

Reception without Receptivity: *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* in the Region of Former Yugoslavia

Đurđa Trajković and Marjan Ivković
Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, Belgrade

1. Introduction: the ambiguity of *Race, Nation, Class* in the post-Yugoslav region

This paper analyzes the reception of Étienne Balibar's and Immanuel Wallerstein's *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* in the region of former Yugoslavia (Balibar and Wallerstein, 1991). Paraphrasing a definition of modern racism as “racism without races” that Étienne Balibar uses in the book, we try to show that the engagement with this seminal work in the post-Yugoslav space can be understood as “reception without receptivity”. While a number of authors from the region do refer to the study, a comprehensive and productive engagement with it exists only in traces.

How should one explain such limited reception of a book, whose thematic field could not have been more relevant for the former Yugoslavia over the last three decades? Why has the study, which offers a nuanced conceptual apparatus for analyzing the breakup of Yugoslavia and the role of nationalism in the region's modern history, not attracted more attention of the regional scholars of nationalism and Yugoslav disintegration? To begin tackling these questions, one should take into account two principal factors: some characteristics of the regional academic environment, particularly the two dominant paradigms of studying nationalism in the former Yugoslavia and the traumatic experiences of the 1990s.

The first paradigm could broadly be defined as “normative universalism”, and is characterized by a predominantly *culturalist* analytical framework and a *proceduralist* (liberal) normative orientation, which posits a binary division of “universalism” and “particularism”, often concretized through the opposition of “modern and “traditional”. When the two dimensions – culturalism and proceduralism – combine, an explanatory framework takes shape which tends to define the post-Yugoslav space and its modern history as that of a constant struggle between “normative particularism” (ethnic nationalism and traditionalism) and various attempts to overcome it (the creation of first Yugoslavia, the “failed” socialist modernization, attempts to

build liberal democracies in the region in the aftermath of the 1990s catastrophe, etc.). The Marxist, yet non-reductionist optic of Balibar's and Wallerstein's approach to the phenomena of racism, nationalism and sexism is in no small part devoted to problematizing the notion of Western normative universalism, and, as such, understandably does not resonate particularly well with the above outlined paradigm of societal analysis.

Another analytical frame of regional self-reflection combines the explanatory perspective of *economism* in the study of the region's history with normative *substantivism* (a vision of the good society “thicker” than liberal democracy such as classical socialism, radical democracy, etc.) the two dimensions usually brought together in one or another form of Neo-Marxist analysis. The “economistic” paradigm has (re)emerged over the last decade and a half through a criticism of the culturalist/proceduralist standpoints in which the latter played the role of a “constitutive other”. Whereas the liberal culturalists tend to see normative particularism - traditionalism, ethnic nationalism and the lack of modernization - as the dominant traits of the ex-Yugoslav social reality, various economistic analyses seek to uncover the structural conditions of the region's traumatic history – above all the restoration and consolidation of peripheral capitalism, justified through the discourse of economic “transition”¹. Should one not reasonably expect, then, that the representatives of the economistic paradigm would welcome a study such as *Race, Nation, Class*, which investigates the manifold ways in which nationalism, racism and sexism function as productive factors in contemporary capitalism?

Post-Yugoslav economism, however, exhibits a relative lack of nuance, a tendency to reduce phenomena such as nationalism, racism, and sexism to their role in the legitimization of capitalism, i.e. the masking of the real relations of power and antagonisms within social reality. The Neo-Marxist perspective of Balibar and Wallerstein, in contrast, considers the denominators

