

The other Anti-imp condition

Awareness and its discontents

ImJuni

23. März 2023

What peace means

Lets assume there is a victim and an aggressor.

Then, given the fact that an aggressor (say an imperial power) is actually invading an independent state of the situation, with a stated intention of overturning its elected government, what peace means, and when it is achieved, can only be determined by those attacked. Neither by their supporters and nor, for sure, by the aggressor.

How can we - not being attacked and safe at home (for now) - understand this?

Such an acute case of the actual situation is synonymous to the question of what "peace" means in the event and aftermath of rape. What it means can and will not in any way be determined by the aggressor. It can only be defined by the victim! It involves the procedural and historically evident rule that also in the event of rape, for achieving "peace", it is up to the victim to establish a definition of what "peace" means! And the aggressors only resort is to its very basic human rights. Which however does NOT by any means involve any right to the definition of the terms for peace, nor to the definition of "peace" itself.

As a consequence, the procedural settlement (ie the definition of when "peace" is achieved) of all affairs linked to any such "colonizing activities", ie. overreach, today and in the past, have to be determined by those colonized, and the colonizer has nothing to say in the definition of terms by when "peace" is achieved, and by when, and through which means, the wounds the colonizer inflicted can be considered as healed.

In the same way its the children who define the procedures and terms of settlement for "peace" with regard to whatever they experienced during their education and upbringing, and with respect to both their parents and their teachers. This very specific settlement, in an equally systematic as emblematic case of "oppression", is the only way to a truly successful coming-of-age and to the achievement of true adulthood, and only if this settlement is experienced as being fully defined by the child's own terms. Its neither on the teachers nor on the parents to set those terms in any absolute sense. In case they do, or try to do, nevertheless, and in case they do not agree on those terms set by the child, the settlement will always remain fragile and will very often lead to pathological narcissistic symptoms.

And finally, its on those subject to narcissistic fury (e.g. as a result of those pathological narcissistic symptoms) - of which antisemitism, misogyny, racism, and esoteric and spiritual paranoia (conspiracy theories) are the most abundant variations - to define the terms on any settlement and the

definition on what is meant by "peace" in relation to the narcissistic aggressor. Because only those who are worshipping the rule of compromise, balance and justice - those who successfully managed to become grown-ups with mindful serenity - can eventually set the *procedural terms* towards "peace" in the face of narcissistic fury. But they can only do so by applying a *definition* of what "peace" means, and consequently what these terms of settlement shall actually involve, if any, as defined by the victim alone.

Profound reasons (materialistic, empirical and logical) to end up on the side of the aggressor can be plentiful. As indicated before, there is indeed very likely a very good materialistic or, even more likely, psychoanalytical reason to be found for someone to become a woman-hater, rapist, tyrant, stalker, xenophobe, anti-social paranoid, antisemite, or simply furious to the extent to want to harm or terrorise other people. The lessons of the past 250 years to draw attention to all those very good "historic" reasons, motivating conscious- or unconsciously the aggressor (say "what does Putin really think?" And why?), while important for improving the way we raise and educate people, i.e. the way we may one day improve our generic curricula, those lessons are a waste of time, or better outright irrelevant, in the face of someone actually being aggressive.

In the event of rape, terror or narcissistic warfare, to even consider lest reflect on such "reasons" has proven time again to be the wrong approach. Both in terms of the proposed "settlements on peace" and the sustainability of its intent. In particular with respect to the aggressors behaviour in its aftermath, as well as on the so-called "healing" effect of such "settlements", which time again show that any compromise with respect to the aggressor leaves the conflict (nevermind the "wounds") open indefinitely.

PostScriptum are these conclusions also applicable for classical (and therefore more commonly ignored or even admired) narcissistic artist transgressions, like the use of antisemite, misogynist, or racist tropes in any work of art.

And then yes, we DO want to draw "lessons" from "the aggressors behaviour" for the next generations to come. We DO want to draw such "lessons" when it comes to analysing the pathologies ("motivations") of the aggressor. But not in order to analyse the real, actual aggressor (like the French revolutionist would have it), but simply in order to prevent quaking and raising more of them in the future.

The terms on which the aggressors deeds are judged and prosecuted shall be based exclusively on the impact his actions have on the victims, and not (as introduced in the juridical prosecution system by the French revolution) on pathologising the aggressor first (on which the foundations of biopolitics - and the politics of analysing the monster according to Foucault - have been built in first place). Again, the limits of this rule are the basic human rights, which also apply to the aggressor (no death sentences, fair trials, etc.).

Since, in the event of the aggression taking place, when the actual symptoms of the assault and the medium to long-term consequences are unfolding, the only thing that needs to be done by everyone involved is to solely listen to the victims to understand their needs, and help and support them by any means, in order to defend and, if possible, to come to terms with the consequences of the act of aggression.

In the face of aggression, it is of utmost importance to ignore any perceived, assumed or even learnt reasoning for the aggressors terror. It is of the utmost importance to ignore the aggressor in the face of the cry of the victims, in order to not idealise the spectacle of his aggression. Since only if we listen and focus on the victims we can know what needs to be done *now*, in the event of the aggression or its immediate aftermath. In the moment violence is or has just been acted out, this rule can be considered basic and shall be applied in all such situations.

