

Prema horizontalnijim osnovama dekolonizacije

Treće izdanje GSG magazina nastajalo je više od godinu dana, u razdoblju obilježenom turbulentnim političkim događanjima, društvenim pokretima i prosvjedima, u kojima se nemogućnost političkog otpora sve češće manifestira u potrebi za simboličkim uklanjanjem označitelja višestoljetnog kontinuiteta imperijalističkih politika. Ako se u ranijim etapama razvoja kapitalizma, problem rasizma još mogao geografski odrediti, u suvremenoj dinamici globalnih tokova kapitala, robe i ljudi, to se nastojanje čini posve izlišnim. U fokusu interesa ovog temata pitanja su koja proizlaze iz suvremenih društvenih i političkih zbivanja i rasprava. U širem dijapazonu takvih tema, primarno su nas zanimala ona koja se tiču suvremene uporabe povijesnih narativa i kulturnih artefakata, odnosno ideologije baštine i kulturne proizvodnje, te njihova uloga u procesu normalizacije i reprodukcije ili pak razotkrivanja i suprotstavljanja suvremenim oblicima nejednakosti i nasilja.

Na poluperiferiji europskog kontinenta, rasprave o ovim pitanjima i dalje uglavnom tinjaju unutar progresivnih, no inherentno privilegiranih akademskih i kulturnih krugova. Iako se poticaji za njihovim otvaranjem nerijetko javljaju kao posljedica budnog praćenja trendova „sa zapada“, njihova se difamacija čini u jednakoj mjeri problematičnom i neproduktivnom. Propušta se, naime, prilika otvaranja rasprave o bitnim društvenim temama, te briše odgovornost kritičkog sagledavanja tog, sve dinamičnijeg i utjecajnijeg diskurzivnog polja, odnosno izgradnje preduvjeta analitičke, situirane i klasno osviještene rasprave o strukturnim uzrocima i dionicima, a ne samo o simptomima nejednakosti unutar dominantnog sustava proizvodnje znanja. Svaki govor o prošlosti i baštini uvjetovan je aktualnim ekonomskim i društvenim odnosima. Stoga ne samo da govor o uzrocima i nasljeđu imperijalnih politika, kolonijalizma i rasizma u današnjim uvjetima sadrži velik kritički i emancipacijski

potencijal, već se njime iscrtava važna linija horizonta kulturno-političke alternative sadašnjem trenutku.

Nije, međutim, iznenađujuće da u lokalnom kontekstu, opterećenom nacionalističkim mitovima, nema mnogo prostora kritičkom čitanju baštine uokvirene eurocentričnim, kapitalističkim vrijednostima. Reakcije predstavnika kulturnih i akademskih elita na sporadična i gotovo plaha kritička čitanja ovih fenomena u Hrvatskoj, redovito se manifestiraju kroz samoidentifikaciju s ulogom „čuvara“ i „branitelja“ kanonskih vrijednosti nacionalne kulture. Ideološka potka suvremenih baštinskih politika evidentna je ne samo kroz inauguraciju novoga skupa baštinskih vrijednosti u vrijeme tzv. postsocijalističke tranzicije, već i kroz izostanak analize i kritike mehanizama ekspertne selekcije i valorizacije, analize koja je u velikoj mjeri izostajala i u socijalizmu, a koja je ključna za razumijevanje baštine kao pojma dominantno uvjetovanog imperativom izgradnje i legitimacije nacionalnih, klasnih, rasnih i rodnih podjela. Stoga rasprave o potrebi ili primjerenosti problematiziranja rasizma ili uopće mogućnosti manifestacije rasizma i kolonijalnog nasljeđa u kontekstima koji se povijesno-geografski nalaze izvan ili na rubovima tradicionalnih kolonijalnih središta moći, upravo podcrtavaju značaj adresiranja ove teme, kao i potrebu stvaranja demokratičnijih i inkluzivnijih prostora rasprave te novih oblika učenja i proizvodnje znanja.