1 Three articles by regional authors that refer to *Race, Nation, Class* in a very cursory manner exemplify the two paradigms. The first is Vlasta Jalušić's 2008 “Post-totalitarian Elements and Eichmann's Mentality in the Yugoslav War and Mass Killings”, which interprets the Yugoslav wars through the optic of “tribal nationalism” as the embodiment of particularism. Jalušić argues that “tribal nationalisms show a general trend: every nationalism, be it defensive or whatever, indulges in racism, in fact, if and when it denies universal equality and common humanity” (Jalušić, 2008: 6). A similar optic of “deeply ingrained” forms of normative particularism as the causes of Yugoslav wars features in Rusmir Mahmutćehajić's 2014 paper dealing with Bosnia “Tabu i njegovi žreci: o nacionalizmu, rasizmu i orijentalizmu” (Taboo and its Sorcerers: on Nationalism, Racism and Orientalism”). Mahmutćehajić notes that “even when Yugoslav communists worked together with chetniks in starting the uprising, the relation towards Muslims as Turks was not significantly altered. Deeply ingrained in the popular consciousness, this relation was reflected in the perceptions of the uprising's leaders and participants” (Mahmutćehajić, 2014: 132). The third, economistic example of reception that makes a cursory reference to the study is the Croatian philosopher Marijan Krivak's 2014 paper “Totalitarizmi danas: od izvanrednog stanja do 'društva znanja’” (Totalitarianisms Today: from the State of Exception to the “Information Society”). Krivak's economism is framed by Deleuze's and Agamben's perspectives: “Capitalism is unthinkable without the constantly self-perpetuating crises. Capital as the 'subject-substance', in Deleuzian terms, is constantly de-territorializing and re-territorializing, which makes it a totalitarian frame for the society of total control” (Krivak, 2014: 267).

of “race”, “nation” and “class” in their dialectical interplay, treats them as co-constituents of the simultaneously symbolic and economic reproduction of the world-system, and does not reduce the quest for normative universalism to its ideological function in capitalism. Balibar and Wallerstein paint a complex, ambivalent picture of the emancipatory potentials and systemic instrumentalization of what Jürgen Habermas has called the “normative legacy of modernity” (Habermas, 1990), thus reducing the study’s capacity to play the role of an economic “corrective” to the regionally prevalent culturalism. The almost complete ignoring of *Race, Nation, Class* by local Marxists has resulted in the practical non-existence of the problematic of “class” in the reception of the book. One notable exception to this trend is the Serbian-Hungarian philosopher Alpar Lošonc (Lošonc, 2012), who refers to Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s study, and whose article we briefly analyze in the next section.

When one turns one’s attention to the regional authors who refer to the study, the question arises whether one can identify certain characteristics of their perspectives that would explain their shared “receptivity” for the book, and whether this would be enough to consider them representatives of a nascent “third paradigm” of regional self-reflection. A good starting point might be to look at the aspects of the study that figure most prominently in the local reception.

2. Neo-racism from Slovenia to Macedonia: fragments of reception

To date, no systematic analysis of Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s seminal work has appeared in the region of former Yugoslavia – Gordan Maslov’s 2008 review, actually a review of both *Race, Nation, Class* and Michael Hardt’s and Antonio Negri’s *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, is the only piece that thematizes the book in the narrow sense of the term. Only three of the papers that otherwise refer to the book engage with Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s work in more than a fleeting manner: Renata Salecl’s 1995 paper titled “The Ideology of the Mother Nation in the Yugoslav Conflict in Envisioning Eastern Europe”, Dragan Kujundžić’s 2012 “Rasa, dekonstrukcija, kritička teorija” (Race, Deconstruction, Critical Theory), and Asim Mujkić’s “Zamišljanje nacionaliteta na Zapadnom Balkanu u tri čina” (“Imagining Nationality in the Western Balkans in Three Acts”, Mujkić, 2013). The remaining pieces of reception range from one-sentence cursory references to equally preliminary and fragmented attempts to use the work in the analysis of particular phenomena within the region.

Most of the analyzed papers do not fit neatly into the two mentioned paradigms; the papers articulate a generally more nuanced view of the role of nationalism in both the historical and contemporary dynamics of the region than both “universalism” and economism. As our analysis shows, these articles do exhibit a sufficient degree of mutual affinity to present the contours of a “third paradigm”. One defining trait of the book’s regional reception is the almost

exclusive attention devoted to the first chapter, “Is there a Neo-Racism?”, the exceptions being Gordan Maslov's review and Lošonc's, Mujkić's and Kujundžić's articles. The second, more important common trait could perhaps best be defined as a “methodological sensitivity” that differs from both the culturalism of the “universalist” paradigm and rigid economism of the Neo-Marxist one: a focus on the *tracing of the specific production of various discourses within the region* (such as literature, politics, law, architecture), a method nevertheless permeated by one specific obsession that has marked the past two decades in the region: namely, the problematic of *identity*.