Yes, under any circumstances the aggressor is granted basic human rights (also to be listened

to his "reasoning" in juridical processing), but no individual, (psycho-)analytical attention as to his motifs shall be granted at any time, neither on the side of the institutions prosecuting nor on the side of the general public.

Instead, what "is to be done" in the face of any aggression, shall be defined by the victims, with support by any of the non-narcistic grown-ups in the room. And the only reasons which usually prevent this rule to be applied is either fear of the aggressor, and/or a sadistic or at times masochistic attraction (fascination of) to the aggression (and to the aggressor).

Interlude

The previously laid out principles are plain enough to understand and to follow, even if their underlying focus on the victim, instead of the aggressor (in the event and aftermath of any aggression) may not be shared by all. But the most difficult question to be answered is completely independent of those principles.

It is the question who decides on who actually ist the aggressor and who is, or who are the victims!

This is the tricky bit. It is also the true Pandora box of the problem of transformative action ("awareness concepts") towards a more progressive, more emphatic (aware), and therefore more solidaristic and in the end fairer treatment of any event of aggression and overreach, which, e.g., incorporates in a better and fairer way actual relations of structural power. The task that concepts of awareness (with respect to the structural power-relationship between aggressor and victim) give themselves, resembles very much the starting point of the 80ies "anti-imperialist" movements, dwelling on struggles and concepts developed throughout the 60s and 70s in various activists circles and across the whole counter-culture¹. If any lessons can be drawn from these struggles, and from the particular history of the "anti-imp" movement for the current struggle for a different "praxis" with respect to structural power relationships in todays mainstream procedures on handling acts of aggression, it has to be: to avoid the traps of shortcutting the analytic procedures for the eros of the action. And if this seems at first counter intuitive to the previously set out principles of non-analytical "all-eyes-on-the-victim" procedures, it is exactly this focal-point of confusion in the whole endeavours of awareness concepts, which is at stake here. Since while the strictly non-analytic part has clearly been identified as to the definition of what "peace" means in the event of a given or past aggression, the analytical part has to focus on the question on "who is the victim and who is the aggressor" before the question on peace is even raised.

Since in all of the before we simply assumed that there is an aggressor and there is a victim, and that this constellation is a priori known to us, and everything else follows from that. But we did not define who decides on who is who of both! Such question on the decision of such "Urunterscheidung" typically arises, when one seriously and sustainably follows up the consequences of our deeds with respect to any, at least theoretically, beautifully styled ideas or goals, even those of the very best intention. It arises in the case of law, with the question on who "decides on the exception" (Carl Schmitt), or in the case of mathematics in the case of "who decides about its necessarily underivable axiomatic" (Russel, Goedel).

Here, we should remind ourselves that the presidency of Donald Trump and its whole narcissistic self, up to todate, rests on the claim that HE ist the victim. Always! And that all others are the aggressors! This is exactly the claim on which most of his followers (and not only his MAGA

¹Back then with respect to the parental war-generation and their "corrupt" authoritarian residuals

followers - see Bolsenaro, Orban et al.), and therefore a significant fraction of "old-white-male"-spirited persons in end-neoliberal societies, thrive on. Everything else is more or less following from this assumption that actually they (WE the old white males) are the victims.²

It is one of the basic features of today's "culture wars" that those who "progressives" identified as the aggressors (say old white binary men), are increasingly defining themselves as the victims. First as strategy ("Schuldumkehr") then as a farce ("Pizza-gate").

The incels who promote and advocate aggression against women, identify themselves as the "true victims" of their victims: women. And sure they believe in this, as much as we believe in certain structural types of aggression. This example of Schuldumkehr lends itself perfectly (much better than any nuthead dictator engaging in organising a genocide) for analysing the aggressor's psyche, searching for the origins of his or her pathological behaviour, while rationalising his or her behaviour in the face of a first exhumated, then analysed, traumatic past. While on the other hand and at the same time the strategy of Schuldumkehr applied by the MAGA people is exactly anticipating this search for "meaning" and rationalisation in an otherwise "meaningless" and empty "suisance" of violence and aggression on side of the aggressor. Because one thing the narcissistic aggressor may anticipate before his aggression is that all (analysing) eyes will be on him, following his act, and in particular on the whole of his personality and on his past, etc pp... for once at least.

Since this is what an structural aggressor, at least those of the narcissistic kind (so most of them), is truly longing for. And much more so than for the pleasures, whatever they are, received directly from the act of aggression. I.e. much more than for any compensation or relief from the ghosts of some distant events happening to him in his past. No, what the narcissistic, systematic aggressor longs for is attention and recognition.

Psychoanalysis will not help here (except, of course, for having uncovered, analysed and described the narcissistic injury in all its not so glorious detail). Imbult in the reasoning on what to practically do in an event of aggression as laid out before is the only true preventive strategy after the event of the aggression, namely to withdraw, as much as possible, our attention from the aggressor, and turn it to the victim.

The Urunterscheidung of awareness

The first consequence to be drawn from all of this is however an quite obvious one. In order to find out what our reasoning so far is worth, if anything at all, we need to turn all this around:

A woman who has been under the violent spell of an oppressive and aggressive male partner, suffering the worst of violence for years finally decides to get rid of the oppressor in an act of aggression and violence herself. This is more or less the blueprint for the French revolutionaries to reconsider the conclusions to be drawn from any "event of aggression" in the face of it.

