
Consumption and Production as Forms of Resistance

Summary

Concept of the political appeared for the first time in Carl Schmitt's theory, implying the autonomy of political decision making specific in relation to other spheres of human actions such as economy and art. With the postmodern political theory, concept of the political starts to be used in combination with the notion of politics, as a sort of counterbalance to political power of established government and its efforts to fully master the society. One of the pioneers of postmodernism, Michel Foucault, believed that the resistance to totalitarian efforts of every politics is performed through caring of self (*souci de soi*), that is, through our individual action manifested as a sort of micropower and representing a counterbalance to official politics. That way, individual action represents the action which limits government's efforts to fully equate politics and social life. Thus, certain sorts of consumption, as one of the fundamental economic activities, can be interpreted as a sort of political activism. Consumption, as a resistance to official politics and economy, can in contemporary context be noticed in projects like slow-food nutrition, buying of second-hand products, rejecting to wear cloths made of fur, re-

jecting to purchase from socially irresponsible corporations. Political activism can be noticed in production as well, which can be seen in the examples of Marx's analyses of this activity. For Marx, only in communist epoch, production becomes an important activity because only then it is transformed from slavery work into a means through which individual capacities and senses are developed. In the communist epoch, with the abolition of private property, production becomes free and creative activity. In contemporary context, "free and creative production" can be perceived in the organic food production, use of already used materials when making cloths and furniture, hand-made production of cosmetic products, in so called home-made production. As it can be seen, consumption and production don't necessarily have to represent products of global capitalism and ways through which the control over the working class is performed. On the contrary, these economic practices can represent both a form of political actions and to, as a "postmodern" concept of the political, function as a means in struggle against domination of capitalism and politics' efforts to identify itself with the society.

Keywords: consumption, production, Marx, Foucault, resistance, the political

Political resistance of certain social groups towards official politics was always a way of correcting the power of authority. Throughout the history of modern politics people's tendency to transform itself from the status of subject to the position of citizen is visible, i.e. to equalize its political status with those in possession of political power. From Glorious via French bourgeois revolution people entered more and more into the space of politics gaining thus broader political rights. These political rights didn't only mean equality with the ruling elite but also a sort of possibility to establish antagonism between those having the political power and those who slowly start getting it and who use it to limit the power of the governing politics. One of the most significant discoveries of the modern political philosophy was the concept of civil society. It was introduced by John Locke in his *Two Treatises of Government* designating the group which limits the power of official politics. More concretely, for Locke "civil society" meant a group which participated in forming the government by contractual handing over the rights to the sovereign to govern the country getting in exchange the insurance to get basic natural rights (life, property, individual freedoms). Through this act, people both participated directly in forming the government but also transformed itself into civil society. At one place in *Two Treatises of Government* Locke defines civil society as one which is inconsistent with absolute monarchy (Hence, it is evident, that absolute monarchy, which by some men is counted the only government in the world, is indeed inconsistent with civil society, and so can be no form of civil government at all.) (Locke, 2003: 138) Civil society's entrance into the space of politics was to prevent the omnipotence of politics and its overall power over society. Throughout the history of politics and political theory, this concept has had more or less different versions of the same definition, but in essence, it meant giving the political power to the society and enabling it to correct power and actions of official politics.

The concept of civil society does not appear in Karl Marx's work, one of the reasons for that being his critical standing towards John Locke and the theory of liberalism. Because of that, in this

article the concept of civil society will be read as a category of working class, first of all because both civil society and working class are formed in the state of antagonism towards the ruling class. In the series of topics of Marx's social and political analysis, such as historical inferiority of the lower class (slaves, serfs and workers) and working class' struggle against the ruling structures (capitalists and potentates) it can be concluded that categories of resistance and struggle permanently appear in this thinker's theory. Namely, Marx understands the society as the category which has in history gone through several phases of its development: primordial communism, slavery, feudalism and capitalism. During the last three phases of its historical development, society is marked by the antagonism between the ruling and oppressed classes: "The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie" (Marx, Engels, 2008: 45). In this aspect of Marx's thought antagonism between working class and the government is important, however not as final victory of one part, but as a state of constant resistance or permanent revolution. It is in the lack of the state of constant resistance that the lack of contemporary democracy is hiding, because democracy is not simply giving the authority to everyone, but a constant state of resistance and possibility of questioning the authority's decisions and of limitation of its power.