Znakovita je u tom smislu, primjerice, burna reakcija hrvatskih političkih struktura i kulturne javnosti na otvaranje javne rasprave o suvremenoj recepciji Meštrovićevih skulptura s prikazom američkih Indijanaca u Chicagu iz 1928., koju su tamošnje gradske vlasti pokrenule početkom 2021. godine.¹ Unisonost defenzivnih reakcija službenih državnih i akademskih institucija i limitiranost kritičke rasprave na ovu temu ukazuje na slijepe pjege uspostavljenih nacionalno-umjetničkih kanona. Ono što zabrinjava nije samo

nemogućnost diferenciranja konteksta i uvažavanja prava za raspravom o reprezentativnim obrascima rase unutar američkog društva, rasprava koje su višestruko usložene strukturnim uzrocima američkog rasizma i hipokrizijom tamošnjih politika identiteta. Problem prvenstveno leži u posljedicama kakve, takvim impulsima ogoljeni stavovi, mogu imati u širenju sljepila na javnu percepciju nepravdi, nejednakosti i diskriminacije u suvremenom društvu. Fetišizacijom artefakata prošlosti, njihovom komodifikacijom i izuzimanjem od društvenih i materijalnih uvjeta proizvodnje i suvremene recepcije, održavaju se strukturne pozicije moći i reproducira se ideologija vladajućih elita, čineći ujedno plodno tlo manipulaciji baštine u svrhu zadovoljenja kratkoročnih političkih interesa.

Ovaj primjer tek je jedan u nizu manifestacija dominantnog baštinskog diskursa, ni po čemu jedinstvenog za hrvatski kontekst. No, dok su političke borbe marginaliziranih zajednica, primarno u Latinskoj Americi, poslužile kao ishodišta kritičkog mišljenja kolonijalnosti i razvoja teorijskog aparata dekolonizacije, na poluperiferiji Europe često i dalje prevladava nemogućnost prepoznavanja vlastite uronjenosti u višestoljetne kolonijalne odnose moći. Kritički aparat čitanja tih odnosa stoga je uglavnom bio posredovan zapadocentričnom epistemološkom optikom, koja se u postsocijalističkom kontekstu često percipira kao (jedina) legitimna i poželjna.² Međutim, činjenica je da se različitim tokovima ekonomskih i ideoloških utjecaja, konstrukt rasne hijerarhije nezaustavljivo prelijevao čak i u one društvene zajednice europskog ekonomsko-kulturnog kruga, koje su i same trpjele despotizam kolonijalno-kapitalističke eksploatacije. Iako posljednjih godina svjedočimo proliferaciji kritičkog akademskog diskursa koji zagovara nužnost epistemološke dekolonizacije tzv. „istočne Europe“, ona predstavlja tek inicijalne obrise, primarno akademskog

interesa za ova pitanja, koja nisu lišena potrebe aktivnog, kritičkog odnosa spram niza kontradikcija i nedosljednosti upisanih u teorijski diskurs o dekolonizaciji.

Ovaj temat nema ambiciju da proizvede sustavan teorijski pristup spomenutim fenomenima, već priložima pozvanih autorica i autora različitih profila, metoda analize i disciplinarnih uporišta, nastoji univerzalizirati i diversificirati diskurzivni prostor za koji vjerujemo da se mora odvijati onkraj zapadnih binarnih kategorija, poput umjetničkog vs. teorijskog, Istočne i Zapadne Europe, identiteta vs. klase, itd. Stoga se povezivanjem umjetničkih priloga, razgovora te kritičkih tekstova i analiza fenomena iz različitih konteksta na (polu)marginama ili izvan samog europskog kontinenta, nastoji osigurati horizontalniji kontekst promišljanja (i) proizvodnje znanja i kritičkih refleksija suvremenih društvenih i ekonomskih simptoma spomenutih tabua i kontradikcija.

Ovakav hibridan urednički pristup, kakav primjenjujemo od prvog broja časopisa GSG, sada dobiva puniji smisao. Uz nešto veći broj i opsežnije tekstualne kontribucije, u ovom su se broju umnogostručili umjetnički prilozi. Jedan od razloga povećanog interesa za umjetničke radove jest i činjenica da se upravo kroz umjetničko istraživanje – radi manje restriktivnih istraživačkih metoda, kao i difuznijih načina produkcije i cirkulacije – lakše i neposrednije bilježi i progovara o temama koje pripadaju dekolonijalnoj kritičkoj paradigmi.