The question here becomes: Is the execution of Luise XVI an act of aggression, as defined above, in face of the fact that a lot of those celebrating his execution were actually his very profound victims? Answering this question easily, say in the way of "yes of course, Louis XVI was a fucking feudal despot [as indeed he was] terrorizing a lot of people living under his rule [as is evidently true], so why are you even considering the question" is already quite some way into the trap laid out by Donald Trump and many others for you.

In a time when arguably a great majority of all people were victims of violent and despotic

²And in a very profound historical context they are of course right! The real foundation of their desperation and rage is the very fact that their time of defining the terms is indeed really coming to an end. This is why they will become ever more violent in the near future, until they finally die out.

oppressors for centuries and finally got rid of their oppression in an act of violence, how are we to judge their act retroactively? Is it an act of aggression [as it evidently was] or simply the victim trying to defend herself after all [as also evidently was and still is the case]? How to judge this final act of violence in which the former aggressor becomes the victim and vice versa?

And it is exactly this logical (so at least potential) impasse with respect to our previous reasonings, which brings us to the question of "Imperialism". And this since the question on who actually is the victim and who is the aggressor - the "Urunterscheidung" of any good-practices of awareness - can be, and must be answered in a "systemic" way. And this means it will have to work independently of the fact if the aggressor is an incel or a woman, or if the victim, again, a women or an old white man. *The decision on who is the aggressor and who is the victim has to be analytical, while the question what "peace" means, and what is to be done in the event of an aggression ought to be left to the victim to decide.*

It is in this context of a potential (logical at first) impasse of fully inclusive reasoning, that the old, stuffy, and today frankly quite misguided, activist concept of (anti-)"imperialism" can finally become useful, especially when it comes to analytical tools developed predominantly at the beginning of the anti-imperialist movement in the 70s and 80s. Therefore we have to first strip the anti-imperialist strata of today of its use as a strategic (although historically not very effective) weapon of the old new-left and their current mansplaining of everything and the world. These kind of remainders of the anti-imperialist movements have for long, and for obvious reasons, been replaced by completely different fronts in the so-called "culture-wars", in which meanwhile some of the increasingly old, predominantly male, "new left comrades" still yell "imperialism", and mean the US and Israel, whatever the matter of the argument.

So lets start at the beginning again. (Anti-)imperialism, as well as the study of imperialism as a modern phenomenon (to be distinguished from its historical and etymological origin of Greek and Roman imperialism), starts off with finding a generic (axiomatic) definition of what a "systemically oppressive" regime or relation means, how it can be identified, and how it can be analysed. So in case there were any achievements at all by the movement of anti-imperialism (or the study of imperialistic power) over the past decades in this respect, they should be of immediate benefit in helping us out of our impasse: i.e. the problem to "correctly" - in the quite usefull meaning of "political correctness"³ and in the spirit of concepts of "awareness" - identify who is the aggressor and who is the victim, in order to be able to start with any meaningful and "correct" (in the sense of not being oppressive themselves) procedure of awareness at all.

So lets see what anti-imperialism (and the study of which) has to tell us in this respect.

Interestingly, the study of imperialism started by anlaysing the aggression, not the victims. You may say: "Of course! It's about imperialism, stupid!" But no, of course! As we hopefully made clear before, the study of imperialism could have started from the victims point of view indeed. And it would be a compelling additional piece of essayistic reflection to think about the question why a lot of traditional anti-imp analysis and rhetoric never actually did this, until today.

In any case, the root, i.e. where anti-imperialism started, is again the French revolution, with its focus on the liberation of the (factually) oppressed "masses" (and Fanon followed the same strategy), followed immediately by an analysis of the mechanisms (and origins) of imperialist power. This is a very useful and fruitful analysis indeed. Especially if we are concerned with the long term lessons learnt for humanity ("the people"), in order to eventually come up with a different systemic principle setting, a new state of the situation, after all. Again, this is a very important contribution, and it

³Diederich Diedrichsen, Politische Korrekturen, KiWi

has been an amazingly fruitful endeavour indeed. However, what was left out of consideration for a long time is the question, quite practically, what "peace means" in the immediate aftermath of the (colonizing) event, i.e. in the aftermath of all of the still ongoing systematic oppression, aggressive systematic overreach, and the negotiations on how to deal with their manifold consequences, of the old, and of the quite new type. And we can see this today again in the remnants of the old Anti-Imp factions like the Wagenknecht Linke. Theirs is an extremely poor-MANs version of Anti-Imp, in which the structural analysis of who is the aggressor and who is the victim is simply left out and is replaced by a stereotype: NATO, US, Israel. And consequently what "peace" means is then left as an empty signifier, to be achieved in its own right: peace for the PEACE! Nevermind what the victim would consider it to be.

The historic and intellectual context which is to explain why anti-imperialists actually started with the ("oppressed") aggressor and not with the victim is surely quite complex to pin down. Especially when we consider the multitude of activist contexts and praxis in which the anti-imperialist movement has been thriving. One, although arguably quite academic context is discussed in the Appendix (Gewalt- versus Friedensforschung), in particular because this discussion has not ended until today and is still quite fruitful, in particular with respect to the recent changes in perspective on how to deal with conflicts in general, and under the impression of the Russian invasion in particular.