In Karl Marx's works, beside class antagonism, community takes one of the central places of concern. Capitalist society is a historical form in which emerges the strongest social antagonism visible in the opposition between workers and capitalists. During capitalism workers become aware of their oppressed status and should, according to Marx, initiate a proletariat revolution with the purpose of overthrowing capitalists from the position of power. In social orders in which there is a class antagonism (slavery, feudalism and capitalism) fundamental form of association was *illusory community* which "was combination of one class over against another" (Marx, 1998: 86), because the structure of illusory community was based on

wealth of its members and not on true human relations. Illusory community is present in slavery, feudalism and capitalism as a structure in which community is privileged at the expense of individuals and relations among them. As opposed to illusory, “real community” is formed only in communism i.e. “in the real community the individuals obtain their freedom in and through their association” (Marx, 1998:87). For Marx there are two important and equal categories which mark the real community, community and individuum. In contrast to primitive communism (primordial social organization) which negated human personality and equated all the community members, a higher type of communism is a social form in which individual acquires his full freedom and develops his versatile abilities. With the abolishment of property and establishment of communist social form, individuum fully develops, not only through his connections with other individuals, but also through emancipation of his senses. For Marx, sensuality and material world play a significant role in forming and maintaining *real* community. In capitalism, human senses lose their importance because the sense a man starts to use is the one of ownership. With the abolishment of private property and emergence of communism, individuals free their senses from being captivated in the space of ownership and subordination to property and commodities. “The transcendence of private property is therefore the complete emancipation of all human senses and attributes; but it is this emancipation precisely because these senses and attributes have become, subjectively and objectively human” (Marx, 1988: 107). With the overthrow of capitalism, instead of the wish to own, a man regains his need to use his basic senses and thus the basic characteristic to participate in social life by means of senses, because the object of senses becomes human and social. “The eye has become a human eye, just as its object has become a social human object – an object emanating from man to man” (Marx, 1988:107). With the abolishment of private property transforms the matrix of sensual relationships towards the

world, which means discontinuation of slavish status of human senses and their directedness towards the human. At the end, this produces the independence of the man, i.e. a man becoming human. A man’s slavish status is visible in capitalist social-economic formation when the worker becomes subordinated to the commodities, a state which Marx calls commodity fetishism. In this state, the commodity is alienated from the creator himself and becomes an independent being having the more relevant status in the social hierarchy than the worker himself, in other words, commodity stops being the property of the one who produced it. A man’s slavish status ends at the moment he becomes independent and starts achieving what is the fundamental goal of the workers’ revolution – the overthrow of capitalists and establishment of socialist, and later communist society and abolishment of the state.

Consumption – Beginnings

According to some authors, consumption became a relevant economic activity in the 16th century when Queen Elisabeth I ordered the English nobles to attend at court which led inevitably to competition among them. Until then, nobles led a sort of solitary lives at their estates, using the middlemen for everything they had to resolve with the court. With this act, members of the noble stratum exited the private and entered the public space in which, through their clothing and jewelry, they started to compete in wealth and taste (Corrigan, 1997: 3). This Queen’s act made the consumption become a relevant social activity, not only because through it public appearance started to create, but also because consumption started to play an important role in creation of social relations. As Corrigan puts it, in the 16th century consumption was tied only to elite (nobles) while in the 18th century it became the characteristic of all social classes. It is only in the 20th century that the consumption got its place at the list of economic activities, “when”, as Arjun Appadurai writes “consumption has [...] become serious form of work” (Appadurai, 2005: 82).

Throughout the entire modern era consumption gained an important role in the set of economic activities and thus became a relevant object of theoretical studying. Because through the consumption processes one expresses his affiliation to a certain class, taste, status, wealth, identity, consumption became also the object of philosophical and sociological analyses. Because of what the consumption expresses, it is evident that culture is the inevitable element in performing this economic activity.