Područje današnje Hrvatske i nekadašnje Jugoslavije kroz veći dio svoje povijesti bilo je u podređenom političkom i ekonomskom položaju, dok je njezino stanovništvo bilo predmetom primjena rasnih teorija. To se, međutim, ne kosi s činjenicom da su novovjekovne ideje o rasi prisutne i u klasno raslojenim društvima „predziđa kršćanstva“. Barem od rođenja ideje Barbarogenija³, u osvit Drugog svjetskog rata moguće je pratiti kako se globalno fluktuirajuće ideje o rasi na ovom području interpretiraju i implementiraju: ponekad

idiosinkratski, kao kod spomenutog pojma Barbarogenija umjetnika Ljubomira Micića, u vidu prihvaćanja teze o rasno drugačijim ljudima s Balkana, koji su pozvani da regeneriraju ustajalu Europsku kulturu; ili pak, mnogo češće, kroz samoidentificiranje s europskom „bjelačkošću“ te kroz apropijaciju rasnih teorija u svrhu relativne ekonomske i političke (nad)moći.

U krajnjoj liniji, naučeni obrasci ponašanja kod susreta s „rasno“ drugim u našim se krajevima ispoljavaju po istom principu, iako u manjoj mjeri, nego u historijskim središtima kolonijalne ekspanzije, gdje je prisutnost mješovitog stanovništva kroz povijest dovela do rasne segregacije i bjelačke supremacije. Dok je u tim kontekstima kolonijalno nasljeđe eklatantno vidljivo i sablasno prisutno u svakodnevnom životu, pa samim time polučuje aktivnije oblike osvještavanja i borbe protiv (normalizacije) tog naslijeđa, na marginama imperija, nekada kao i danas, teže je razlučiti, te stoga i lakše prikriti, mehanizme dvostruke eksploatacije i specifičnih modusa racijalizacije.

U razgovoru s Anom Sladojević⁴, Catherine Baker naglašava da je ovo područje, pripadajući mediteranskom kulturno-ekonomskom krugu, oduvijek bilo na sjecištu susreta i ekonomsko-kulturne razmjene različitih predmodernih kultura, europskih i izvaneuropskih utjecaja, ili pak na razmeđi apsolutističkih centralnoeuropskih carevina i Osmanskog carstva. Tim su se tokovima kapitala ljudi raznih podrijetla tijekom stoljeća susretali, a tim je kontaktom, odnosno kroz medije, kulturu i robu koji su kolali Europom, rasizam, kao ideologija koja pravda kapitalističke i imperijalne ciljeve, prenesen te – više ili manje svjesno – prihvaćen u svim krajevima i marginama Europe i svijeta, pa tako i na južnoslavenskom prostoru. Tako je, usprkos perifernoj poziciji i ekonomskoj eksploataciji te orijentalizaciji njegovog stanovništva od strane imperijalnih europskih sila, riječ o

području čije se stanovništvo ipak primarno samoidentificira kao „bjelačko“. Usprkos političkoj podređenosti, kroz trgovinu i kolanje dobara, ovdašnje su političke i ekonomske elite također profitirale od kolonijalizma, a njegovi su se derivati slijevali u svakodnevnicu života nižih slojeva i radničke klase na ovim prostorima.⁵

Suprotno geopolitičkom konceptu srednje i jugoistočne Europe kao sjecištu kultura, nacionalistička desnica nastoji konsolidirati ovaj prostor kroz perpetuirano iznalaženje i iscrtavanje granica. U njihovom su imaginariju jugoistočna Europa i Balkan branik europske „bjelačkosti“. Tematiziranjem europskog slikarstva koje prikazuje osmanske ratove, umjetnički prilog Ferenc Grófa govori o pozivanju mađarske ekstremne desnice na isti taj imaginarij u novim povijesnim okolnostima, kada na granice Europske unije dolaze izbjeglice u bijegu od ekonomske deprivacije prouzročene neoliberalnim kapitalizmom i posljedicama imperijalnih ratova zapadnih zemalja.

Izuzimanje jugoslavenskog prostora iz pitanja koja se tiču nasljeđa kolonijalnih odnosa i suvremenog rasizma, postaje jasnije u komparaciji s nekim od srodnih fenomena iz drugih, poluperifernih dijelova Europe. Prilog Minna Henriksson ukazuje na prakse implementacije rasne znanosti u finsku modernu kulturu posredstvom likovne umjetničke produkcije tijekom kasnog 19. i ranog 20. stoljeća. Izloženo rasnim teorijama, kojima se vršila kontrola stanovništva kroz nacionalnu i etničku konsolidaciju, nordijske zemlje same postaju plodno tlo reprodukcije rasističke ideologije.