That the anti-imps focused on the oppressor and not, at first, on the victim or on the liberation (!) of the oppressed and their say on "what peace actually means"⁴ has consequences up to to date in the form of the Neue Welt and Wagenknecht Anti-Imp thirst for peace by any means (i.e. as empty signifier). And this is while other options for emancipating the victims (e.g. by letting them define what peace means) would clearly, at least theoretically have been available. And we will discover that also here the solutions are biased in praxis by this "arbitrary" selection of a very specific, curious starting point (Urunterscheidung): the "liberation" from the oppression, instead of the condition of settlements in the aftermath of the oppression, to be defined by the victim. That the historical, temporal dimension plays an important role in this sequence of attention might be evident, but should not necessarily have been a necessary pre-condition for the choices made given all options..

Nevertheless, we can take our practical glues from these struggles, and also from their particular list of priorities. So lets go at it.

According to (anti-)imperialist (ur-)reasoning an oppressor/aggressor is defined exclusively (!) by

1. a systematic use of power, for arbitrary goals,
2. the fact that those arbitrary goals are achieved exclusively through the use of systematic power.

As a consequence of 1) and 2) a phenomenological necessity (signifier) for systematic aggression is:

3. "jouissance" on the side of the aggressor in applying these systematic means, for arbitrary goals.

What this, however, means is first, that the use of specific power to achieve specific goals is NOT imperialist, and therefore NOT oppressive (while it might be contestable or morally questionable,

⁴I.e. it was exactly peace for the PEACE and liberation for the LIBERATION, nevermind what actually is achieved with it after the event

or much worse!). A point in case is aggression involved through broken hearts or mental incapacity. A case in which the juridical systematology developed by the French revolution was particularly interested in, already starting with Rousseau.

Second, that the key to identify the oppressor (imperialist) is that he or she uses systematically the same means (power relations) to achieve goals, which are necessarily decoupled from the systemic aspects of the means (but not necessarily from their use value).

So to use two classic examples: Oppression is when the way it happened to you that you have a lot of money, is structurally unrelated to what you try to achieve in using this money. Since the reason that you won 1 million in the lottery is structurally unrelated to the fact that you bought a house with that money and now squeeze the last cent out of the inhabitants, simply for the very unrelated (to the lottery) reason to make much more money. This is a clear case of systematic oppression! And the classic "defence" of such cases further emphasizes the conclusion. Since the "defence" of such a case has always been that "all that money" corrupted the (yes what: stomach, testicles, ... brain?) of the oppressor, and this is why the poor guy now acts as a capitalist berserker. Of course he doesn't want nor wasn't meant to behave like this! If he only would have known what a complete asshole "all the money" made out of him, he... and so on.

Or the fact that you are born a white child enabled you to gain easier access to a certain type of job. Since being born as a white child, and getting a job is principally, ie. systemically (although not factually of course) completely unrelated, this is always an act of oppression. And even though it is indeed not the fault of the white child being born as such, it remains an act of systematic oppression! Since the golden rule, as stated before, is that analysing or excavating the "good reasons" as to why the aggressor became one in first place, shall not have any influence on what "peace" means.

In contrast, in order to illustrate the case with an even more extreme example: if you carry out a bank robbery, in which you raised the money which bought you a Kalashnikov, which you planned to use all along (von "langer Hand") to then solely use to kill your ex-lover, even if the intention to do this would be (and likely is) for not very good reasons ("niedere Beweggründe"), say jealousy, that would clearly NOT be an overreach of the oppressive kind.

The same, if you throw a disgusting old rotten banana at your ex-lover or ex-friend because you believe she cheated you with respect to several promises she made and related expectations, that's NOT aggression of the oppressive kind.

It clearly can also NOT be an aggression of the oppressive kind if aggression is taking place between two groups striving for recognition of a systemic kind (so here we need to exclude seeking for recognition within, family, clans, religious or other non-systemic groups), while they are both otherwise, and individually, systematically oppressed by a third group of systemic dominance (this has wide ranging consequences, which we need to leave for follow-up considerations).

In all of these cases, we however are clearly confronted with an act of aggression indeed! But, in order to come close to our problem of "Urunterscheidung" and for the practical case of the praxis of the "awareness concept" we cannot and shall not treat them in the same way.

What this means is, that an aggression to be of an *oppressive* kind is, by means of the original anti-imperialist distinction, actually quite narrowly defined. And that makes it indeed much easier to identify such type of aggression and separate them from aggressions of the *specific* type. Especially when there are no other means, nor experience nor skills, to stage a proper trail with all its associated good-practice procedures. The latter is unfortunately frequently the case in the very praxis of "awareness" concepts, carried out under a large range of environmental conditions and often by volunteers or activists. Therefore, no attempt shall be made by such awareness concepts, in order to arrive at our very crucial a-priori conclusion on who actually is the victim and who is the aggressor for aggressions of the *specific* type. The latter should be left to outsiders of the very environment

in which the aggression occurred and in which the awareness concept is applied.