Damir Arsenijević's (Arsenijević, 2011) article on post-war Bosnia is among the clearest examples of the mentioned methodological sensitivity. The paper could be interpreted along the lines of an implicit dialogue with some unanswered questions posed by Balibar's and Wallerstein's book. While Balibar has proposed “practical humanism as anti-racism”, Arsenijević's article proposes that art and poetry are a place where to enact such politics as a way to deactivate the reification of the victims' bones. Focusing on the politics of memory in the aftermath of the war in Bosnia, Arsenijević argues that the bodies that are exhumed, counted, associated, and managed are labeled as *ethnic* remains by forensic sciences (multiculturalist post-conflict management, politics of reconciliation and religious rituals). He offers a counter-discourse arguing that the bones belong to all of us and that the emancipated process of becoming a subject can only take place when the subject is freed from the shackles of a victim position or any other position that is merely focused on the interests of a particularist identity. While being critical of both nationalists and anti/nationalists (whose perspective amounts to little more than “complaining and blaming”), Arsenijević suggests that the problem with us/them binary is that it is an attempt to saturate the political, to present this binary struggle as the only one — i.e. it is an attempt to foreclose the political.

Balibar's arguments assume a more prominent role in Asim Mujkić's study of ethnonationalism in the modern history of Bosnia (Mujkić, 2013). Mujkić's reference to the book makes use of Balibar's arguments regarding the constitution of *identity*. By combining Balibar's argument from “The Nation Form: History and Ideology” about the “twofold illusion” that grounds the temporal continuity of a nation with Judith Butler's perspective, Mujkić seeks to understand the complexity of this process through the example of Bosnia and Herzegovina and explore how the naturalization of the “ethnopolis” underpinned the constitution and development of the “fiction” of a homogenous nation-state in Bosnia from the XVIIIth to the end of XXth century. Mujkić moves away from an understanding of an ambiguous relation between racism and nationalism, particularism and universalism in order to reveal a paradox of the so-called *Balkanization*. In a desire to dismantle the myth of “Balkanization” as something specific to the region, Mujkić will argue that there was nothing Balkan about it, but rather, affirming Balibar's thinking, it was a profoundly European invention (Mujkić, 2013: 45). The most important contribution of Mujkić's thinking is that it supplements Balibar's argument by focusing specifically on the influence of the ideology of language, literature, history, philosophy, law and

politics, that is Humanities, in the making of the ideology of ethnonationalism which predates the arrival of capitalism and the creation of bourgeoisie.

For Balibar, however, it is the *return to class*, or class struggle within an ideology based on new language and new words, that is the precondition for an effective anti-racism and anti-nationalism. The condition of the possibility of class struggle is not the replacing of one ideology with another (multiethnic society and heterogeneity instead of homogeneity and ethnopolis) but the destruction of the racist complex which presupposes not only the revolt of its victims but the transformation of the racists themselves, that is, the internal decomposition of the community created by racism and the breaking up of the community of males. While Mujkić's analysis is a complex attempt at a recuperation of an ideal past and lost heterogeneity as specific to the Balkans, Balibar warns us precisely about the danger of such “restorative unity”, itself a trait of differential racism.