Koristeći se arhivskim snimkama Radio Televizije Novi Sad u Vojvodini, umjetnički duo Doplgenger otvara pak prostor kritičkom čitanju jugoslavenske, očekivano europocentrične slike Pokreta nesvrstanih. Posrijedi je, naime, uvriježena teza o iznimnosti jugoslavenske pozicije unutar ovog globalnog antiblokovskog pokreta, preciznije, sintagma kojom se

Jugoslavija, kao jedina europska članica, imenuje „vođom Nesvrstanih“, pored činjenice da su značajnu ulogu u Pokretu imali mnogo moćniji i veći svjetski akteri Globalnoga juga. Iako je jugoslavenska vanjska politika snažno strateški podupirala dekolonizacijske procese i oslobodilačke pokrete, Doplgengeri svojim radom zadiru u širi značaj razlikovanja kolonijalizma i kolonijalnosti,⁶ odnosno u modus djelovanja potonjeg mimo ili čak unutar deklarativnih antikolonijalnih politika.⁷

S druge pak strane, nekadašnje kolonijalne sile poput Portugala i danas se ograđuju od bilo kakvog udjela u razvoju suvremenog rasizma. Od 1950-ih godina, koncept *luzotropikalizma* postaje ključan za legitimaciju portugalskog poznog imperijalizma. Tvrdnja da su Portugalci razvili posebno „benevolentni“ oblik kolonijalizma i dalje rezonira u javnoj sferi. Inês Beleza Barreiros, Rui Gomes Coelho, Patrícia Martins Marcos i Pedro Schacht Pereira, na primjeru javnih polemika pokrenutih oko recentno podignutog spomenika misionaru Antóniu Vieiri u Lisabonu, razotkrivaju diskurzivne akrobacije održavanja *luzotropikalnog* koncenzusa u Portugalu.

Behzad Khosravi Noori u svojem se pak tekstu bavi fenomenom kojeg naziva „nesvjesnim kolonijalnim“. Odmičući se izvan povijesnih geografskih granica europskog kontinenta, Behzad govori o prisutnosti Europe u Iranu, koja se manifestira kroz apropijaciju pozicije „drugoga“, odnosno samoegzotizacijom pripadnika teheranske radničke klase kroz figuru derviša. Iščitavajući moguće razloge i okolnosti nastanka ovih fotografija, Behzad govori o iranskoj modernizaciji 1960-ih te o ugnjetavanju na dvostrukoj, rasnoj i klasnoj osnovi.

Časopis otvaramo i zatvaramo umjetničkim prilogom Jasmine Cibic koja zamišlja izgled dviju izumrlih sorta ruža. Njihovi izvorno rasistički nazivi [za više informacija okreni stranicu →] razlog su njihovog nestanka kroz drugu polovicu dvadesetog stoljeća. Ovaj rad nam, zajedno s ostalima u

ovom tematu, ukazuje, međutim, na činjenicu da brisanjem rasističkog govora iz javne komunikacije, ne možemo otkloniti teret prošlosti niti riješiti problem suvremenog rasizma u društvu. U toj, kao i u svakoj drugoj borbi za društvenu pravdu i jednakost, potrebno je poznavati i razumjeti uzroke i mehanizme širenja te opstanka rasizma na svim razinama i u različitim društvima diljem svijeta, osvještavajući njegovu vezu s materijalnim životnim uvjetima te stvarajući nova epistemološka utemeljenja antirasizma. Nadamo se da će prilozi u ovom broju pridonijeti izgradnji kompleksnijeg i horizontalnijeg pristupa različitim oblicima i manifestacijama kolonijalnog nasljeđa i suvremenih antikolonijalnih pozicija na poluperiferiji Europe.

[→]

Ilustracije na unutarnjim stranicama naslovnice i poledine časopisa adaptiran su rad Jasmine Cibic iz serije *Ornamental Rash* (2018.). Izostavljeni su rasistički nazivi ruža, koji su inače integralni dio rada. Ilustracije su nastale u suradnji s botaničkom ilustratoricom Beatriz Inglessis.

