

THE END
OF OUR HISTORY

1989. The Berlin wall collapses. Destroyed by the citizens of the city in the will of unity of the German people. Symbolically, this fall marked the decline of the Soviet union, and by extension of its ideology.

Theorized by Francis Fukuyama (among others), the concept of the 'end of the History' is to say that after the fall of the Soviet ideology and the Cold War, nothing will happen because we'll live in an area where a single ideology will dominate; capitalism. The first time in the mankind history.

Since then, Fukuyama himself has come back on these remarks. Of course, the capitalism dominates. In the corporate world, the financial world or in the governmental sphere. But many voices have risen as so many counter-ideologies. These voices are, for some of them an heritage of the libertarian ideas of the 60s/70s, or older ones. For the others, they are spontaneous reactions arising against 'capitalist' or 'neo-capitalist' actions (military, economic, etc...). As developed by Nina Power, these movements of counter-ideologies claim a certain reactionary vision of a post-capitalist world. She evokes the metaphore of the mythological Hydra to represent this 'resistance'. Each head of this beast is a movement of revolt, of fed up, of indignation, of insubordination or quite simply of existence. All independent and different from each other, but linked by an anti-hegemonic vision. Even if, I understand, it's impossible to imagine that terrorism and Occupy movement, for exemple, are assimilated to the same things. But they are both a reaction against the dominant capitalist order.

Why, then, all these movements are minorities, or even marginalized? There is something good in the diversity. This is partly because of the way in which this type of subjects are treated by the dominant media spheres. Do not talk about it, is eclipsing the problems. To treat only one facet, is erasing certain legitimate claims. Sometimes even unconsciously the media occure diverge nt points of view. This is what McCombs and Shaw call the theory of the agenda settings. By speaking only in certain topical subjects or inviting the same people to television, radio or newspaper, the media create a spirale of silence (as defined by Noelle-Neumann). Spirale that stifles the anti-system speeches and encloses us in a pro-hegemonic vision. And here we can joint the point of view of Chantal Mouffe on the positioning in front of a dominant system. She say "artistic practices play a role in the constitution and the maintenance of a given symbolic order, or in this challenging". This passive positioning strengthens the system, though unconsciously or involuntarily. As George Gerbner very well explained, the long-term cultivation of this kind of discourses creates a situation of unconscious agreement about the immobilism of our society.

I challenged you to find a day, a single day, without media talking about the profits of big companies, stock market fluctuations, or political disputes. Yet, this is what slowly ends our History.

Le silence de nos cris
face au vacarme du capital.