Incels hate 'women' and not that particular person, which happens to be a woman. Russia is an imperial country and no doubt acts in aggressive ways against non-aggressive people and countries. While the underlying "logic" of the aggression is systematic, victims of such type of overreach are nevertheless individuals. Victims of Russian aggression are, since it's of the systematic type, therefore clearly the true victims and allowed to defend themselves even violently. The same is true if the US would act aggressively against non-imperialist countries. In contrast, Russia could legitimately act aggressively against people or countries who systemically act as aggressors against non-aggressive people or countries, and as long as they target the systemic aggressor only. In any of these cases can victims of such aggressions be identified as victims, since they have been subject to an aggression by a systemic oppressor. And systemic oppression (imperialist and of power, racist, misogynist, antisemitic, religious) can often be identified by clear and practical rules and analysis, exactly because the motivation of the aggression is *independent* from the identity of the person targeted.

In contrast, the identification of who is the victim and who is the oppressor in acts of aggression which do not involve aggression of the systemic kind, but are of an origin which is very closely tied to the victim as individual and to particular, individual relations (jealousy, materialistic pre-conditions, love and hate) are very difficult to decide without very thorough, learnt and skilled good-practice procedures as elaborate as those used in a modern trial, on which the accused is not found guilty until his or her guilt is proven, and the decision on who is the aggressor has to wait until the final prove, i.e. after all procedures have been thoroughly applied.

Here we shall note, that bullying is not so frequently mentioned as an aggression of the systemic type, which it however is. And bullying has not been identified as being part of the suite of "imperialist praxis" at the time the original definitions on who is considered to be an "imperialist" have been drawn. But recently "bullying" has not only been identified, correctly, as an aggression of the systemic kind happening on schoolyards and in offices and workplaces. "Bullying" has been observed even at the level of state interaction, as one of the "soft" power indicators of imperialist-victim relations and not necessarily involving violent physical interactions. So "bullying", when applied by an aggressor systematically, i.e. independent of personal, very specific (person-to-person, state-to-state) relations, and in order to achieve *systematic* goals, this has indeed to be on our list of aggressions of the systemic type.

In conclusion

In conclusion we have to let go of attempting to prosecute aggression of the non-oppressive, non-imperialist kind in any praxis of "awareness" (but also in other context). And even though these events are still very clear acts of aggression, particularity in cases in which the person responsible to identify victim and aggressor, and therefore charged with the responsibility of prosecution, have to carry out their task after the fact and were not also witnesses of the aggression themselves, those in charge of protecting and supporting (potential) victims of the *systematic* type shall always handover their "responsibility" to an outside(r) entity in case of aggressions of the *specific* type.

Sure, we always shall intervene to prevent any type of aggression in the event if it. We shall be prepared to step into any act of any type of violence in case it happens in front of our eyes, and in case we actually can intervene. However, who is to blame, who to exclude, who to "judge", shall only be done in the event an aggression of the oppressive kind can be identified in an unambiguous way. Following the strict "anti-imperialist" definition of who is the aggressor and who is the victim in such an event, and being helped by the disconnection between the motifs of the aggressor and

the individuality of the victim, the chances to arrive as such an unambiguous identification are not too bad. And once the identification of an oppressive aggressor of the imperialist (structural) type is identified, all eyes shall be on the victim, and on the victim's definition of what "peace" means (if anything) under such conditions. If the "Unterscheidung" can not be done unambiguously, or if the aggression is one of the specific type, the case shall be handed over to professional jurisdiction.

The belief in the conspiracy, like current anti-imperialists have it, that this system of "good-practices" prosecuting the aggressions of the specific type is fundamentally corrupted by oppression of the systemic type, and therefore we need to take the law "in our own hands", also for specific cases, is following a paranoid Trumpian kind of reasoning, and is therefore arguably of the systemic kind of aggression itself. A lot of current day Anti-Imp paranoid thinking is therefore a logical contradiction with respect to its own terms, i.e. not being capable to distinguish aggressions of the systemic and the specific kind, while projecting all of the experienced aggression to be of a systemic kind. This is the standard example of a paranoid reaction.

And similar, the belief one could, as an individual or as a group of people, be capable to follow through such good-practice principles for aggressions of the specific type and on the level established continuously elaborated by current day jurisdiction since the French revolution is nothing else than plain narcissistic hubris. Which of course teams well with the paranoid condition of the old Anti-Imp.

Due to such underlying conditions of "felt" conspiracies, still widespread today in many activist circles, many of the present day concepts of awareness dwell into prosecuting ANY type of factual aggression and overreach themselves. And, as a result, fall back to a level of arbitrariness and Willkür seen only before the French revolutionaries responded exactly to this type of prosecution practices. To call such practices "progressive" is therefore yet another misnomer, both in theory and praxis.

Practices of awareness should therefore be restricted to acts of aggression of the systemic type, by, after having identified the systemic oppressor, siding with the victim and let the victim decide what is to be done in the face of the aggression. While any dealings with aggression of the specific type should be handed over to the police. The latter has to be emphasised as of significant importance, in order to forecome that the practice of awareness is not becoming a praxis of systemic oppression itself, and therefore disavowing itself on the run.

One postscriptum on the question of identification of the systemic oppression is needed here. For the meanwhile widespread implementation of "awareness" concepts, it seems to be of significant practical importance to identify "external trustees" before (!) any event of aggression does actually occur. What is meant with this. The praxis of awareness often involves the situation of a group of people having to decide after the fact (1) with respect to an event of aggression on the question of who is the victim and who is the aggressor. And frequently without being involved or having been witness of the event themselves. So all they hear about it, is through memes or tell-tales, or, in the best case, through someone of the group having been involved. So under such circumstances, the question is how to identify the fact of 1) an act of aggression of the systemic type taking place, 2) to decide as a group on who is the victim and who is the aggressor.