Nigger Boy Rose
(R. Hennessy, 1931.), tintni ispis na pamučnom papiru, 100 x 70 cm

Gypsy Rose
(Van Rossem, 1931.), tintni otisak na pamučnom papiru, 100 x 70 cm

1 Osim službenog priopćenja Ministarstva kulture i medija Republike Hrvatske, ovaj je događaj polučio niz tekstova, analiza i izjava eminentnih znanstvenika, kulturnjaka i političara, kao i dvije *online* javne tribine. Za cjelovit pregled napisa o ovoj temi, vidi: „Javna rasprava o skulpturama Indijanaca Ivana Meštrovića u Chicagu“, *Historiografija.hr*, 15. ožujka 2021., URL: <https://historiografija.hr/?p=25408>

2 Vidi primjerice: Katarina Kušić, Philipp Lottholz, Polina Manolova, „From dialogue to practice: Pathways towards decoloniality in Southeast Europe“, *dBEPCIA*, special issue: *Decolonial Theory & Practice in Southeast Europe* (2019.) 3, URL: <https://dialoguingposts.files.wordpress.com/2019/03/special-issue.pdf>

3 Ljubomir Micić, *Barbarogenije civilizator*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 1993., URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HeNk5EQjOrs>

4 Ana Sladojević bavi se temom rase u jugoslaven-skom prostoru, izučavajući i kontekstualizirajući povijest i suvremene uporabe zbirke koja čini fundus Muzeja afričke umetnosti u Beogradu. Vidi: Ana Sladojević, *Muzej afričke umetnosti, Konteksti i reprezentacije*, Muzej afričke umetnosti, Beograd, 2014., URL: http://mau.rs/images/publications/Epublications/Muzej_africke_umetnosti_konteksti_i_reprezentacije/Ana_Sladojevic_Muzej_africke_umetnosti_konteksti_i_reprezentacije.pdf; Ana Sladojević, „Anticolonial representation at the Museum of African Art“, TrAIN Open Live Event, travanj 2021., URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GvnbxEHO-Sg>

5 Fokus Grupa u svojem radu „Soba s pejzažem: Vedute iz Palače privilegirane tršćansko-riječke kompanije“ govori o velikom ekonomskom napretku Rijeke čija je podloga bila monopol za prerađivanje šećera uvezen s karipskih plantaža trske. Fokus Grupa, „Soba s pejzažem: Vedute iz Palače privilegirane tršćansko-riječke kompanije“, *ARTMargins* (2021.) 10 (1): 77–92, URL: <https://direct.mit.edu/artm/article/10/1/77/100605/A-Room-with-a-landscape-Vedute-from-the-Palace-of>

6 Vidi: Aníbal Quijano, „Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality“, *Cultural Studies* (2007.) 21:2-3: 168-178.

7 Umjetnik Naeem Mohaiemen, u suradnji s Urošem Pajovićem, u umjetničkom prilogu za *ARTMargins* još je izravnije ukazao na taj problem analizirajući Titovu samouvjerenu izjavu povodom podjele Pakistana 1971. godine: „Nikada više neće biti pitanja Balkana na svijetu.“ Uroš Pajović, Naeem Mohaiemen, „Southward and Otherwise“, *ARTMargins* (2019.), 8 (2): 79–89., URL: <https://direct.mit.edu/artm/article/8/2/79/18089/Southward-and-Otherwise>

Toward a Horizontal Decolonization

The third edition of GSG magazine was assembled for over a year, amid tempestuous political events, civil movements and protests. The increasing inability to establish a meaningful political resistance resulted in efforts to, at least, symbolically remove signifiers of centuries lasting imperialistic politics. If, during the earlier stages of capitalism, the problem of racism was perhaps geographically circumscribed, the contemporary dynamics of the global flow of capital, goods and labor make such efforts utterly pointless. This issue focuses on matters derived from current social and political events and debates. We were primarily interested in subjects pertaining to the contemporary utilization of historical narratives and cultural artifacts, the ideology of heritage and cultural production, along with their role in the process of normalization and reproduction, or in revealing and resisting, forms of inequality and violence.

On the fringes of the European continent deliberation on such issues is still confined to progressive, yet inherently privileged academic and cultural circles. Although the incentive for increasing their inclusiveness is commonly the result of a mere 'western' trend emulation, ignoring these issues is equally problematic and unproductive. By doing so, we are neglecting the opportunity to address important social topics, while simultaneously removing responsibility for critical examination of an increasingly dynamic and influential field of discussion. We are also missing an opportunity to create preconditions for an analytical, culturally situated and class-conscious debate on structural causes and stakeholders, a debate not solely concerned about symptoms of inequality within a prevalent system of knowledge production. Any discussion about history and heritage is conditioned by current economic and social relations. Therefore, not only does the discussion about causes and legacy of imperialistic policies, colonialism and racism in contemporary circumstances

have a large critical and emancipatory potential; it is equally important in broadening the horizons of the cultural-political alternative of the present moment.