In another multi-ethnic regional context, that of contemporary Macedonia, Natasha Sardzoska relies, in “Mapping and Homogenization of Memory”, on Balibar’s argument that identity is never individual but rather built on the basis of social values, norms of behavior and symbols, and mobilizes it as a framework to critically address the Macedonian political elites’ revisionism and the reinvention of the urban landscape, now infused with nationalistic affiliation and identification (Sardzoska, 2016). Through the example of Skopje, Sardzoska seeks to understand the double movement of the historical necessity to build national emblems of extreme patriotism and megalomaniac projects of imperial hegemony, to critically evaluate the societal complexities and capitalist contradictions within contemporary Macedonia. Showing how the erasure of the socialist past has led to revisionism and systematic obliteration of everyday experiences, Sardzoska explores the change that happened by looking at how architecture participates in creating emotional cartographies within arbitrary maps. To the erasure of memory, she proposes that architecture should reinvent history, nourish closeness not conflict, proximity not removal, sense of togetherness not intrusion of usurpation, rethink present instead of smuggling the past neo-baroque of space, negotiate belonging (Sardzoska, 2016: 157). While relying on Balibar’s understanding of identity, Sardzoska supplements it with the change that has happened within neoliberal Macedonia. By denouncing the erasure of the past, however, she falls into a trap of ignoring the ambiguities of her own proposal. If Balibar’s argument is that at the heart of change and transformation lies class struggle, it is difficult to see how closeness, proximity, and togetherness are not only the logic of neoliberal ideology, but, even more dangerously, point to the erasure of politics, resistance, and change in the name of quietism, resignation and sentimentality

Apart from Renata Salecl, whose article is analyzed in the next section, Slovenian authors who refer to *Race, Nation, Class* use the concept of neo-racism as an analytical tool for social research in a relatively strict sense of the term. Veronika Bajt’s research article “The Muslim Other in Slovenia” seeks to use Balibar’s argument to consider the anti-Muslim attitudes that she finds in relation to wider socioeconomic and political exclusionary practices in contemporary

Slovenia (Bajt, 2008). Bajt argues that such discrimination is related to the practicing of Islam in Slovenia which reduces the Other to nationalistic, Islamophobic and racist classifications. However, Bajt argues that the main difference compared to the West is that, while differential racism is based on the impossibility of overcoming cultural differences, the “Muslimness” is accepted in Slovenia as part of the identity and tolerated as long as it remains secluded in the private sphere (Bajt, 2008: 310). The fact that the Muslims remain associated with lower social classes, whose educational levels are below average, renders their position one of a multiple minority, based on religion, ethnicity and class. Bajt concludes that while Muslims are tolerated, they are at the same time discriminated, excluded and victims of prejudice. Bajt’s study is informative, yet it does not seem to grasp the extent to which Balibar’s argument could be useful for extending the critique to her own method, for Bajt reinforces to some extent the logic of differential racism by positing that “policy solutions”, that is, more intervention by the State in its regulations of the relations with the Other, is necessary.

Slovenian anthropologist Nina Vodopivec uses an example from an intercultural workshop to argue for intercultural understanding in “Challenging Global Citizenship through Interculturality”, criticizing the notion of “global citizenship” and “multiculturalism” as reproducing the inclusion/exclusion divide and being essentialist (Vodopivec, 2012). Drawing on Balibar’s argument that cultures can lock people into static identities, the article proposes to forge new forms of solidarity, make victims visible and discuss shared oppression as a way of challenging and destabilizing power. Vodopivec argues for a “care of representation”, she urges the readers to “tell different stories” that can reveal how political economy is racialized, and thus overcome the dichotomies of us/them, bridge gaps and offer new alliances (Vodopivec, 2012: 62).

One exception to the prevailing focus on the problematic of neo-racism and identity constitution at the cost of other aspects of *Race, Nation, Class* is found in Serbia: namely, Alpar Lošonc's article “Late Capitalism, Europeanization: Dusk of Multiculturalism, or Something Else?” (Lošonc, 2012). Lošonc's main argument both challenges and expands some of the generalizations posited by Balibar, by displacing the question of racism, not in relation to nationalism, but to the State, neoliberalism and the normative assumptions of the social conditions under which it occurs. Lošonc is the only author in the region who touches upon the book's neglected analytic dimension of *class*. For Lošonc, modern racism is not only a relationship with the Other based on a perversion of cultural and sociological difference, but it is a relationship *mediated by the intervention of the state* (Lošonc, 2012: 63). It is a conflictual action-orientation which is lived distortedly and projected as a relationship with the Other. Rejecting “heavenly ethics”; Lošonc treats the conventional multiculturalism as a form of culturalist reductionism (the focus only on culture without economy), which lacks the capacity to dissect the elements of power. Despite Lošonc’s maintaining that multiculturalism is necessary, he wishes to offer a political reading of its demise, arguing that neoliberalism needs nationalism as a form of mobilization to establish itself. In proximity to Balibar, Lošonc reads neoliberalism,

an “acculturation regime” in his terms, as that which creates individualization and de-individualizes at the same time, all the while being dependent on a strong state (ibid: 67). While he argues that colonialism did respect diversity and, at the same time, it did not provide much in the way of emancipation, he concludes by advocating for a more “political” understanding of culture.