It is of utmost importance to prevent a damage to the integrity and the well-being of the group to have access to an external trustee in such cases. No tell-tales, nor memes, but also no inside report of an (trusted, beloved, etc...) group-member (loyalty is the principle core of narcissistic Schuldumkehr) shall suffice to decide.

In any "good-practice" case of awareness an outsider, who all of the group's members trust for ideally unrelated reasons, and therefore has been appointed before (!) any event, shall get involved in order to try to find out "what happened". If the trustee decides that an aggression of the specific type happened (in which case the trustee shall stop her investigation on details), the group shall

ask the police to investigate further (and/or do nothing itself). If an aggression of the systemic type is identified by the trustee the group needs to decide, based on the conclusive reasoning of the trustee, who is the victim and who is the aggressor. Since in cases of the systemic type such "conclusive reasoning" is more likely to be convincing and therefore it is more likely that the group will make the correct decision, the group shall base their decision on who is victim and aggressor on such reasoning from an external trustee. All other practical consequences, applying the rule of the victim, as laid out above, shall follow from there.

Appendix: Friedensforschung versus Gewaltforschung im Kontext heutiger Awarenesspraxis

Im Folgenden möchte ich den wissenschaftlichen Diskurs über den Unterschied zwischen Gewalt- und Friedensforschung kurz umreißen. Nicht weil ich in der Lage wäre einen detaillierten, wissenschaftlichen Tiefenblick auf den Stand des Diskurses zu geben, sondern, weil schon die grundsätzlichen Prämissen dieser Diskussion, im Kontext unseres Diskurses zur Praxis der Awarenesskultur, von großer Relevanz sind. Denn Gewalt-, wie Friedensforschungen, wie noch zu sehen sein wird, haben jene Praxis, mit der wir uns heute in Kollektiven auseinandersetzen, sicherlich entscheidend mit beeinflusst.

Um was geht es also im produktiven Streit zwischen Gewalt- und Friedensforschung, wenn es um die soziologischen Grundlagen der Analyse, wissenschaftlichen Forschungspraktiken und A priori geht, bezüglich des Gesellschaftsphänomen "Gewalt" im weitesten Sinne, oder gar um "Krieg und Frieden".

Die Gewaltforschung nach Popitz grenzt sich von der Friedensforschung im Geiste Norbert Elias', der Frankfurter Schule, oder Bordieus' dadurch ab, dass sie Gewalt zunächst (!) nur in der rein phänomenologischen Form von physischer Gewalt, und also ausschließlich als ein Ergebnis von "Aktionsmacht" betrachtet. Physische Gewalt, mit der sich Gewaltforschung ausschließlich (!) beschäftigen will, wird damit deutlich von anderen Formen der Gewalt, die aus anderen Machtformen hervorgehen, abgegrenzt.

Das zur Verfügung stehende Angebot von Machtformen aus denen unterschiedliche, also auch nicht-physische Formen von Gewalt entstehen, sind die genannte Aktionsmacht, instrumentelle Macht (Androhungen und Versprechen), autoritative Macht (Anerkennung), und Wissensmacht. Laut Popitz und der Gewaltforschung geht physische Gewalt aber wie gesagt zunächst einmal notwendig ausschließlich aus Aktionsmacht hervor. Der Akt physischer Gewalt setzt einen konkreten Handlungsspielraum für den Gewalttäter voraus, diese Gewalt auch physisch und materiell durchführen zu können (siehe Deutschen Gewaltforschung - Jan Claas Behrends, Hörsaal DLF). So weit so logisch.

Damit grenzt sich die Gewaltforschung von der Kritischen Theorie und der Friedensforschung ab, indem sie, ganz soziologisch, beim "nackten" Phänomen beginnt, um von diesem dann, unter gewissen Voraussetzungen, auf den abstrakten (politischen, strukturellen, konzeptionellen) Kontext zu schließen.

Aktionsmacht ist eben genau nicht strukturelle Macht. Und letztere kann, zum Beispiel in Form von Diskriminierung, in einem zweiten Schritt, also reaktiv, zu Gewalt führen, aber eben nicht, jedenfalls nicht nach Maßgabe der Gewaltforschung, als Ausgangspunkt der Beobachtungs- und Rechtfertigungslogik von Gewalt.

Die Gewaltforschung naturalisiert dadurch zunächst einmal (und will das auch belegen) den "reinen Fakt der physischen Gewalt", und zwar indem sie erst wenn dieser tatsächlich der Fall ist

quasi anfängt zu denken. Und dadurch eben nicht den, deutlich spekulativeren Weg geht, darüber nachzudenken, ob bestimmte, strukturelle, ideologische, kulturelle etc Konstellationen a priori zu Gewalt führen (können). Also als Folge einer bestimmten gesamtgesellschaftlichen Struktur.

