

Sticking to Hegel's multilateral method of philosophy, Ganchev demonstrates that his own version of philosophy, which he describes as "philosophy of the universal history," unifies in the same productive whole ontology, epistemology, and the dialectical logic of the universal history. He goes a step beyond Hegel's position by adding axiology to unified philosophical cognition. Axiology becomes a core part of Ganchev's holistic approach to the philosophy of history. Moreover, he sublates Hegel's method by underlining the indispensable role of the theory of reflection in philosophical cognition with a special provision for the crucial place of the activity of the social (historical) subject.

Of tremendous importance for the entire trilogy is the last part of the third volume, which deals with socio-political prognostics. Taking Nikolay Sergeevich Rozov's works as a guide, Ganchev believes that the near future over the next 15–20 years can be viewed through three major tendencies of socio-political development: westernization/globalization, protest and isolationism, and multipolar partnership.⁹ These three tendencies determine three scenarios for the development of humanity. The first scenario features a total crisis of the national state on a global scale and a gradual decline of social life in all spheres. The second is characterized by a multitude of local wars, which might involve weapons of mass destruction. Ganchev assesses the probability of each of these scenarios at approximately 35–40%. The third and most favorable has a lower probability of 25–30%. According to this last, the financial groups ruling all over the world will become aware that it is in their interest to combine market principles with state regulations, which should lead to overcoming international conflicts and resolving global risks. This salvational accords with the duty to the creator and the profound teleology of evolution. In order for this only optimistic scenario to prevail, Ganchev calls on intellectuals to work for a new metaphorical Sermon on the Mount. The present noteworthy study undoubtedly belongs to this metaphor.

DIMITAR GANOV HOW THE "DEFERRAL OF MEANING" READS FILMS AND WATCHES PHILOSOPHY

The book *Political Philosophy in Motion *.mkv* (Manolache, Viorella. 2017. *Political Philosophy in Motion *.mkv*. The Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Translation: Ian Browne, Ann Marie Browne, 233 pp.) produces and traces multiple and multifaceted levels of dynamic transitions between images and concepts, discursive and visual movements, cinema and philosophy. The reference here is provided by Linda Hutcheon's theory of **dedoxification** presented in her *The Politics of Postmodernism* (1989). The term *doxa* has a long history in the structuralist tradition (Deleuze, Derrida, Bourdieu, etc.), but Hutcheon tries to build a specific model of deconstruction of popular ideologies in political philosophy. Viorella Manollache car-

⁹ Ibid., vol. III, 2016, 387.

ries this model over in a particularly apt way into her study on the philosophical reading of films, because cinematography is structurally polyphonic and the forms of public consciousness (opinion) are only some of the many elements of its completeness (or rather its incompleteness, according to Manolache). The author declares a marked attachment to Jean-Luc Nancy; to *Conversations on Cinema* (2013) by Gaetano Roberto and Slavoj Žižek; to the *aesthetics of immanence* of Georges Didi-Huberman, according to whom cinema “reworks” the raw material “into **nodes of a combinatory hybrid discourse**”; to Jacques Rancière’s view of “a cinematic feature, a particular form of political power enshrined in the specific **powers of the machine**, which is both lacunar and irregular” (Manolache 2017:6-7); etc. Manolache assumes from Damian Cox and Michael Levine the hypothesis that “**making a film = philosophizing**”, that “**film = philosophical text**”, and that between the two, there is a reciprocal recessive attitude whereby they are equally involved in the process of dedoxification. The author explores films that, according to her, focus on the main themes of political philosophy, such as power, ideology, representation, the representing and the represented (Manolache 2017: 3), social identity and conformism, liberalism, the social contract and mode of governance, personal freedom, the right to life and property¹, etc. (ibid. : 21). However, for Manolache, the presence of political influence in cinema is not limited to the themes of movies.

Of crucial importance in Manolache’s theory are the “visual clues.” She gives some very forceful examples of this in the films *Ghost Dance* (1983) directed by Ken McMillan, *Limits of Control* (2009) by Jim Jarmusch, *Memento* (2000) by Christopher Nolan, *After the Dark (The Philosophers)* (2013) by John Huddles, Woody Allen’s *Deconstructing Harry*² (1997), *D’ailleurs Derrida* (1999) by Safaa Fathy, etc. In *The Limits of Control*, the iterative principle of the hitman’s encounters requires that he respond negatively each time to the question whether he speaks Spanish, after which he receives a code scrawled on a matchbox. At the end of the film, there appears the caption **No limits, no control**. “If access to/at language is blocked... Jarmusch asserts that language is a control mechanism, making an equivalence of sense – **words-suggestions-persuasions-orderings = instruments of control**, nodes which any construct attempts to unite, unlocking, in fact, forces and energies that cannot be broken by **the limits of control**” (ibid.: 188). The particular forms of escape from public surveillance have an impressive political impact. In *Memento*, the character, who has lost his long-

¹ Here we do not have the space to explain with the required clarity the other two very important hypotheses about dexification in cinema – regarding how these major themes are taken over in film scenarios, and regarding the philosophical viewing of films and the recognition (in the sense of revealing) of the technologies that support/recompose that viewing.