Contemporary Croatia witnessed the only instance of the reception of *Race, Nation, Class* in the full sense of the term: Gordan Maslov’s 2008 book review, which combines the analysis of *Race, Nation, Class* with Hardt’s and Negri’s *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Maslov, 2008), tries to explain the significance of Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s analysis of the interrelation between race, class, and nation for the contemporary world-system. Maslov explores the most salient arguments, suggesting that the book gains more importance for us today when the very thinking of globalization has entered the stage of theoretical reflection. Underlying ambiguities, contradictions, and paradoxes, Maslov suggests that the most important contribution of post-Marxist reading is the structural understanding of hierarchical divisions within the global capitalist economy and its relation to the problem of universality that is inextricably intertwined with the reproduction of racism and nationalism. Maslov’s reading, even though rather generous with the book, misses a great opportunity for inquiry into the importance of the book for the regional context or Croatia. What would be the similarities and differences of the way racism and nationalism are posited in the region? Is Balibar’s critique productive to understand the Yugoslav wars? Understandably constrained by the form of a book review, Maslov does not explore possible avenues for a productive appropriation of the study in the Croatian or ex-Yugoslav context.

4. Elements of productive appropriation between psychoanalysis and deconstruction

As exemplified by the above articles, the nascent third paradigm of societal analysis in the ex-Yugoslav region is characterized by two common traits: the refusal to reduce nationalism and neo-racism, either to the ideological layering of capitalism or to the manifestations of normative particularism; and, second, a methodological orientation that we dubbed the “tracing of specific production of discourses”, best exemplified by Mujkić’s, Arsenijević’s and Sardzoska’s papers. The two traits, however, are combined most fruitfully within those points of reception that go beyond a cursory engagement with *Race, Nation, Class* and attempt one or another form of productive appropriation. One can identify elements of such preliminary productive appropriation in Renata Salecl’s and Dragan Kujundžić’s articles, each proposing a synthesis of Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s perspective with alternative (yet potentially complementary) traditions, those of psychoanalysis and Derridean deconstruction.

Renata Salecl’s 1995 article “The Ideology of the Mother Nation in the Yugoslav Conflict”, the first reference to the book in the region, combines the two authors’ Marxist perspective with Lacanian psychoanalysis. Salecl’s reading underlines Balibar’s insight that

contemporary racism, that of the 1990's, works as a "natural" determinative force, assuming the form of a metaracism that perceives cultures as fixed entities and desiring to maintain cultural distances. Salecl makes a powerful argument, combining psychoanalytical reading and Balibar's insights to show that, in the case of the Bosnian war, what was mystified is the direct failure of the West to understand the political dynamic of the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Salecl suggests that Yugoslavia's symbolic death happened several times before the war: naming Yugoslavia a "floating signifier", she underlines that each moment in the modern history of Yugoslavia (when it granted autonomies, changed constitution) marked a symbolic death, a fracture within the symbolic order that Yugoslavia was (Salecl, 1995: 91-92).

Salecl's reading supplements Balibar's perspective by asking two questions: how can war distort all human relations until only national identification prevails, and what is the logic of war (Salecl, 1995: 93)? Drawing on Elaine Scarry's argument (Scarry, 1985) and exploring the notion of fantasy, Salecl suggests that the aim of war is to dismantle the "fantasy structure" of the enemy country, to destroy its self-perception and the ways in which the latter structures its identity. Salecl explores the role of fantasy in the political discourse of Slobodan Milošević, suggesting that the success of his discourse lies in balancing what he said and left unspoken, leaving it to the addressee to "surmise" the unspoken, i.e. fill in the meaning with fantasy (ibid: 98-99). She argues that the success of Milošević, but also success of any neoconservative populist ideology, rests on the distance between ideological meaning (the return to the values, the self made man, etc.) and the level of racist and sexual fantasy that, although unmentioned, function as a way in which the addressee deciphers the symbolism of the ideological statement.

