

4A: Metapolitikk

Karl Ekeman: "Echoes of an Uncanny Chuckle: on Laughter and Alienation in Alt-Right Metapolitics"

One of the most significant aspects of the ‘metapolitics’ of the “alt-right”, rising to fame as an online phenomenon in 2016, was the use of memes, and the overall tone of laughter, humour, and irony. In this paper, I will be addressing how this laughter can be understood to have a deeper metapolitical significance than what it might appear to have at first glance.

‘Metapolitics’ is what many radical right movements call their cultural struggle for hegemony. When proponents of the “alt-right” picked up the concept, it was however already charged with a history of contestation. Alain de Benoist, one of the most prominent thinkers within the French New Right, claims to see it as a theoretical and philosophical undertaking. Guillaume Faye – who collaborated closely with de Benoist in the 70’s and early 80’s, before breaking with Benoist’s think-tank – has however criticized de Benoist for overstressing *theory* at the expense of *practice*. In Faye’s view, metapolitics should rather be enacted as an effort of propaganda. When the “alt-right” picked up the concept it was this ‘practical’ interpretation of the concept that seems to have been a guiding principle. In this paper, I will however be asking whether or not there might a connection between the theoretical problem that Benoist saw as the impetus for his metapolitical project, and the laugh of the contemporary “alt-right”.

This question serves as a backdrop for the paper’s key theoretical discussion on laughter and its relation to uncanniness and alienation. I will be drawing upon the three major theories of laughter, and read them in relation to Freud’s and Heidegger’s writings on the uncanny, and ask whether or not one might understand laughter as an other-side of uncanniness, in itself pointing to alienation as a metapolitical *motif* in the “alt-right”.

Carsten Madsen: "Agon, polemos, koinonia og homonoia. Retoriske strategier i kampen om folket"

Med udgangspunkt i de klassiske begreber for kappestrid (*agon*), krig eller differentiering (*polemos*), fællesskab (*koinonia*) og konsensus (*homonoia*) anvendt i græsk epik, filosofi og retorik vil jeg i dette bidrag diskutere to væsensforskellige retoriske strategier samt de former for retorisk kritik, som de synes at fordre.

Disse to strategier bestemmes hhv. under henvisning til Martin Heidegger som *ontologisk* og under henvisning til Barbara Cassin som *sofistisk* (eller *logologisk*). Målet er dels at vise, hvordan moderne retorik endnu synes at fungere på baggrund af klassiske forestillinger, og dels at gøre opmærksom på to forskellige måder, hvorpå moderne retorisk kritik med fordel kan gentænke et begrebskompleks fra den græske antik i forbindelse med aktuel konfliktbetonet kommunikation. Særligt vil jeg argumentere for en retorisk kritik, der inddrager Cassins forståelse af sofistik med henblik på at udøve en retorisk kritik over for forskellige former for populistisk retorik, der gør fordring på at tale folkets sag.

Det ontologiske forståelse af retorik udvikles ud fra Heideggers bestemmelser af Aristoteles’ retorik i *Grundbegriffe der aristotelischen Philosophie* (1924) samt hans anvendelse af begrebet *Volk* i *Logik als die Frage nach dem Wesen der Sprache* (1934). Den sofistiske

forståelse af retorik udvikles under henvisning til Cassin (cf. *L'effet sophistique* (1995) og *Sophistical Practice* (2014)) og henviser desuden til Michael C. McGee og Maurice Charlands begreb om *people* i hhv. "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative" (1975) og "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Québécois" (1987).

De to strategier knytter an til den klassiske strid mellem filosofi og retorik, og i termer af ontologi over for sofistisk vil jeg desuden diskutere forholdet mellem *topos* og *kairos*, *polis* og *cosmopolis* samt sandhed og relativisme.