Thorstein Veblen detects the characteristic of people who have money to be showing the consumption in public. He calls this “conspicuous consumption”, a form of consumption through which one tries to show his wealth and status thus producing envy in society. Through conspicuous consumption of expensive commodities, the leisure class gains its reputation (Veblen, 2007: 53). Veblen relates conspicuous consumption with conspicuous leisure considering both characteristic of leisure class, which he defines as a class with huge amount of free time it can “consume” the way it wants and not the way it is imposed. Same as in case of conspicuous consumption, time consumption is also performed in order to cause envy in the rest of society, because the one who owns the leisure has no need to work. All this indicates that, for Veblen, consumption is a class conditioned activity. On the other hand, Georg Simmel considered luxury consumption a product of not only class divisions but also to represent the activity connected to all forms of socialization. Each form of consumption is a type of social form. Simplified, wearing what the majority is not is a form of segregation from the rest of society and indicator of social bravery, whereas wearing what the majority wears indicates social conformism and cowardice. In short, through consumption one shows the degree of his inclusion in and exclusion from the society. As in Veblen, consequences of consumption show that it is essentially a social and cultural activity but also, that through it one can express his attitude towards the society. In Karl Marx, affinities towards consumption were conside-

red worthless because the only way to evaluate the commodity is through the quantity of labor time invested into each product. However, in one part of *Capital*, Engels will refute this and declare that the value of commodity is defined in commercial relations, i.e. in exchange. According to Marx, in capitalism commodity is not owned by the one who produced it (the worker) but is taken over by the owner of the means of production (the capitalist). In that respect, Marx distinguishes two functions of commodity: exchange and use. Primary for capitalism is that the commodity enters into exchange relations to evaluate its value, so it can be compared to other commodities. Therefore, the basic function of the commodity in capitalism becomes that of exchange. Because in capitalism the commodity is alienated from the worker and because it rules him, Marx is critical towards exchange function of commodity since not only that the commodity rules human relations, but it also alienates people (Corrigan 1997: 35). In that sense, Marxism had a great influence on consumption praxis in socialist societies. In most socialist societies a dictated consumption prevailed which meant limited consumption activities (Luthar, 2006).

Taking care of oneself or the resistance as the individual action

Consumption can be the expression of individual aspirations but also a product of collective action. According to George Simmel, consumption in which the opinion of the community is conformed to and which is characterized by the lack of own choice is called conformist consumption, whereas individual consumption can be understood as the expression of bravery and one’s wishing to separate from the taste of majority. Individual actions of separation can be understood as the resistance towards both the taste of majority and towards the intention of the majority to impose its will on individuals. Michel Foucault considered basic aspiration of each government to be in control over the society through the processes of surveillance and

disciplining the individual. For him, disciplining is performed institutionally, the best examples of it being prisons and mental institutions. The entire society is structured in a way that individuals are constantly under surveillance. For Foucault, the governing apparatus is not able to entirely control society because it is prevented by individuals who through various practices of, first of all, “taking care of and working on oneself”, make resistance. He emphasizes that, through their practices, individuals create constantly and anew their own meanings and modify their standpoints in accordance with the circumstances they find themselves in. Foucault suggests the term “technology of the self” by which he explains the individual’s aspiration to conceive the world he finds himself in but to also constantly produce knowledge about the world. Technologies of the self are those: “which permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality” (Foucault, 1988: 18). These practices don’t necessarily have to be of spiritual nature, nor do they have to be associated with the transcendence of human soul. Their goal is to acquire happiness through certain operations on oneself, which as the consequence can have the change of own actions and behavior. As one of the examples, Foucault takes stoic actions of especially Seneca and Marcus Aurelius for their relations towards the death. It is not about some sort of pessimism or nihilism, but that one should “tend to make one live each day as if it were the last”, i.e. to tend to summarize one’s entire life into one day (Foucault, 1997: 104.). In the technologies of the self, Foucault sees a sort of resistance towards the Christianity and its relation towards the body and sexuality as it suppressed human sexuality by introducing the practice of sexual ethics. Contrary to Ancient and Christian idealism, Foucault suggests we turn our look from heaven and god towards ourselves, our libido, which is defined by our

main goal in the technologies of the self, and that is to: “constantly scrutinize ourselves as libidinal beings” (Foucault, 1997:182).