Salecl suggests that one thing that can be learned from Lacanian psychoanalysis is that politics without fantasy is an illusion. She argues for two ways in which intellectuals should address this problem: one is to keep open the distance between ideological meaning and its addressee. The dilemma of democratic politics is not how to replace one fantasy with the other or to prevent the articulation of racist fantasies. Salecl proposes something more radical and more difficult – to create a political space in which those racist fantasies would have no real effect. Salecl's arguments to some extent function as a supplement for materialism of the kind practiced by Balibar and Wallerstein. One might argue that one partial limit of materialism's concerns its ability to perform the "politics of separation" proposed by Salecl's analysis - one should not then understand a relation between psychoanalysis and materialism along the friend/enemy line, but as a possible novel articulation which "contaminates" both fields of inquiry.

Finally, one of the most interesting pieces the analyst of the regional reception comes across is Dragan Kujundžić's short piece from 2012, "Rasa, dekonstrukcija, kritička teorija" (Race, Deconstruction, Critical Theory). The only piece of post-Yugoslav reception alongside Maslov's that does not thematize the region itself, the article presents a reflection on a conference that took place at UC Irvine in 2003 titled "tRace", which brought theorists of race such as Achille Mbembe, Nahum Chandler and Kendall Thomas together with Jacques Derrida as the representative of deconstruction and Étienne Balibar as the "pre-eminent representative of

critical theory” in the words of Kujundžić (who was the conference’s principal organizer). The conference’s plenary session saw the debate between Derrida and Balibar on racism entitled “Election/Selection”. Kujundžić’s paper presents the most concise and comprehensive reflection on *Race, Nation, Class* within the regional reception, and explores its affinities with Derrida’s perspective on racism. Kujundžić’s ability to synthesize the three dimensions of Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s analysis – that of race, nation and class – is perhaps best exemplified in the following concise reflection:

“Thus the racial classification becomes a symptom of the class struggle of the subjugated races, those that are not the dominant, white race. This strategy which, on the one hand, traces the origin of races to the language of the universal conversion and theology, and, on the other, to the Enlightenment and bourgeois capitalism, has allowed Balibar and Wallerstein to treat race not just as an essentialized product of racist imagination, but also as the result of the movement of Western philosophy in the age of capitalism and colonialism” (Kujundžić, 2012: 245).

For Kujundžić, the “innovative forcefulness” of *Race, Nation, Class* consists above all in the non-essentializing approach to the concept of race, one that is always tied to the material, political and philosophical conditions that define modernity through the interplay of race and class, the “interaction of certain processes of selection and choosing” (Kujundžić, 2012: 246). Kujundžić’s reflection on the possibility for synthesizing Balibar’s and Derrida’s insight thus centres around both perspectives’ stress on the constitutive role of *theory* for racism, as Western metaphysics has, according to both authors, always possessed a certain “epistemological impulse” to exclude.

5. Conclusion

The question that remains concerns the limited reception, or rather, receptivity, of even the “third-paradigm” authors in the region for Balibar’s and Wallerstein’s study – namely, why does even this type of analysis make relatively limited use of the book’s analytical potentials? By way of conclusion, we suggest that the limited receptivity of these authors has to do with the relatively strong *postmodernist sensitivity* that can be identified in most of them, which creates a certain discrepancy between the positivist and macro-structural perspective of Balibar and Wallerstein and the “third-paradigm” authors’ epistemologically and methodologically more ambiguous positioning. To outline this discrepancy in as concise a way as possible, one might try to anticipate some questions that the third-paradigm authors could pose to Balibar and Wallerstein: for example, could it not be that those engaged in class struggle are also racists and sexists? Would not the abolishing of frontiers mean a relentless expansion of the world of One, world without heterogeneity? Could one argue that, while in the previous epochs there were politics of racism, it is not until modernity and capitalism that race, sex, and nation became plastic and elusive concepts, institutionalized and impossible to destroy. One could then suggest that capitalism, the constitution of modern sciences and division of labor in the modern nation-

