

Natalja ZAMKOVAYA*Vinnitsia trade and economic Institute the Kyiv national trade and economic University
zamkovaya76@mail.ru*

About Some Aspects of “Colonial Racism”

ABSTRACT

Current article is dedicated to the issues of racism as one of the most important factors of language-cultural discrimination. Basic ideas of postcolonial racism and the phenomenon of post-modernism in racism study have been analyzed. Foreign and Ukrainian scientists' views upon the modern phenomenon of multiculturalism and its place in the modern philosophy have been evaluated. Natural-biological and theoretical characteristics of the category of “Differences”, including the total bellicose culture of relations between the “majority” and “minority”, have been scrutinized. In this article it has been studied that fixation of “racism” definite autonomy from “nationalism” gives possibility for creating the assumption of the “nationalism’s” probable existence without racism. Besides, the possibility of double identity within nationalism has been examined.

Key words: *colonial racism, neo-racism, postcolonial racism, cultural racism, migrant, post-modernism, multiculturalism, category of “Differences”, double identity, nationalism.*

While analyzing the phenomenon of racism as one of the most important factors of language-cultural discrimination, we appeal to the modern racism type of “colonial racism” known as “neo-racism” or “postcolonial racism”, for which more implicit operation of discrimination strategies is more characteristic than for “colonial racism”. Among modern researchers, the biggest contribution to this subject development was made by French scientist E.Balibar, whose point of view will be fundamental in our current issue. Besides, some ideas of CIS countries scientists seem remarkable too. One of them is Russian scholar V.Malahov, who, unlikely E.Balibar, concentrated on analyzing racism manifestations on Russian ground (although he was relying on some notable theoretical notions). These notions are similar to E.Balibar’s concepts to some extent, which proves that the total paradigm of these concepts has been composed. These common notions can be combined into three following items. Firstly, author’s considering of the ethnic element in the process of the national community formation, including the factor of the possible “ethnos reduction” as a “quasi natural community” (Malahov, 2007, p. 23).

Secondly, V.Malahov identifies the essence of racism from the point of view of “ethnic substrate”, which composes the basis for the differentiations’ logic as fundamental for racism. (This logic’s Postulate denotes, in fact, the notion of the Stranger or Alien as the object of racism discrimination). Thirdly, from Russian scientist’s point of view — “racism is concerned with fastening connections between differences and dominating” (Malahov, 2007, p. 82).

Developing this idea, the author underlines: “Racism is one of the strategies of removal. The mechanism of removal — is a fundamental social mechanism, and removal should underline the definite ideological background (Malahov, 2007, p. 84)”. And further he proves clearly, that such background has “quasi natural” image, as mentioned above. (At the same time he claims definitely the meaning of Russian racism based not on the “blood argument” but on the “civilization argument” (Malahov, 2007, p. 86)”, which supports our earlier statement concerning “civilization racism” species and Russian example as typical for this species).

Fourthly, V.Malahov’s vision on “postcolonial racism” is very close to E.Balibar’s view. For example, French scientist states about the “differentiation racism”, “meta racism”, “second position racism” as typical features of neo-racism and modified colonial principle (Malahov, 2007, p. 32). Besides he adds that for this type of racism purely biological or traditional criteria are not appropriate, leaving “cultural relevance” ahead. Therefore we consider it reasonable to make a definite remark as for ethnic-biological racism share being able to remain steady at any circumstances, while ethnos representatives generate corresponding cultures and for this reason they are responsible for these cultures.

This way E.Balibar gives examples of “Arabian phobia”, based upon world outlook, not compliant with the European one. In the phenomenon described above we deal with the typical mixture of “Arabian ethnos” with Islamic religion, which means — with cultural phenomenon. (We can interpret this mixture by the means of “concentration” operation, highlighted by Z.Freud for interpreting dreaming process). According to Z.Freud, reference on such mixture gives us possibility for “returning biological world” to the frame of “cultural racism”, which contradicts to some extent to its out coming concept of cultural racism independence from ethnic-biological substrate. These concepts precisely coincide with V.Malahov’s observations of modern racism being based on both “differentiation logic” and “difference logic” rather than on “inferiority logic” (Malahov, 2007, p. 82).

