity, not because any of these people had expressed the least interest in Žižek’s anti-left publicity stunt) are (compelled somehow) to be speaking at the conference or rather caricatures of these celebrities, ridiculous, contemptible, parodies, are conjured like spirits. Their presence, a deformed vision of anti-imperial praxis in intellectual production, is not only in itself a reduction in quality, bringing along a laughable and horrifying “interspecies” consequence, but their proximity, more sinisterly, infects the celebrity white males, who are tainted by the association and become trivial and ridiculous from the mingling, incapable of carrying out the civilizing mission; the contagion makes them decadent as well; they lose their dignity, their discernment and judgement, and their ability to lecture, teach and lead. Terry Eagleton, at the all-white, all-male setting, was to speak about great Shakespearean tragedy, but forced now into contact with the inferiors sharing the podium, he is infected with their inferiority and will be speaking instead about inferior Shakespeare romances. Peter Hallward has lost the bold triumphant “Will” of his Gramsci reference, and instead, surrounded by all these too material, too earthy, raced and gendered interlopers as colleagues, will be speaking of “the Body”. Bosteels was to speak on “The Leftist Hypothesis: Communism in the Age of Terror” but has been cowed into a lec-
ture entitled, “The Postcolonial Hypothesis: Frightened Communism?” Badiou’s science-flavoured “generic” has been corroded and degraded to “empty”; Toscano is inspired by his new surroundings to celebrate “Ignorance” instead of “Knowledge.” “Alas, poor Marx,” the Roses lament from the sidelines as it all ends with bell hooks popping up to exhibit the ultimate indignity, the degradation of the language in the act of comical uppitiness. The presence of women and people of colour naturally leads to the practice of magic instead of rational pursuits, and as in a screenplay the last shot is of all gathered in a risible séance. Marking certain of Žižek’s most pernicious achievements to date, the participants, and the young Trotskyists and anarchists who shared this jest, affected ignorance of what there could possibly be to object to in what they insisted was a sincere and gentle request for diversity and necromancy from unidentified students of Oriental and African Studies. The conference audience, in the end, was almost entirely white. A “safe space” for fascist, racist, imperialist discourse mis-labelled “communist” had been created. This safe space would metastasize in years to come.

Žižek never admitted to authoring this prank, but another anonymous document, an account of the conference and its discontents, appeared in Radical Philosophy journal signed by “M.H.” (MH 2009) It ignored the racist effrontery in the “joke” program, acknowledging only the implied objections regarding gender, and praised the anonymous SOAS students the anonymous author affirmed as anonymous authors: “All of which leaves a question hanging in the air: who are the more imaginative political thinkers: Badiou, Žižek, Rancière, Negri and the rest, or the anonymous students of SOAS? It’s not hard to imagine what even old Bertie Brecht would have answered to that.” (Replace the antiracist, feminist leftist students with racist and sexist ones, one assumes is the implication, which indeed was what effectively was accomplished.)

At the conference itself, Žižek waxed lyrical on a favourite theme of his, the crude imperialist vision of the gift of civilization that white Frenchmen generously bestowed upon Africans by enslaving them and then teaching them about the Rights of Man. (MRZine 2009) “We white leftists,” Žižek has often declared, “can leave behind our endless self-flagellating guilt”4 once “we” fully

---

4 Once having grasped that great white intellect liberated the black Haitians], we white Leftist men and women are free to leave behind the politically correct process of endless self-torturing guilt. Although Pascal Bruckner’s critique of the contemporary Left often approaches the absurd, this does not prevent him from occasionally generating pertinent insights—one cannot but agree with him when he detects in European politically correct selfflagellation an inverted form of clinging to one’s superiority. Whenever the West is attacked, its first reaction is not aggressive defence but selfprobing: what did we do to deserve it? We are ultimately to be blamed for the evils of the world; Third World catastrophes and terrorist violence are merely reactions to our crimes. The positive form of the White Man’s Burden (his responsibility for civilizing the colonized barbarians) is thus merely replaced by its negative form (the burden of the white man’s
realize the benevolence of “our” white ancestors toward the ancestors of “them,” “our” contemporaries (always Other, never comrades) in Haiti. He took care to heap contempt on all things African at every opportunity:

Žižek: The Marseillaise problem, it’s a wonderful question! [someone had referred to the story of forces defending Cap à Pierrot singing the Marseillaise] The usual multiculturalist answer would have been why Marseillaise, it’s French, we should all sing some some I don’t know, some -- Costas Douzinas: The internationale -- Žižek: yeah some some African song I don’t know or whatever. I would say unfortunately this is what white, white multiculturalist liberals like us to do. They don’t like the third world people to sing their songs, they want respect the same way you go a little bit to a Thai restaurant, to an Italian restaurant, and so on and so on, the white Marseillaise was revolutionary there. It didn’t mean -- it meant something very precise. It didn’t mean, you see even we primitive half-ape blacks, our grandparents were still jumping on trees like apes in Africa, we can now even participate in your, No! It meant we are more Frenchmen than you!