state simply intensified all these processes, practices, and discourses, which were already nascent in ancient Greece. The above mentioned paper by Dragan Kujundžić, for example, relies precisely on Derrida's reflections on Balibar's approach to racism in his response to "Election/Selection", pointing out that, for Derrida, the impulse to racialize goes back to the very founding of philosophy and the formulation of "metaphysical oppositions, hierarchies and differences" (Kujundžić, 2012: 248).

These difficult questions are not straightforwardly answered by Balibar and Wallerstein, although both authors agree that the phrase "we are all racists" will not suffice. While both Balibar and Wallerstein insist on not falling for the image of the "pure consciousness" of intellectuals, their theoretical elaboration does not offer a great variety of tools, practices or guidance as to resistance except for "practical humanism". The perspectives analyzed in this paper suggest, together with *Race, Nation, Class*, that the main question still haunts us: how to destroy the racist and sexist complex? Or better yet, is it possible to destroy it? Paradoxically, it is here that the Yugoslav reception might be seen as a productive supplement to the book, as it offers some concrete examples that we have very briefly reflected upon.

Bibliography

Reception of Race, Nation, Class (by country)

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Arsenijević, Damir (2013) "Gendering the Bone: The Politics of Memory in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Journal for Cultural Research* 15:2: 193-205.

Jalušić, Vlasta (2008) "Post-Totalitarian Elements and Eichmann's Mentality in the Yugoslav War and Mass Killing," *Startseite*, 4:1.

Mahmutćehajić, Rusimir (2014) "Tabu i njegovi žreci: o nacionalizmu, rasizmu i orijentalizmu," *Godišnjak BZK "Parobrod"* XIV: 128:150

Mujkić, Asim (2013) "Zamišljanje nacionaliteta na Zapadnom Balkanu u tri čina" *Dijalog*: 1-2/03

Croatia

Krivak, Marijan (2014) "Totalitarizmi danas: od Izvanrednog stanja do "društva znanja," *Dani praktične filozofije*: 263-283

Maslov, Gordan (2008) "Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire," *Diskrepancija* 8:13: 146-157.

Macedonia

Sardzoska, Natasha (2016) "Mapping and Homogenization of Memory: from Urban Reinvention of the City of Skopje towards Conflicting Narratives of Porosities in the Spatial-Historical Landscape" u *Interpretacija Jugoslevnskih sukoba i njihove posledice: izmedju sustinskog dijaloga i neslaganja*. Fakultet Politickoh Nauka i Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst: Beograd,.

Serbia

Lošonc, Alpar (2012) "Late Capitalism, Europeanization? Dusk of Multiculturalism, or Something Else?" in *Challenges of Multiculturalism*, Heinrich Boll Foundation, Regional Office for Southeastern Europe: Belgrade.

Kujundžić, Dragan (2012) "Rasa, dekonstrukcija, kritička teorija," *Interkulturalnost* 4: 242-252.

Slovenia

Salecl, Renata (1995) "The Ideology of the Mother Nation in the Yugoslav Conflict in Envisioning Eastern Europe" edited by Michael D. Kennedy, in *Postcommunist Cultural Studies*, University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

Bajt, Veronika (2011) "The Muslim Other in Slovenia. Intersections of a Religious and Ethnic minority" in *Muslims in Poland and Eastern Europe: Widening the European Discourse on Islam*. Katarzyna Gorak-Sosnowska. University of Warsaw: Warszawa.

Vodopivec, Nina (2012) "Challenging global citizenship through interculturality: Crossing borders and practicing solidarity," *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices* 6:1: 88-100.

Other sources

Balibar, Étienne and Wallerstein, Immanuel (1991) *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, Verso: London.

Habermas, Jürgen (1990) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*, MA: The MIT Press: Cambridge.

Scarry, Elaine (1985) *The Body in Pain*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.