All this brings us closer to the thesis of individual free and creative production mentioned at the beginning of this article, where the goal of labor in communism is fostering individual abilities and senses. Contrary to labor in capitalism – which represents the work for the other and therefore suppression of individual abilities and skills – labor in communism is not necessary and is not performed under pressure, nor for some other’s needs. What can be noticed in the technologies of the self is that labor can be understood as creative only when it becomes individual which is seemingly contrary to Marx’s standpoints of insisting on community and placing individuality in the background.

In both thinkers (Marx and Foucault), individuality is a way of struggle against the domination of politics and capitalism. For Marx, pure individuality in the labor processes is the exclusive way of struggle against the recovery of capitalism, whereas for Foucault taking care of oneself, performed through various ways of individual attaining happiness is a form of reaching micropower and resistance towards the domination. In other words, for both, development of individual abilities, skills and senses is a way of resisting the domination of political and economic power of the ruling class.

Invisible consumption

As it could be seen in Veblen’s and Simmel’s theories, consumption is defined by public space. If we buy something it is important we do that in public because this is how we show our taste, status, wealth, influence. Moreover, through consumption procedures we also show our relation towards the society: we either fit or stand out. However, consumption doesn’t have to be visible and connected thus to acquiring status. It can be a sort of moderate activity within which money is being allocated to a series of family needs. Consumption can also be

a practice of restraining from consumption or disposal of money. Arjun Appadurai considers there are also other ways of consumption which do not have to be reduced to excessive money spending in public for the purpose of acquiring status. Consumption doesn't have to be a practice which demonstrates one's irresponsibility, nor does it have to be connected to immoral procedures, nor to be the activity dictated by the ruling class. Consumption can be socially liable and morally correct activity. The biggest problem of consumption is that throughout history it was defined through the opposition to the process of labor. Labor has always been perceived as a morally correct human activity, because through the processes of labor something was created, family was supported, and the worker-producer was a functional and proper member of the society. Contrary to usual understanding of consumption as excessive money spending, product of labor was visible, material and usable. Consumption was usually understood as immoral because it was defined as action in which there was no labor. Torstein Veblen wrote about this as one of the characteristics of the "leisure class" which he defined as the group which does not work because work is the "evidence of poverty" (Veblen, 2007: 30). However, Appadurai defines consumption as a serious labor which, among others, represents the activity of allocating money for the household, reasonable and cautious spending, saving, or money disposal. Consumption does not have to be understood as excessive waste of money, nor does it have to be exclusively ascribed to those who perform "serious" manual or production labor. After all, housewives' work has in some countries started to be treated as the labor of equal status as the so called "real employment".

Understanding it as labor and not mere waste of money, Appadurai indicates that consumption should have the same status as production. This, on one hand, means that labor is not a notion reduced to pure manual and production labor, nor that the labor in classical sense is understood as the only morally correct human activity. Also, it is important to point out those

standpoints which support the thesis that production labor is conducted without any control, whereas consumption is the economic process in which one participates consciously and can have a choice. For instance, Judith Williamson deems: "that in our society the conditions of production are ones over which people have no control, no choice about if or where to work, or about the conditions under which to work; consumption, however, offers some means of coping with the frustrations of capitalist conditions of production" (Fiske, 2000: 25). Contrary to production – labor in which one enters necessarily and without choice – consumption produces the sense of control over money and commodities. Both Fiske and Williamson emphasize the importance of consumption because it produces the feeling that within capitalist system one can control certain economic practice. This feeling of controlling the situation is expressed the most when in the process of shopping a product is chosen, because then one has the choice to reject something. This feeling of having the right to choose indicates that individuality, free will, sense of control over things and processes exist also in capitalism and that it is possible to carry it out through the practice of consumption.