Das ist nämlich der Weg den die Friedensforschung (Norbert Elias) und die kritische Soziologie (kritische Theorie) gehen, und von dem sich die Gewaltforschung, als historisch jüngeres Projekt, abgespalten hat. Die Friedensforschung sucht gegenüber der Gewaltforschung also gerade in den gesellschaftlichen Strukturen den Ausgangspunkt für eine am Ende fast notwendige, folgerichtige, konkrete, und schließlich physische Äußerung von Gewalt, während in der Gewaltforschung die Frage ist wann und warum sich aus einem sowieso immer schon und überall vorhandenen ("natürlichen") Gewaltpotential, das im Normalfall unterdrückt ist, oder nicht zum Ausdruck kommt, physische Gewalt (dann doch) als konkrete Form äußern kann.

Wissenschaftstheoretisch könnte man sagen, die Friedensforschung misstraut rein phänomenologischen (soziologischen) A priori, während die Gewaltforschung ideologisch und moralisch motivierte Vorurteile, die in Strukturanalysen immer virulent sind, zu unterbinden sucht.

Tatsächlich sind gerade heute wieder verschiedene Spätfolgen einer Friedensforschung sichtbar, die sich auch durch bestimmte Traditionen der aktivistischen Linken, aber noch viel allgemeiner durch handfeste, historische Perspektiven in der, überwiegend männlichen, weißen, jetzt alten Nachkriegskindergeneration der letzten 50 Jahre festgesetzt haben. Hier geht es um die Gefahr, dass unterkomplexe (sagen wir naive) und durch Verdrängung, Ignoranz, etc., zustande gekommene, und deswegen ideologisch verbrämte Strukturanalysen zu Schlüssen führen, die die Frage "was Frieden ist" diesen Vorurteilen und Meinungen alter weisser Männer unterordnet, anstatt den Opfern der sehr konkreten Gewalt.

Von Wagenknecht, über Schmalz Jakobs bis Habermas propagieren diese selbsternannten "Friedensforscher"(sie sind allesamt keine Experten auf dem Gebiet des vorliegenden Gewaltphänomens) ihre Strukturanalyse der politischen Historie des Ostens, in der (surprise, surprise) nur die Seele Russlands eine Rolle spielt, und keine der anderen post-sowjetischen, souveränen Staaten je vorkam (siehe SPD Ostpolitik). Ausgehend von einer sehr von Verdrängung und Nichtwissenwollen gekennzeichneten Strukturanalyse, ziehen sie ihre "notwendigen" Schlüsse was Ukrainerinnen, im Sinne "des Friedens"(hier als gänzlich leerer Signifikant), zu tun hätten. Einen besseren Beleg dafür, warum es notwendig ist im Komplex Friedens,- und Gewaltforschung einen anderen Ansatz zu finden, könnte die Gewaltforschung gegenüber der Friedensforschung kaum (er)finden.

Denn die Gewaltforschung will eben nicht mit einer Analyse des Täters (und damit der Gefahr einer täterzentrierten Faszination für dessen Macht, Imperialismus, Gewalt) und ihren strukturellen Voraussetzungen beginnen. Und hier ist sie unseren heutigen Forderungen einer progressiven Awareness für das Opfer sehr nahe. Denn die Gewaltforschung beginnt mit dem Akt der Gewalt selbst. Aus dieser Axiomatik lassen sich dann für die Gewaltforschung auch durchaus strukturelle Probleme ableiten, die dann quasi erst als Ergebnis dieser Abweichung von einer Norm der natürlichen Gewaltunterdrückung oder Hemmschwelle zu struktureller Diskriminierung, Diktatur, etc führen, ohne dass jedoch klar wird, in wieweit hier das Phänomen (die Soziologie), die Theorie vor sich her treibt, oder das Ereignis selbst zum Urheber aller Geschichte wird (also Geschichte als reine Abfolge von Ereignissen und Folgen).

Letzteres scheint (wie allgemein in der Soziologie) in der Gewaltforschung gleichwohl die präferierte Version zu sein. Denn sie begrenzt das Ereignis Gewalt, mit einem sehr spezifischen, sozusagen kultur- wie kontextblinden Allgemeinmodell:

1. Gewalt ist unter Menschen immer eine Option

- (a) Dies wird nur eingeschränkt dadurch, dass, rein empirisch, jeder Mensch eine Gewalt-

hemmschwelle hat (phänomenologisch), und diese zu überwinden, situationsabhängig erlernt werden muss (und nur eine Ausnahme Minderheit diese nicht hätten)

2. Gewalt tritt phänomenologisch deswegen nur dort (neu, unkontrolliert) auf, wo ein (staatliches) irgendwie herrschendes Gewaltmonopol zur Unterdrückung konkreter physischer Gewalt fehlt oder zusammenbricht.

Damit ergibt sich automatisch eine Linie von einem Ereignis physischer Gewalt, zu einem Zusammenbruch, oder einer Fehlfunktion staatlicher Ordnung und ihres Gewaltmonopols das genau diese Formen der konkreten, physischen Gewalt (Sicherheit) ein zu dämmen versucht.

Die zersetzende oder/und transformatorische Macht, die solch ein Gewaltausbruch hat, kann dann im schlimmsten Fall zu bestimmten Formen staatlicher Verfasstheit führen, die, entweder diese Gewalt nicht mehr eindämmen können (failed states), oder wollen solange diese die strukturelle Macht des Systems stützen (totalitäre Systeme, Diktaturen).

Damit ergibt sich eine Argumentationsführung der Gewaltforschung ausgehend von einem prinzipiell IMMER angelegten Gewaltpotential, das unter konkreten praktischen Umständen (Abwesenheit eines Gewaltmonopolpotentials) sich in ein strukturelles Gewaltphänomen (Diktatur, Diskriminierung, Genozid) entwickeln kann.