A brief aside: Costas Douzinas, Žižek’s straight man there, is a British academic of Greek parentage and a practical creature of Žižek. Douzinas was brought up in England and made his entire career there; he was advanced in academia by Žižek’s favor and that of former CIA agent Duncan Kennedy (of Critical Legal Studies, a partially Marxist but dominantly Schmittian school of post-structuralist legal criticism) and ended playing an enormous role in
guilt) : if we can no longer be the benevolent masters of the Third World, we can at least be the privileged source of evil, patronizingly depriving others of responsibility for their fate (when a Third World country engages in terrible crimes, it is never fully its own responsibility, but always an after-effect of colonization: they are merely imitating what their colonial masters used to do, and so on) :

“We need our miserabilist clichés about Africa, Asia, Latin America, in order to confirm the cliché of a predatory, deadly West. Our noisy stigmatizations only serve to mask the wounded self-love: we no longer make the law. Other cultures know it, and they continue to culpabilize us only to escape our judgments on them.” (Žižek 2009b)
what is perhaps Žižek’s most criminal enterprise since the Slovene embezzlement-by-secession caper and destruction of Yugoslavia, namely Syriza. Douzinas today, remarkably, is a member of the Greek Parliament, despite having no professional or political history in the country. Stathis Kouvelakis is another British long-time associate of Žižek who played a central role in Syriza, and of course Yanis Varoufakis, also very close to Žižek from the time of Syriza’s conception, is British-educated (an “Anglophile opportunist” and “would-be Mavrokorodatos”⁵). In fact Syriza, a kind of colour revolution, is a grand scale case of the Žižekian equivocation, “simultaneously pro-BDS and pro-Israel, simultaneously anti- and pro-memorandum, regretfully memorandum-enforcing”⁶: neoliberal empire masquerading as its own nationalist opposition carrying out the seizure of Greece disguised as a daring act in the Jacobin spirit. In this way the middle classes were marshalled to crush the organized working class, as in traditional fascism, but misled into imagining themselves carrying out their salvation by the renewal of “the communist idea.” But what Žižek really thinks of communism and communists could not be more explicit than he made it in Greece, shouting (to the applause of his bourgeois hipster audience): “The party, KKE, is basically the party of the people who are still alive only because they forgot to die.” (Žižek 2014a) These remarks were made at a time when “clashes” that saw anarchist provocateurs activate police reactions turned lethal for communist workers. Viewers of the video will see it is not merely a joke or an extemporaneous remark (he repeated the same formula on several occasions), but an incitement to violence under cover of witticism.

After the 2009 On The Idea of Communism conference, where the seeds of the propaganda campaigns for the Syriza swindle and other decoy left movements that would divert the energy and usurp the place of popular resistance to advance the ruling class offensive further were cultivated, Žižek was invited on BBC radio, where the hundred quid a seat celebrity intellectual gathering was described as if it were a special meeting of the Comintern. Žižek was introduced as “one of 900 delegates” to the event. (BBC 2009) His summary was that the meeting proved once again that “the Left had no alternative” to the austerity policies of Western governments in particular or to capitalism in general. “All they want to do is outlaw racism.” Shortly thereafter he was lecturing another London audience about how there is no Congolese working class, bringing Congo forward of an example of what happens when empire abandons the “former” colonized world, and explaining that making the public (not the shareholders of BP) pay for the Gulf oil spill clean-up is “a properly communist response.” (Callinicos, Holloway, Žizek 2010)

⁵ …according to a KKE connected correspondent, by email.
⁶ …in the words of the same correspondent
another discussion on BBC radio (BBC 2012) were audibly gasping in shock when he insisted, “I’ve looked closely into all criticisms of Europe especially this left liberal masochist one ‘no, no Europe is a history of slavery, it’s the worst of them all.’ What strikes me and gives me hope for Europe, and I mean it seriously, in a strict philosophical sense, are we aware to what extent even the most ferocious critique of imperialism, violence of Europe is founded in European legacy? That for example Indian independence, Congress Party. These were Indians educated in Cambridge. It’s true European tradition. This is what I like in Europe. Show me another civilization which, with all its horrors, and I admit them, has developed the strongest mechanisms that I know to criticize itself.” A guest from the previous segment insisted on being allowed to remain to rebut him on air. On another day he was telling another BBC camera (Klein 2009) -- this time after being introduced as the literal reincarnation of Marx -- that the USSR was the greatest horror in human history, “worse than fascism,” and on another declaring in the New Statesman:

We should not be afraid to encourage, as a combination of terror and trust in the people, the resurgence of an important figure in all egalitarian-revolutionary terror - the “informer” who denounces culprits to the authorities. (In the case of the Enron scandal, Time magazine was right to celebrate the insiders who tipped off the financial authorities as true public heroes.)