It is not particularly surprising that within a local context, pervaded with nationalistic mythologies, there is little room for a critique of heritage, which is dominated by euro-centric and capitalist values. The reactions of representatives of the cultural and academic elites to occasional and nearly timid critical interpretations of these phenomena in Croatia, are regularly manifested through self-imaging as 'guardians' or 'defenders' of canonical national cultural values. The ideological grounds of contemporary heritage policies is evident not only in the inauguration of a new set of heritage values during the so-called post-socialist transition, but also in the omission of analysis and criticism of expert selection and valorization criteria – an analysis which was to a large extent also absent during the socialist period – which is, however, crucial to understand heritage as a phenomenon predominantly conditioned by the imperative to create and justify national, class, race and gender divisions. Therefore, discussions on the need or adequacy of examining racism, or even the very possibility of the manifestation of racism and colonial heritage in contexts which are geo-historically located outside, or on the margins of traditional colonial centers of power, further underscore the importance of addressing this subject, as well as the necessity of forming more democratic and more inclusive forums of discussion, along with new forms of learning and knowledge production.

Within this context one might find indicative the volatile reaction to the public debate on the present reception of Meštrović's sculptures of Indians erected in Chicago in 1928, initiated by the city authorities at the beginning of 2021.¹ The resulting unanimous defensive disposition of official state and academic institutions and the limited critical debate on

the subject suggests a myopic viewpoint and blind spots in the established national-artistic canons. What is troubling is not merely the inability of differentiating context and recognizing the right to debate the representative racial forms within the American society, debates that are layered with structural patterns of racism and the hypocrisy of identity politics in the United States. The problem lays primarily in the potential consequences that the attitudes, exposed by such impulses, may have on generating further blind spots in the public perception of injustice, inequality and discrimination in contemporary society. By fetishizing artifacts of the past, by their commodification and exemption from social and material circumstances of production and contemporary reception, the structures of power are thusly maintained and the ideology of the ruling elites reproduced while creating fertile ground for heritage manipulation for short term political goals.

This example is just one of many manifestations of the dominant heritage discourse, in no way particular to the Croatian context. Yet, while political struggles of marginalized societies, primarily in Latin America, originated decolonial critical thought and the development of the theory of decolonization, the semi-peripheral context of Eastern Europe is still dominated by the inability to recognize the consequences of their own involvement in centuries-long colonial power relations. Therefore, critical theoretical tools for reading these relations have been mainly imported through a western epistemological prism, which, within the context of post-socialism is often perceived as (exclusively) legitimate and desired.² However, the fact remains that by way of different modes of economical and ideological influences, the construct of racial hierarchy has been insuppressibly entering even those communities of the European economic-cultural circle which have themselves suffered colonial-capitalist exploitative despotism. Even though we have lately been

witnessing the proliferation of critical academic discourse advocating the necessity of epistemological decolonization of so-called 'Eastern Europe', it represents merely initial outlines, of a primarily academic interest in these matters, which are in need of an active, critical stance towards a number of contradictions and inconsistencies included in the theoretical discourse of decolonization.

This issue of the *GSG* magazine has not the ambition to assemble a systematical theoretical approach to the aforementioned occurrences. Through contributions of invited authors with various backgrounds, methodologies and disciplinary foundations, it aims to generalize and diversify a discussion that should transcend western binary categories, such as artistic vs. theoretical, Eastern and Western Europe, identity vs. class, etc. Therefore, the intention of this assemblage of artistic works, discussions, critical texts and analysis of phenomena originating in different contexts located on the (semi)margins or outside the European continent, is to ensure a more horizontal context to consider and produce knowledge, as well as to activate critical reflections on contemporary social and economic symptoms of the previously mentioned taboos and contradictions.

The hybrid editorial approach, which has been employed since the first issue, has with this issue achieved its fuller potential. Apart from a greater number and variety of texts, this volume also sees an increasing number of artistic contributions. One of the reasons for this is the fact that it is precisely through artistic research – due to the wider scope of its research methods, as well as a multifaceted mode of production and circulation of the artwork itself – one can more easily and directly respond to and speak of topics belonging to the critical paradigm of decolonization.