Since from the 20th century onwards the society has been defined by consumption, it means that our entire relation towards the reality is created through this activity and that it forms our perception of reality to the greatest extent. In that sense, consumption is not only fulfilling certain economic obligations but is also a means by which one has the possibility to think and choose in the everyday world. Therefore, Michel De Certeau writes that consumption represents a way by help of which a buyer performs certain resistance towards the imposed economy. Through choosing, thinking, decision making, Certeau indicates that consumption is only another form of production coming thus close to Arjun Appadurai's thesis of consumption as labor. In reality, rationalist and centralized production is opposed to an entirely "different sort of production", called "consumption", characterized by craftiness and fragmentedness. This sort

of production is not demonstrated in its own products but in an art of using those imposed on it (Certeau, 1988: 31). Therefore, in Certeau, consumption is understood as creative selection and use of products. Here, a parallel can be drawn with De Saussure's difference between *langue* and *parole*, where the first is a set of 'imposed' linguistic rules and the latter use of the language. So, on one side we have a set of rules and on the other individual variations and modifications of those rules in everyday life. In *The Practice of Everyday Life* it is not about pure individualism, but that each variation or each idiom in the consumption originates after all from the individual but in certain context, situation, and at the end, from the contact with the other. Returning to Foucault, this everyday practice is a sort of individual variations and modifications of imposed rules. What Certeau claims is that actually no side (rules and their individual variations) wins over the other. Thus, no side assimilates the other and they both remain in constant state of tension.

For Certeau, consumption represents the relation of the individual towards the governing ideology. Namely, consumption is not just a mere resistance towards the social control, it is a modification of each ideology. Resistance towards the social control can be noticed in the example of food. Fast food has in today's world become a sort of ideology, what supports capitalist social order. Fast food has the function of cultural leveling, Burger King, Kentucky Fried Chicken and McDonald's being only few examples and indicating the way in which culture of nutrition governs all parts of the world by suppressing each form of cultural particularism. Slow food movement which insists on the relevance of local national cousins indicates the resistance towards global imperialism of fast food nutrition. What is important to emphasize for consumption is that in case of slow food nutrition it represents a political act through which one resists global politics of cultural leveling. The need for local is not a kind of recovering tradition but establishing the opposition global-particular. This way it is visible that through the practice of nutrition, modification of the dominant ideology can be

performed. "The slow food movement started in 1987 as a left-wing protest against McDonal-dization, Americanization, the disappearance of local cultural diversity and a slower pace of life. Its original emphasis – highlighted by the 1989 manifesto's subtitle 'International Movement of the Defense of and the Right to Pleasure' – was on gastronomic pleasure; local artisan food specialties and slow- paced *osterias* were appreciated because they contributed to such a pleasure" (Pellandini- Simányi, 2014: 152).

"Labor of consumption"

Beside slow food nutrition, it is important to mention proletarian shopping, one more form of modification of classic type of shopping with the function of resistance towards the official economy, which is expressed through viewing the products but not also in standard buying. This sort of practice is about consuming images, a sort of selection which is not finalized with buying, but with the use of shopping malls spaces for spending free time. This way shopping mall fails in controlling the buyer or dictating him what to buy, instead the potential buyer manages to resist the imposed advertisements and products and to use the space for spending his free time. In this case it is about the "pleasure of reading" the images. Those images are the shop windows with various goods through which one is spending something the seller has not direct benefit from. The enjoyment in trying the clothes or using the parfum testers but also in restraining from the act of buying is another form of image consumption. In other words, process of buying does not have to be completed because consummation can also be viewing, trying and tasting through which the concrete buying and use of money, and eventually dictate of the vendor that something must be bought, are put out of use. In his works, Certeau uses terms "tactics" and "strategy". Whereas strategy is a way by help of which manufacturers tend to gain the buyers, Certeau uses the term "tricks" when trying to explain the style of consumption of so called "weak" in their tendency to avoid standard and even legal

procedures in buying imposed by the so called “strong” ones. Those are the petit tricks though which one strives to deceive the tendency of big manufacturers to dictate the consumption.

