

Hereby, a statement that depicts my wish to distance my self radically from Cecilia Sjöholm's text "Little Yid, Little Man, Little People: Arendt on Chaplin" which as a part of I Will Never Talk About the War Again catalog (Fargfabriken, Sept. 2011. pg. 15 - 18.) follows. In other words, this is why I withdrew my text.

Digest:

Distancing from the "Little Yid, Little Man, Little People: Arendt on Chaplin" text by Cecilia Sjöholm is needed on my behalf because the text implied that "Marxism and racism" (where the author stated "Why did marxism and racism [in the form of Nazism] win the battle of all - isms?")¹ should be or were treated as equal "totalitarian" projects which did not only name principle ideas of Marxism and utterly criminal core principles of racism (and nazism) as being the same, but it made, or tended to make relative the structural racism of today's liberal democratic capitalism, its neocolonial nature and ultimately its "free market" totalitarianism.

Elaboration:

As first, Sjöholm's text is unacceptable to me because it, almost immediately, in the title implied that the concept of "little people" is universal as a pretext to a proto-victim of totalitarian regimes, hence, equalizing "little people" in the First world and the Third world. Contemporary predicament of "Little people" in the Third world by far surpasses (in practical reality and in a degree of harshness of that reality) the predicament of the same people in the First world of capital and in most cases those predicaments were created by totalitarian neocolonial tendencies practiced exactly by the First world's liberal capitalism, not some uncanny "totalitarian" regime - more precisely, by capitalism and colonialism of the First world, not some shady -ism. As Sjöholm stated " If we are all suspects, or all refugees, who gets to dictate?" The implication of "all being in the same mess" does not stand as an argument in my opinion because the concept of "all being in the same trouble", as well as "universal predicament" of "little man" is extremely hard to pinpoint or arguably state in the context of global socio-political topology. Although it might sound simplistic, but there are those who got killed *en masse* and those who lose the possibility to get a job or, metaphorically said, to obtain latest edition of iPhone.

As second, putting "Marxism and racism" in the same context as if those were or are being mere "totalitarian" regimes is unacceptable by my self because I found such a statement to be a reflection of a lack

¹ Cecilia Sjöholm, *Little Yid, Little Man, Little People: Arendt on Chaplin* (I Will Never Talk About the War Again, Fargfabriken exhibition catalog, Stockholm, 2011.) pg. 16

of profound analysis of the fundamental distinctions between those ideologies. On the other hand, such equalizations (though not just in this particular case) might be seen in line with the representational practices exercised by contemporary European populist strategies and politics that, with more or less sophistication, rehabilitate fascism with liberal dimension under the guise of equalization of all "totalitarian ideologies."

Sjoholm's rhetorical question " Why did Marxism and racism (in the form of Nazism) win the battle of all - isms?" implied that some "battle of all - isms" existed, which is at best a frivolous point of approach to theory of ideology and as second, as stated, it seemed that "racism in the form of Nazism" to be a problem, but racism (neocolonial agenda's, racist immigration policies etc.) in the form of liberalism and hideous "democratic populism" does not seem to be a problem, nor it was tackled as "totalitarianism" in this text.

As third and final, it seems that the concept of "totalitarianism" in the text in matter is being conceived as the "totalitarianism of the state" (nation state or otherwise) pointed against "an individual."

In general, if the European populism (in majority of cases based on white Christian fundamentalism) and its strategy of making relative of the European genocidal colonial past, of Holocaust, of structural racism and utter tolerance of today's Israel's far - right government actions is not being tackled (in any serious text), liberal capitalist glorification of the "individual" should not be regarded as something "more socially or politically valuable" then being a mere ideological strategy. Hence, the neoliberal "liberation of an individual" should be seen and/or interpreted within a context of liberal capitalist dogma, as reading of Arendt (the suppression of individuality for an abstract idea of mankind), in general context, might have suggested.

After all, I recon and argument that every idea of mankind is abstract, but it is the politics, society and after all ideology in its core sense, not an individual, a refugee, family or a "little man," that make it into a political, sovereign, functional and more equal society.

Šefik Tatlić