Through most of its history, the territories of modern Croatia and other former Yugoslav republics were in a

subordinate political and economic position, while population itself was subjected to racial theories. This, however, does not contradict the fact that modern ideas on race have been present in class differentiated societies comprising the 'bulwark of christendom'. At least as far back as the 'birth' of the notion of *Barbarogenij*³, at the dawn of World War II, it is possible to trace the regional interpretation and implementation of the globally fluctuating notion of race: sometimes distinctive, like the aforementioned *Barbarogenij* created by artist Ljubomir Micić, in terms of accepting the premise of racially exceptional Balkan folk, who are called to regenerate a stagnant European culture; or, perhaps more often, it was a form of self-identification with European 'whiteness' or the appropriation of racial theories as a means to economic and political empowerment and/or superiority.

In the end, learned forms of behavior upon encountering the 'racial' other, manifest themselves locally in the same manner as in historical centers of colonial expansion, where the presence of diverse populations throughout history had led to racial segregation and white supremacy. While these contexts have an acute and eerie everyday presence of colonial heritage, causing more engaging forms of raising awareness and opposing (the normalization of) such a heritage, at the edge of empires, – then as now – it is more difficult to differentiate, and as such easier to conceal, the mechanisms of double exploitation and specific modes of racialization.

In conversation with Ana Sladojević⁴, Catherine Baker emphasizes that the region, belonging to the Mediterranean cultural-economic circle, was always at an intersection of encounters and economic-cultural exchange of various pre-modern cultures, European and beyond European influences, or the dividing line between Central European rule and the Ottoman Empire. Because of this flow, people of different

origins met through the ages. Their contact, or the exchange of culture and goods circulating throughout Europe, resulted in the transference and – more or less conscious acceptance – of racism as an ideology justifying all capitalistic and imperial aims across Europe, including the Slavic south. So, despite its peripheral position and the orientalizing of its population, the region's people primarily self-identify as 'white'. Even though they were politically subordinated, the local political and economic elites also profited from colonialism by means of trade and the circulation of goods, with its consumer products permeating everyday lives of the lower and working classes⁵.

Contrary to the geopolitical concept of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, as an intersection of cultures, the right wing nationalists attempt to consolidate this region by perpetually establishing and drawing borders. In their vision, Southeastern Europe and the Balkans are the front lines defending European 'whiteness'. Researching European paintings depicting the Ottoman wars, Ferenc Gróf's work discusses the Hungarian extreme right's invocation of identical imagery in current historical circumstances, as immigrants arrive at the European Union's borders, trying to escape economic deprivation caused by neoliberal capitalism and the aftermath of imperial wars of the capitalist West.

The exclusion of the Yugoslav region from issues of inherited colonial relations and contemporary racism becomes more evident, when compared to similar phenomena from other semi-peripheral parts of Europe. Minna Henriksson's contribution identifies customs of implementing racial science in Finnish modern culture by way of visual art production during the late 19th and early 20th century. Exposed to racial theories, Nordic countries became fertile ground for the reproduction of racist ideology employed to stratify and control their population through national and ethnic consolidation.

Using archival footage from the Radio Television Novi Sad in Vojvodina (Serbia), the artistic duo Dopelgenger introduces a critical interpretation of Yugoslavia's view of the Non-Aligned Movement, which was unsurprisingly euro-centric. At the center of discussion is the established proposition of Yugoslavia's exceptionality within NAM as the global anti-block movement. They examine the position from which Yugoslavia, as the only European member of the Movement, has been commonly referred to as the „leader of the Non-Aligned“, disregarding the fact that important roles were played by more powerful and larger countries of the Global South. Even though Yugoslav foreign politics strongly supported decolonization processes and liberation movements, Dopelgengers delve into the broader meaning of differentiating colonialism and coloniality⁶ by examining the latter's manner of application alongside, or even within, declared Yugoslav anticolonial politics.⁷

On the other hand, former colonial powers such as Portugal continue to distance themselves from any role in the development of modern racism. Starting in the 1950s, the concept of *lusotropicalism* became central in the legitimization of Portugal's late empire. According to this concept, the Portuguese built an exceptionally 'benevolent' form of colonialism, an idea that continues to resonate in today's public sphere. Inês Beleza Barreiros, Rui Gomes Coelho, Patrícia Martins Marcos and Pedro Schacht Pereira used the example of debates triggered by the recent statue of missionary António Vieira in Lisbon to shed light on current discursive acrobatics by those who continue to support the so-called Portuguese *lusotropical* consensus.