Responsible consumption and demonstration of a sort of resistance towards the imposed and dictated consumption is also visible in buying at flea markets and in second-hand shops. Flea market breaks the brutal logic of capitalism because it functions as a place of meeting and immediate conversation, a place where one has the possibility to bargain and negotiate, where the buyer gets the opportunity to dictate the price to some extent and where the price is not entirely imposed. The act of buying a product for a lower price creates a feeling of responsible consumption but also a feeling that something that could have been destroyed is revitalized and put in use. Buying used clothes and their reactivation demonstrates antimaterialistic attitude towards shopping, a sort of identification with the lowest classes but also a responsible use of clothes. However, this sort of entrepreneurship demonstrates a new sort of economy which not only creates a new and influential style in the world of fashion, but also forms a new sort of entrepreneurship which resists capitalist rules. Sellers of second-hand clothing just like those at the flea markets become a new sort of entrepreneurs which break the image of capitalism as a mechanism in which both the producer and consumer are trapped. In this sort of economy there is directedness, choice and creation of own style, forming of a look through the bricolage or patchwork of different and used clothes. This style is not only a style but also a sort of anachronous individualism and individual’s resistance towards current fashion. Flea market represents Marx’s development of individual senses and capabilities and Foucault’s technology of the self.

Beside that, this sort of entrepreneurship represents also a sort of resistance towards capitalist system which designates producer and consumer as the pieces of mechanism which already has the formal logic of its functioning. Selling used clothing is not following the style

or actual events in the world of fashion. On the contrary, it is a sort of action through which one breaks the concept of “fashion” as the constant now, constant actuality and need to belong to the spirit of time. Such entrepreneurship is a sort of “trick” for selling what has passed and has no longer relevance in the fashion world. At the same time, such sort of entrepreneurship restores the relevance to the old and gives it back its importance enabling thus the new reading of fashion as the system of signs. In Barthes’ words, it offers fashion for the reading by the potential client but also by the entire society. Difference between the imposed fashion style and the one chosen in second-hand stores is in that the latter represents the individual’s choice through which beside revitalizing old clothing and giving it the new meaning, he acts responsibly and ecologically by “recycling” the already used clothing. Here it is not about some sort of postmodern nostalgia for some “retro” fashion-aesthetical practices but about individual giving of a new meaning through a clothing bricolage.

In the sphere of production situation is similar when it comes to small family-run enterprises. Importance and significance of individual knowledge and skills is visible in production of handmade and unique products. In the domain of tourism, unique products represent a tendency to give a certain artistic earmark to a souvenir because this unique product symbolizes the artistic variation of a general memory of a place. Thorough his imprint, the author gives *parole* to the space which is *langue*. By being hand-made or handicraft product, each unique product is endowed with particular importance and significance and even the meaning, since because of the specificity given to it by the individual – the feeling that both production and individual work were invested in the product – gives it a higher importance. This specificity is understood as creativity, just like Marx’ free activity for the purpose of developing individual capabilities, or Foucault’s technology of the self, practice in which one acts individually getting thus out from the disciplined work and necessity. Similar can be noticed in the produc-

tion of organic food and cosmetics. In the organic food production, it is again small family-run enterprises and individual and creative work that are employed. Since this is a production that takes place in so called hygienical conditions and whose purpose is healthy food, organic production is by its principles a socially responsible production which gives it a meaning of empathy, altruism and responsibility but also indicates a so called anti-materialistic character of this sort of enterprise. This does not mean a sort of identification with poor social strata, but a sort of resistance to a mass production and thus the logic of capitalism. Modification of capitalist logic is visible in the non-imposed, creative and free work.

Consumption and production are capitalist activities but within capitalist structure both can be observed as the practices of resistance and correction of official economy. Also, their function is not only to act in accordance with individual needs and thus defy the rules of capitalism, because neither of them can get out of the framework of the capitalist ethics, just like through a revolution, however magnificent it might be, it is not possible to destroy the politics and government or establish a global classless society. What is, however, possible in the sphere of politics, is to establish a strong enough space of the political as a relevant counterbalance to the official politics. Similarly, in the sphere of economy, these activities of small and creative productions carried out without necessity or some imposed program can be a significant counterbalance to capitalist practice. However much the work of contemporary corporations is characterized by social-corporation responsibility and business ethics, morality of acting is possible and achievable only through individual creative economic activity because it is the only way to realize freedom. At the end, this world does not need a classless and passive society, on the contrary, it needs a society which lives in constant political and economic antagonism. Space of freedom is not only that in which individual has the possibility for non-imposed creative activity but also in which there is constant active "resistance" towards official politics and economy.