Finally, there is one feature — common for the both researchers — fixation of object colonial ethnos racism strategy alteration into the notion of migrant. So, E.Balibar underline “using migration category, which substitutes the notion of race, but on the other hand — leads to the decomposition of “class consciousness [3, 30]” as one of neo-racism characteristics. The author examines similar ideas in the phenomenon of “post-modernism”, which might appear in the age of globalization, according to his point of view, “where the borders will operate rather as the prevention measures” (Balibar, & Wallerstein, 2002, p. 30). The operation of “prevention” is exactly the support of the situation of “cultural equilibrium combination”, protection from stranger’s penetration to the definite community. V.Malahov also sticks to this idea in his paper “Pan Le Pen and others”, where he displays in the precisely judicial discourse “recoding the problem of social cooperation into the problem of cultural disposition (Malahov, 2007, p. 93)”. In this case, racism way of thinking results in switching off from the routine problems of social life to the problem of “cultures’ collision”. (Therefore, we can see that race discrimination, as for the body of migrant, is a kind of both colonial racism and cultural racism, and

their combination as well).

Concluding the tendency underlined above, Russian scientist classifies its subject as “the process of making migration ethnic”, as a result of its consideration in the field of ethnic-national discourse (Malahov, 2007, p. 104). The most significant drift on this article is the analysis of ideological and institutional foundations of racism migrants’ segregation. These foundations include: a) state and state-maintained social organizations, whose goal is “migrants’ problems solving”; b) institutions of residence and/ or registration; c) legislature, which blocks migrants’ possibilities in the process of their total socialization. Besides these analytic specialties, there is one more remarkable feature of V.Malahov’s research — comparative analysis, which demonstrates this tendency’s specific functioning in Germany and Russia. Conclusion, driven from this analysis, is highly important in the Ukrainian interlingua conditions, while the author confidently defines the difference between Germany as a European country (where the process of bringing ethnics and racism migration is milder) and Russia (where this tendency is fastening because of the nation’s idea as “community’s origin” dominating there (Malahov, 2007, p. 113).”). Specification characteristics of Russian national identity racism centre completely coincide with the characteristics analyzed above, dedicated to colonial and cultural racism in Russia (including its Ukrainians treatment manifestation).

Finally, the last type of colonial racism is the modern phenomenon of “multiculturalism”, which is practically not included to E. Balibar concept but it is comprehensively analyzed in the works of other authors. Taking into consideration correlation between multiculturalism and racism, we should pay attention to V.Malahov’s description of “multiculturalism” as the “variety of minor despotisms” in which the “carnival of heterogeneities finished with the cultivation of new homogeneities (Malahov, 2007, p. 153)”. Consequently, reasonable question arises — why is multiculturalism, which primarily seems categorically opposite racism, one of the forms of modern racism way of thinking?

In our current research we have no objectives to dwell into the problem of multiculturalism meaning, especially when there is no tendency for this ideology developing in Ukraine yet. That’s why we will deal with that phenomenon of multiculturalism, which helps to understand the “logic of modern consciousness racism” better. The key word, by means of which it is possible to follow the connection between multiculturalism and racism, is the “Difference”. But there is a contradiction that multiculturalism ideology carrier tries find himself his difference from other members of the community, which is used to call itself the “nation”, or, by other words, is doing what the carriers of the dominating culture do in the classical racism. The “Difference” possesses purely natural, “ethnic” characteristics and is often symbolized by the means of the “root” image (merely ontological category, which is more real than “nation” or “political nation”).

For example, modern American science nowadays is characterized by the real struggle around the problem of “root” seeking (the issue of the theoretical multiculturalism researcher A. Heilie). At first glance, such seeking is not bad, but practically this mythology hides racism basis of multiculturalism “Difference”. A. Heilie, quoted above, proves that seeking of such root for Afro-Americans means the project of “black culture” formation, which differs from “white culture”. (This peculiarity was successfully described in Y.Bayeva’s Ph.D. thesis “Problems of Ukrainian national consent in the context of historical-political analysis” (2011), and we support the basic conclusions of this analysis, though they have been made in the different theoretical discourse of solving the problem of national and social consent). In this thesis the author analyses J.Serl’s statement, famous philosopher, Indian by his ethnic origin, who demonstrated the technology of “cultural-group segregation” in multiculturalism.