² The film parodies Derrida’s philosophy (the title was translated very inadequately into Bulgarian as, *Da raznishtim Harry*, which literally means “Let’s Unravel Harry”).

term memory, leaves “reminders” for himself in the form of notes, tattoos, photographs, while the five-minute retrospective episodes of his memory are interrupted by memory failures and black-and-white linear sequences from his pre-traumatic time. This continues until the end of the movie (which is indeed the beginning), when the two dimensions of the narrative coincide, and the understanding is encrypted and postponed by “*incomprehensible letters, placed in sequences conforming to the instructions... given by someone else*” (ibid.: 189). In *Ghost Dance*, another film devoted to memory and ghosts, Jacques Derrida makes a cameo appearance, where he claims this signifies his being a ghost of himself, and that cinema is “*an art of ghosts*” (ibid. : 178). But more importantly, Derrida defines the ghost as a memory of that which never existed. We can easily guess that according to Derrida, this simulacrum, constitutive of pseudo-history, can be produced only by power positions, and that cinema is an excellent mediator for such ideologemes. Derrida's words, spoken nine years before the publication of his book *Specters of Marx*, as well as his overall presence in the book we are discussing, also point to the key function of Manolache's “visual clues”. For Derrida, the signifier can never independently designate what it signifies, but rather does so in relation to other signifiers from which it differs (thus, the neographism *différance* is introduced). The meaning is deferred forever or is carried continuously across a chain of signifiers, or “*traces*”, as Derrida calls them; but it is often implicitly understood that, ever present beyond the text is their quasi-transcendental (and in this case, ideologically preset) guarantor: *the specter*. In *Political Philosophy in Motion* *.mkv, the clue is not a password that enables the revealing of the message, but is a “trace”, an “imprint” that refers to another trace. Yet none of the traces are consequences of a transcendental signified that precedes them; instead, the traces themselves (the *clues*) produce meaning by means of their own “deferral”. The Derridean approach to the message in cinema determines the specific structure of the book. Manolache loquaciously constructs theoretical spaces, combines seemingly incompatible discourses and cinema analyses, justifies her scientific approach and finally completes her paragraphs without making a concluding emphasis. Explicit conclusions and generalizations are virtually absent or quite lapidary. Here the form of the scientific product seems to be inseparable from the content: the deferral of meaning plays a leading role in the book. The author does not construct a prescriptive explanation of “the political philosophy in motion”, does not produce a philosophical system that could serve as a “*substantial common good*” (Chantal Mouffe) for cinematography.

But the “deferral” that interests Manolache is related not to the abstract deconstructionist reading of film as philosophy, but to the existential meaning: ultimate existence. In Safaa Fathy's film *D'ailleurs Derrida (Derrida's Elsewhere)*, Derrida talks about the tragedy of death and survival: the meaning of what we have had to experience is determined at the last moment, that of death. And this happens not when all the necessary traces/clues have “deferred” this moment: the very structure of the deferral arises with the coming of the last moment. Not accidentally, *Memento* is an important film for Manolache, as is post-

apocalyptic cinema, but especially *The Philosophers*, in which philosophy students are invited to perform a thought experiment: they have to decide who of them, and why, must survive a nuclear war. Only when the experiment and the idea of suicide completely displaces reality do we understand that “we let ourselves be led by what we feel, and not by real facts. And that means that weak minds are easy to manipulate and to influence by arguments presented with zeal, even if in reality these are very bad or completely erroneous ideas” (ibid.: 101). Manolache offers varying interpretations of this film through a creative application of the ideas of Cioran, Lyotard, Arendt, but the single guiding thread of her interpretation is that the very idea of the credibility of the apocalypse originates not from the approaching end of life, but from the acceptance of the manipulative “visual clues” for a sort of dooming eschatology. In the film, political philosophy works with the tools of cinematic aesthetics, visually expressing the inner collisions of the characters.

The monograph *Political Philosophy in Motion *.mkv* by Viorella Manolache, a young researcher at the Ion Brătianu Institute of Political Science and International Relations in Bucharest, is a remarkable phenomenon in world philosophical literature. It is a very original interdisciplinary work that can be placed simultaneously in the domains of political philosophy, philosophy of cinema, aesthetic theory, poststructuralism, etc., but persistently eludes its ultimate classification under a particular scientific field or tradition, and avoids sending a prescriptive message to readers.

ХРИСТО ХРИСТОВ

ЧОВЕШКОТО ТЯЛО КАТО ИЗРАЗИТЕЛ НА ИДЕЯТА ЗА ЛИЧНА НЕПРИКОСНОВЕНОСТ

През 1533 г. в Парижкия университет пристига от Льовен един млад студент по медицина на име Андриес ван Везел, който се захваща да изучава теориите на Гален за строежа на човешкото тяло под ръководството на известния доктор по медицина Жак Дюбоа. Младият човек трескаво изучава началата на анатомията като наука, търсец знания, които да бъдат получени посредством опитни наблюдения, но не и с четене на стари книги, като за целта прекарвал дълго в разглеждането на костите на покойниците, запазени в костниците на Гробището на невинните. Този млад студент по медицина през 1541 г. ще разкрие, че книгите на Гален по анатомия почиват на резултати, получени при дисекции на маймуни, и поради това съдържат много неточности. Същият ще се захване да изготвя първите атласи по анатомия, ползвайки услугите на редица художници по време на учебни дисекции на труповете на екзекутирани престъпници, за да издаде съчинение за строежа на човешкото тяло в седем тома в 1543 г., озаглавено *De humani corporis fabrica*. Този неспокоен, критичен и феноменално любознателен човек, умиращ при завръщането си от Йерусалим, където е бил на поклонение в Светите земи, остава известен в историята като Андреас Везалий, ба-