Once upon a time, we called this communism. (Žižek 2010d)

Needless to say, the Enron whistle-blowers are entirely fictional. Žižek’s apparent posture swings and pivots wildly to be incessantly attacking, opportunistically, whatever current challenge to empire has the élan, and defending whatever policy of empire is facing resistance. On the surface this appears as “incoherence” – bashing the Bolivarian revolution or any popular working class movement gaining ground for insufficient radicalism, suggesting they’re unworthy of support or at least that their demise is nothing to lament especially (their own fault for their timidity and inauthenticity), while hailing US backed palace coups as in Ukraine or US backed contra terrorist subversion as in Libya as “revolutions” that only the despicable beautiful soul liberals could fail to abet – but once the politics driving these shifting positions is grasped (defence of US empire and increasing fascization of culture) all the apparent quirks and hypocries reveal themselves perfectly consistent. (Žižek 2015b) Despite twenty years of posturing as a radical leftist, Marxist, and Links-
fascist, whenever the moments of truth arrived – the financial crisis, the wars, the refugee headline – Žižek proved himself again and again both an ordinary establishment (neo-)liberal and simultaneously an ordinary right fascist.

How does he get away with this, then? “The Left” has not traditionally accepted, either in academia or in the liberal press where public intellectuals debate, the kind of incoherence and sophistry that mark right wing radio shock jocks and Murdoch television disinfotainment. Some of Žižek’s defenders claim that he is somehow or other engaged in jousting with right wing ideologues and the fact that his product so resembles theirs proves he is “fighting fire with fire.” To his target audience, university students and faculty and the liberal readers of social democratic organs like The Guardian, The New Statesman, Le Monde, El Pais, The London Review of Books, the travelling Žižek show can appear a perplexing and an entirely clownish affair. Indeed many of Žižek’s defenders offer this clownishness as an excuse or even a kind of merit – it “gets a reaction,” “attracts an audience,” “gets people talking about Marx”, (much as Harry Potter is defended against criticism with the diversion that it “gets children reading again”) therefore it must be valuable – but that is part of its disguise. In the broadest terms, as Antonis Balasopoulos put it,

*The purpose of [Žižek’s rhetorical] strategy is to i. attribute extreme right-wing content to communist ideas ii. attribute progressive content to extremely reactionary ideas iii. confuse everyone about which is which iv. slander the left while seeming to be “daring” and “provocative”. (Balasopoulos 2015)*

Unsurprisingly, in this endeavour, Žižek relies on rational exploitation of irrationalism and more or less scientific techniques of mediatic manipulation rather than argument. The Gambits for Deception chart above (page 11) is an excellent guide to his practices, which deserve close study and will be explicated in detail in Part Two of this paper (Žižek’s Rhetoric: Motifs, Gambits and Manoeuvres: i. The Barflies ii. Fetishistic Disavowal iii. Paradox, Parallax, Paraconsistency iv. The Protocols v. Overidentification v. The Mobius Strip.) Many of his ruses and tactics, we shall show, derive initially from The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion and Carl Schmitt’s adaptation of it into a “critique of liberalism” that has competed with Marxism and served as its changeling since the early 20th century. As Žižek’s practices are not unique to his output but are proliferating everywhere, with devastating effect on the public sphere, civil society, and democratic political discourse, comprehension of their tactics
and tricks is absolutely necessary for counter-propaganda and the defence of rationality. The relevance and urgency was never clearer than as now this goes to print and Žižek, after endorsing Donald J. Trump on the eve of the US Presidential elections, in a backhanded manner that actually advertised Hilary Clinton as the candidate of “sanity,” moved in the immediate aftermath to blame the ascent of a New York billionaire demagogue on “political correctness” and “the hegemony of multiculturalism” – that is, on the populations most opposed, and most vulnerable, to Trump and Žižek’s shared fascist project. (2016c)
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**THE PROTOCOLS OF THE LEARNED LACANIAN OF SLOVITZIA: PART ONE**

Abstract: Mada u sve većoj meri smatran za kontroverznog, Slavoj Žižek i dalje nastavlja da uživa reputaciju velike zvezde među javnim intelektualcima sa “Radikalne Levice” na Zapadu. Zapadni mediji koji ga agresivno promovišu kao “levičara” nisu upoznati sa činjenicom da u svojoj rodnoj Sloveniji on predstavlja ključnu ličnost liberalne partije koja je vladala državom u većem priodu svoje nezavisnosti i koja je počinila notorno “elektronsko etničko čišćenje”, a da je sam Žižek tamo viđen kao reakcionarna ličnost. Ovaj članak (iz dva dela) detaljno ispituje Žižekove spise da bi razobličio kao puku tanku oblogu njegovu privrženost socijalističkim i komunističkim idejama. Žižekove tehnike zavaravanja i preusmeravanja, ova studija pokazuje, potiču od izvornog teksta desničarskog pseudosocijalizma: “Protokoli sioniskih mudraca”. Zaključak do koga ova studija dolazi vidi Žižekov projekat kao nastavak iste fašističke misije koju je i njegov uzor imao—da infiltrira i uzurpira diskurs levice u cilju promovisanja reakcionarne politike prerusavajući je u progresivnu i revolucionarnu—baš kao što je svojom propagandnom retorikom to svojevremeno pokušano u čuvenoj podvali carističke policije.
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