J.Serl described this repressive tendency commenting the distribution of multiculturalism in the educational system: “Current idea doesn’t mean overcoming environmental accidents, brought to the University, but rather it means educational duty to confirm you in your racism, ethnic or sex identity, and that every group — or at least every primarily depressed group — must be represented in the humanities’ programs only as groups. That’s why, today you are not proposed to read huge literature pieces, whether native or foreign. Especially this idea looks very archaic. Instead, you are suggested to read “representative” pieces, such as novels, written by Afro-Americans or by the writers of north-eastern part of Pacific Ocean” (Serl, 2002, p. 38).

(We underlined the terms by which the author notes natural-biological characteristics of “Differences”, where race characteristics are accompanied by sex characteristics. Distracting aside from the subject matter of our current issue, we should mention, that “Difference” category dominating helps to understand not only the forms of ethnic and cultural identification, but also the identification of sex, which consequently helps to understand multiculturalism as the turned over pyramid of traditional relations between the “majority” and “minority”, as the total culture of bellicose any minority’s dominating over majority. (In the context we realize such phenomenon as feminism or homosexuals as derivatives from “Difference culture”, which occupied its position in the mythology of multiculturalism).

As a conclusion of our analysis of racism meaning of “multiculturalism” we would like to scrutiny S.Zhizhek’s idea: “Multiculturalism — is the disavowed, transformed self-referent form of racism, fixed distant racism, which respects the identity of the “Difference”, studies it as the encoded wholesome community, which he, the multiculturalism follower, supports on distance, that reflects his privileged universal position (Zhizhek, 2005, p. 110)“. So, this Slovenian researcher observes the difference between classic racism and multiculturalism as the difference between “colonial” and “cultural” imperialism, which he calls “auto colonization”.

And finally we should conclude our analysis of relations between “racism” and “neo-Nazi’s” as the factors of discriminative practices concerning definite ethnic and lingua-cultural groups of people. Analyzing different kinds of racism lets us state that racism is quite an autonomous phenomenon, which follows the national consciousness on the ethnic background but doesn’t exclude other conditions. As we mentioned before, in this research we discuss E.Balibar’s study about nationalism initiative, claiming that any national consciousness obligatory needs racial “addition”. (And that’s why the author makes conclusions that “racism” forms in “poly nationalism”). The disadvantage of E.Balibar’s concept encourages us to accepting closer for us H.Arendt’s concept, which analyses “racism / nationalism” relations in absolutely opposite perspective.

Besides, she underlines that the “outdated false explanation of racism as the kind of exaggerated nationalism” remains in the circulation. Developing this stereotype’s theory, H. Arendt notes: “It is true that racial way of thinking appeared on the arena of active policy at the moment when European nations prepared and realized their national sovereignty. Racism from the very beginning

has been contradicting national border, no matter on what criteria it's been distinguished, — geographical, lingual, ethnographical or any other, and moved aside the idea of anything national-political. The racial approach itself, has been an omnipresent shadow, which followed the development of European nation's wealth, while, finally, it turned into the terrifying weapon for these nations' destruction. From the historical point of view, racists' relation with patriotism is much worse than of any other representatives of all international ideologies as a whole, and they have been the only ones who consequently rejected the main principal of national organization — the principal of integrity and solidarity of all nations, guaranteed by the idea of humanity (Arendt, 1951, p. 206).

Fixation of "racism" definite autonomy from "nationalism" gives possibility for creating the assumption of the "nationalism's" probable existence without racism. Such nationalism mix can be as it follows "Ethnos minus segregation". No doubt, any mix of ethnic (or natural) meaning of national identification specifics, can't exist without the notion of a "Different", which is able to compose the basis for further segregation, in case if it is identified with the notion of a "Stranger". But accidents when such identifying doesn't occur and the concept of a "Different" are used only for separating some definite community from a similar community without a usual emotional xenophobia feeling.