Jene Machtformen, die für die Gewaltforschung also ein wesentliches "weites Feld" für eine genealogische Erklärung

von Gewalt darstellen, werden somit erst als Konsequenz - quasi als historisch konkrete Ausbuchstabierung eines entfachten (entflüchteten) Gewaltpotentials - ausbuchstabiert.

Was können wir hieraus für unser heutiges Problem der Praxis von Awarenesskulturen lernen.

Als gute Hegelianerin wissen wir jetzt schon wo diese Dialektik der beiden "fundamental verschiedenen" Ansätze endet: sie beschreiben ein und dieselbe Aktivität, aus dialektisch aufeinander bezogenen, verschiedenen Analysen eines jeweiligen, spezifischen "Zustand der Situation", ausgehend von einer Wahl (a priori) eines phänomenologischen (und konzeptionell logischen) "Ursprungs" des Ereignisses. Diese Verschiedenheit der Ansätze dient im Kreis dieser Dialektik dazu, einerseits einen gewissen Distinktionsgewinn zu erzielen, andererseits aber auch im Ergebnis Schlüsse

zu ziehen, die komplementäre Antworten auf "den ganzen Zustand der Situation" (das Absolute) zu geben in der Lage sind.

Eindeutigerweise basiert die Axiomatik des Antiimperialismus jedoch vor allem auf Resultaten der Friedensforschung (was auf Grund der historischen parallelen beider Theorien auch Sinn macht). D.h. der originäre Antiimperialismus der siebziger Jahre geht davon aus, dass eine strukturelle Situation (politische Theorie, Ideologie), ein bestimmtes Sosein der herrschenden Machtkonstellation zum Gefolge hat (Unterdrückung, Diskriminierung, etc.), um dann, ausgehend von diesem A priori der strukturellen Macht, auf eine bestimmte phänomenologische Gewaltform zu schließen. Also Kapitalismus gleich Ausbeutungsgewalt und Faschismus gleich physische Gewalt und Diskriminierung, etc. Eine Gewalt, die sich dann, als Resultat der strukturellen Situation, ganz konkret in spezifischer, physischer Gewalt entäußert.

Wir sind als Resultat unserer Überlegungen zur Praxis der Awareness zum Ergebnis gekommen, dass es eine der Voraussetzungen für progressive und eben nicht unverhofft regressive Awarenesspraxis ist, sich auf Phänomene struktureller Gewalt (Rassismus, Sexismus, Bullying, Antisemitismus, etc.) zu beschränken, und alle Formen nicht-struktureller Gewalt dem modernen (sic!) Rechtssystem zu überlassen.

Dies bedeutet also auch, dass der Ausgangspunkt von Gewaltforschung (im Unterschied zu traditioneller Friedensforschung) - das Phänomen physischer Gewalt an-sich - KEIN Triggerpunkt für Awarenessaktionismus sein sollte! Nicht, weil damit wertend etwas über die Axiomatik der

Gewaltforschung gesagt sein sollte (diese hat, wie oben dargestellt, eine wichtige Schwachstelle der Friedensforschung im Blick, die auch für

erweiterte, politische Diskussionen im Kontext der Awarenesskultur von Belang ist), sondern weil ohne die prinzipiell eindeutig identifizierbaren Formen struktureller Gewalt, der Gefahr für regressive, oder gar strukturelle Formen von Gewalt durch Awarenesspraxis, Vorschub geleistet wird.

Dies bedeutet jedoch nicht der Skepsis der Gewaltforschung gegenüber den A priori der Friedensforschung (strukturelle, ideologische Vorsortierung von Macht als Voraussetzung für die verschiedenen, konkreten Äußerungen von physischer Gewalt) entgegen zu treten. Der Anspruch ist, muss (!), in unserem Falle wesentlich bescheidener (sein):

Da die Prävention einer ins repressiv-regressive kippenden Awarenesspraxis, aufgrund ihrer oftmals mit sehr wenig Ressourcen und wenig Zeit zum Nachdenken ausgestatteten Praxis, und ihren leider wenig ausgeprägten oder/und durchdachten

Prozedere und Konzepten des Handelns, momentan die dringendste Aufgabe im Kontext progressiver Aktionsformen und Kollektive ist, sollte - for now - der Zugang der Gewaltforschung als Grundlage für Awarenesspraxis zunächst nicht zur Anwendung kommen.

Denn dazu bedarf es einen im höchsten Maße konzentrierten, empirisch extrem korrekten wie nüchternen Umgang mit dem "Phänomen Gewalt", will man diese ausschließlich ausgehend von ihrer rein physischen, individuellen Entäußerung betrachten, und daraus dann unmittelbar, "im Eifer der Situation", über "die notwendigen Konsequenzen" richten. Welche darüber hinaus dann auch noch alle den Anspruch haben ihre strukturelle Natur, im Sinne der Gewaltforschung, quasi vorweg zu nehmen.

Solch eine Methodik muss zwangsläufig jede heutige Praxis der Awareness überfordern, und führt dadurch zwangsweise selbst zu

systemischen, und auf der menschlichen, individuellen Ebene deswegen oftmals fatalen Fehleinschätzungen.