Behzad Khosravi Noori explores and elaborates on the phenomenon he calls "the colonial unconscious". Stepping outside the historically laid geographical borders of the European continent, Behzad discusses the European presence

in Iran as manifested through the appropriation of the position of the other, the Teheran's working class photographic self-exoticization in the figure of a dervish. In determining possible reasons for the creation of such photographic imagery, Behzad talks about Iranian modernization in the 1960s and the simultaneous racial and class oppression.

The magazine opens and closes with the work of Jasmina Cibic who imagines the appearance of two extinct types of roses. The reasons for their disappearance in the second half of the 20th century are their racist names [for more see below ↓]. This work, along with others published in this issue, indicates, however, the fact that by simply removing racist speech from public communication, or by removing statues of racists and colonists, we cannot unburden ourselves of the past nor solve the problem of society's contemporary racism. In this, as with every other struggle for social justice and equality, it is necessary to know and understand the reasons and mechanisms behind, its longevity at all levels of various societies worldwide, and its connection with material living conditions, in order to contribute to the new antiracist epistemological foundations. It is our hope that the articles and work contained in this issue contribute to the construction of a more complex approach to various forms and manifestations of colonial heritage and contemporary anticolonial stances on the semi-periphery of Europe.

[↓]

Illustrations on the inside of the front and back covers of the magazine are an adapted work by Jasmina Cibic from the series *Ornamental Rash* (2018). The racist names of the roses, which are an integral part of the work, are omitted. The illustrations were created in collaboration with botanical illustrator Beatriz Inglessis.

Nigger Boy Rose
(R. Hennessy, 1931),
inkjet print on cotton paper,
100 x 70 cm

Gypsy Rose
(Van Rossem, 1931),
inkjet print on cotton paper,
100 x 70 cm

1 Apart from the official statement of the Ministry of Culture and Media of the Republic of Croatia, this event triggered numerous texts, analyses and statements from scientists, culture workers and politicians, as well as two online public panels. For an overview of articles on the subject see: "Public discussion on Ivan Meštrović's Indians sculptures in Chicago", *Historiografija.hr*, 15 March 2021, URL: <https://historiografija.hr/?p=25408>

2 See, for example: Katarina Kušić, Philipp Lottholz, Polina Manolova, "From dialogue to practice: Pathways towards decoloniality in Southeast Europe", *дБЕСИЯ*, special issue: *Decolonial Theory & Practice in Southeast Europe* (2019), 3. URL: <https://dialoguingposts.files.wordpress.com/2019/03/special-issue.pdf>

3 Ljubomir Micić, *Barbarogenije civilizator*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 1993, URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HeNk5EQjOrs>

4 Ana Sladojević herself researches the subject of race within the region of Yugoslavia, examining and contextualizing history and contemporary use of the Museum of African Art's collection in Belgrade. See: Ana Sladojević, *Museum of African Art, Contexts and Representations*, Muzej afričke umjetnosti, Belgrade, 2014, URL: http://mau.rs/images/publications/Epublications/Muzej_africke_umetnosti_konteksti_i_reprezentacije/Ana_Sladojevic_Muzej_africke_umetnosti_konteksti_i_reprezentacije.pdf; Ana Sladojević, "Anticolonial representation at the Museum of African Art", TrAIN Open Live Event, April 2021, URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GvnbxEHO-Sg>

5 Fokus Grupa made a research on Rijeka's considerable progress, whose basis was a monopoly on refining sugar imported from Caribbean cane plantations. Fokus Grupa, "A Room with a landscape: Vedute from the Palace of the Privileged Company of Trieste and Rijeka", *ARTMargins* (2021), 10(1): 77-92., URL: <https://direct.mit.edu/artm/article/10/1/77/100605/A-Room-with-a-landscape-Vedute-from-the-Palace-of>

6 See: Aníbal Quijano, "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality", *Cultural Studies* (2007) 21:2-3: 168-178.

7 The artist Naeem Mo-haiemen, in collaboration with Uroš Pajović, in the art section of *ARTMargins* has even more directly pointed out the issue analyzing Tito's self-confident statement prompted by the division of Pakistan in 1971: "There will be no Balkan question ever again in the world." Uroš Pajović, Naeem Mo-haiemen, "Southward and Otherwise", *ARTMargins* (2019), 8 (2): 79-89., URL: <https://direct.mit.edu/artm/article/8/2/79/18089/Southward-and-Otherwise>