Such accidents are not isolated among the variety of so called "protective nationalism", which can be aggressively bellicose but also can take moderate forms, limiting itself only by its existence law protection. E.Thomson describes this mentioned nationalism type speciality: "Protective nationalism characterizes such notions, created by common memory, which feel danger for themselves — or as a result of their little number (as, for example, Lithuanians, Georgians and Chechens), or because of danger from other expansive neighbors. Communities' ideas, for which such nationalism type is typical, are directed rather inside than outside, which lead to their being unable to build successful relations with the outside world. Protective nationalism is the means of resistance from the bellicose Different invasions to their identity, but it is very often interpreted as xenophobia or antisocial behavior. Such identifying is the demonstration of colonial declinations itself, as far as it pushes the Different to the Procrustean bed of discursive area, shaped by the mediators, who represent the major political efforts (Thomson, 2008, p. 32)". (It has been emphasized for the reason of defining the facts, which distinguish the typical relations character of protective nationalism with expansion nationalism type and colonial discourse.)

V.Zhabotinskyi's nationalism can be treated as a typical example of nationalism of this kind (type of world outlook without any discrimination and segregation aspects), which is highly interesting from the point of view of the described by us problems. Firstly, we should consider that the affiliation to the protective nationalism leads to the reduction of remarkable portion of the natural component in the ethnic version of its nationalism. For that reason the author claims: "For the one, who is Ukrainian by nationality, all the other connections with the tribe, race etc. may have only secondary meaning: the choice of culture is identified neither by the "race" nor by the "tribe" but by recognizing national affiliation (Zhabotinskyi, 1991, p. 66)".

Thereby, we see, that such type of nationalism, supported by the theoretic scientist, is not mostly natural-ethnic, but ethnic-cultural type of national identity project. Secondly, it is obviously directed against colonial nationalism (including Russian), and can be illustrated by aggressive anti-colonial, but not xenophobia character. In this struggle he is nearly the first who uses the term "Russification" in Ukrainian background as the tools of divesting the nation of its culture and as the instrument of colonial enslavement. He analyzes it in his brief paper "School Falsification", which is incredibly actual in Ukraine nowadays: "...Secondary comprehensive education has nothing in common with enlightenment or progress if it is not delivered to all population groups by the language, recognized by these groups' national culture (Zhabotinskyi, 1991, p. 54)".

Thirdly, V.Zhabotinskyi's nationalism is characterized by immense respect to the similar types of nationalism, which protect its culture and identity. This way he honors T.G.Shevchenko's memory and in his article "Shevchenko's Anniversary Study" appreciates him as the "national poet" and calls him the "congener". Particularly he wrote that T.G.Shevchenko is, first of all, national poet, and for this reason some irresistible manifestations of his aggressiveness towards other nations (Polish and Jews) can be forgiven. This evaluation obtains pathos, which is expressed in the demonstration of the Ukrainian soul's ability to "the highest take off of its origin cultural creativity"; besides it has become the "glaring precedent" which didn't let Ukrainians deviate from their "national Renaissance" road.

And finally, fourthly, the example given above confidently demonstrates that within such nationalism type the kind of double identity is possible, which means that the researcher simultaneously operates as the Zionism ideologist (as we have already mentioned, he was the ideologist of creating Israel state) and Ukrainian nationalism supporter. This fact firmly proves that the protective nationalism type often gains forms of nationalism without racism segregation. Besides, an exciting accident of double national identification of the previous century gives the example of identification projects, which developed in the end of the XX century. V.Malahov underlined, that "non classical" theories of citizenship and distribution of the "multiculturalism" practice demonstrate consequent reevaluation of national community. According to such concept, membership in the nation doesn't involve the only one identity (Malahov, 2007, p. 195).

Thereby, V.Zhabotinskyi has given the example of not only bellicose protective nationalism as Zionism, but also has become the first supporter of "cultural pluralism".

References:

1. Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Cleveland : World Pub. Co. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822390169-017>
2. Balibar, E., & Wallerstein, I. (2002). Sushhestvuet li neonacizm [Does "neo Nazism" exist]. *Rasa, nacija, klass. Dvusmyslennye identichnosti*. Moscow.
3. Malahov, V. (2007). *Ponaehali tut. Ocherki o natsionalizme, rasizme i kulturnom plyuralizme. [Ponaehali tut. Essays about nationalism, racism and cultural pluralism]*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
4. Serl, J.(2002). *Politics and Humanities Education. Domestic Letters*, 2002.
5. Thomson E. (2008). *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism*.
6. Zhabotinskyi, V. (1991). *Vibrani stat'i za natsionalnogo pitannya [Selected articles on national education]*. Kyiv.
7. Zhizhek, S. (2005). *The Interpassive Subject*.