Bibliography

- Appadurai, A. 2005. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*. London Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Corrigan, P. 1997. *The Sociology of Consumption*. London: SAGE
- Certeau, Michel de. 1988. *The practise of everyday life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Fiske J. 2000. *Reading the Popular*. London: Routledge
- Foucault, M. 1988. „Technologies of the Self“. Luther, M, Huck Gutman and Patrcik H. Hutton (ed.). *Technologies of the Self*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press
- Foucault. M. 1997. „The Hermeneutic of the Subject“. Paul Rabinow (ed.) *Ethics. Subjectivity and Truth*. New York: The New Press
- Locke, J. 2003. *Two Treatises of Government*. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press
- Marx K. 1998. *The German Ideology*. New York: Prometheus Books
- Marx, K. 2008. *The Manifesto of Communist Party*. London: Pluto Press
- Marx L. 1988. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: Prometheus Books
- Pellandini- Simányi, L. 2014. *Consumption Norms and Everyday Ethics*. London: Pgrave Macmillan UK
- Veblen T. 2007. *Theory of Leisure Class*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Williamson J. 1986. *Consuming Passions. The Dynamics of Popular Culture*. London: Marion Boyars

Potrošnja i proizvodnja kao oblici otpora

Sažetak:

Koncept političkog po prvi prvi put se pojavljuje u teoriji Carla Schmitta, gdje označava autonomiju političkog odlučivanja, specifičnu u odnosu na druge sfere ljudskog djelovanja, poput ekonomije i umjetnosti. S postmodernom političkom teorijom, pojam političkog počinje se koristiti u kombinaciji s pojmom politika, kao neka vrsta protivteže političkoj moći regularne vlasti i njenom nastojanju da u potpunosti ovlada društvom. Jedan od pionira postmodernizma, Michel Foucault, smatra da se otpor totalitarnim nastojanjima svake politike vrši kroz brigu o samom sebi (*souci de soi*), odnosno, kroz naše individualno djelovanje koje se ispoljava kao vrsta mikromoći, i predstavlja protivbalans oficijelnoj politici. U tom smislu, individualno djelovanje predstavlja akciju kojom se ograničava nastojanje vlasti da u potpunosti izjednači politiku i društveni život. Na tom tragu, i određeni vidovi potrošnje, kao jedne od temeljnih ekonomskih aktivnosti, mogu se tumačiti kao vrsta političkog aktivizma. Potrošnja se, kao protest prema oficijelnoj politici i ekonomiji, u savremenom kontekstu može uočiti u projektima poput *slow-food* ishrane, kupovini *second hand* proizvoda, korištenjem odjevnih predmeta

koji ne sadrže krzno, odbijanja kupovine od društveno neodgovornih korporacija. Politički aktivizam se može primijetiti i kada je riječ o proizvodnji, što možemo da vidimo na primjeru Marxovih analiza ove aktivnosti. Za Marxa, tek u komunističkoj epohi, proizvodnja postaje važna aktivnost, jer se ona tada transformira iz ropskog rada u sredstvo putem kojeg se razvijaju individualne sposobnosti i čula. U komunističkoj epohi, sa ukidanjem, privatnog vlasništva, proizvodnja postaje slobodna i kreativna aktivnost. U savremenom kontekstu „slobodnu i kreativnu proizvodnju“ možemo vidjeti u proizvodnji organske hrane, upotrebi već korištenih materijala pri pravljenju odjeće i namještaja, hand-made izradi kozmetičkih proizvoda, tzv. kućnoj radinosti. Kao što vidimo potrošnja i proizvodnja ne moraju da predstavljaju produkte globalnog kapitalizma i načine putem kojih se vrši kontrola nad radničkom klasom. Naprotiv, obje ekonomske prakse mogu da budu i oblici političkog djelovanja i da, kao „postmoderni“ koncept političkog, funkcionišu kao sredstva u borbi protiv dominacije kapitalizma i nastojanju politike da se identificira sa društvom.

Ključne riječi: potrošnja, proizvodnja, Marx, Foucault, otpor, političko
