Summaries

Luz Gómez García: Equality and Gender. The Arabian Woman Renews Her Militancy

The article discusses recent developments in the struggle for women's liberation in the Arab world. It deals with contradictory attitudes as both religious and secular women begin to recognize that binary thinking about each other as either conservative or modernized does more to exclude women than to bring them closer to their aspirations as fully respected human beings. Analyses of the Egyptian and Tunisian situation from a feminist point of view reveal that women are again being excluded from public spaces when they are defined as ›religious‹ or as ›victims‹ of repression, violence and intimidation. The article shows that women, queer people and social movements in the Arab world are gradually discovering the productivity of intersectional approaches to their reality. Finally, it is argued that secular Western feminism can also learn from the different groups in the Arab world as well as their forms of resistance.

Wulf D. Hund: A Black, Scabby Brazilian. Marginalia to a Dream of Baruch Spinoza

Spinoza's famous dream is intimately connected with the history of colonialism and the annals of anti-semitism. Differing from the numerous images of Africans circulating in the Netherlands, Spinoza's vision represented neither an exotic imagination, a respectable partner, nor a submissive slave. Instead it represented the spectre of the slave in revolt. The skin disorder attributed to him refers to both colonial and anti-semitic racism and, in this context, to the ideology of purity of blood, which had legitimated the expulsion of Jews from the Iberian Peninsula. Subsequently, those who had fled to the Netherlands used it against their own black slaves. Spinoza does not critically dissolve this double racist nexus, but dreams of it as a menace. His vision can therefore be seen as a slumbering anticipation of the collaboration of European philosophy in the construction of modern racism.

Nicolás González Varela: Marx' Spinoza Notebooks

Marx was certainly an attentive reader of the political Spinoza. A substantial appropriation took place between 1841 and 1842, in his »democratic« phase, preceding his »Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right« and his overcoming the Republican Liberalism of Bauer and Ruge. Marx, following Hegel's method itself, repudiates political Spinozism – not because Spinoza is absolutely wrong, but because his thought is not at a level according to the most advanced development of Liberalism, which is that of Hegel. Marx conceives Spinozism as a point of view which is necessary and essential for the development of Liberalism, but he rejects the system as such and regards Spinoza as a subordinated moment of Hegelian political philosophy. Marxs understanding of Spinoza in its entirety, in its limitations and blind spots, is related to the moment in which Marx himself takes up the ›patricide‹ of Hegel.

Jan Rehmann: Spinoza and Nietzsche. Against Confusion the Capacity to Act with the Power of Domination

The widespread assumption that Nietzsche's *Will to Power* stands in continuity to Spinoza's *Potentia agendi* fails to take into account the fundamental opposition between the two: Spinoza's *Potentia agendi* is not used in the hierarchical sense of domination but understood as a capacity to cooperate in a ›reasonable‹ way. By contrast, the later Nietzsche defines power as »overpowering«, »dominating«, and »violating«. In fact, the later Nietzsche sharply denounces Spinoza's »Jewish hatred« and turns his *Capacity to Act* into its elitist and exterminist opposite. The construction of a Spinozian-Nietzschean linearity thus amounts to equating social cooperation and a phantasized annihilation of the sick and the weak. We must liberate Spinoza's philosophy from Nietzsche's suffocating embrace and use it for our alternative designs of a ›good life‹ for all.

Vesa Oittinen: ›Marx Without a Beard‹? Spinoza in Soviet Philosophy

The Soviet reception of Spinoza had its starting point in the analyses of Plekhanov who asserted that Marxist materialism was just a form of ›modern Spinozism‹. Together with Hegel, Spinoza thus became one of the philosophical ancestors of dialectical materialism. Although the Plekhanov tradition of interpreting Spinoza remained dominant until the end of the Soviet Union, there were nevertheless many more or less original attempts to combine Spinoza's ideas with Marxism. As early as the 1930s Lev S. Vygotsky attempted to use Spinoza's doctrine of affects as a remedy to overcome the crisis in psychology. Another prominent ›Soviet Spinozist‹ was Evald Ilyenkov, whose ideas on an ›activity approach‹ to philosophy were founded on Spinoza's insights.

Werner Goldschmidt: Spinoza or Machiavelli? Althusser's Confessions of a Heretic Marxist

Following Althusser's own ›confessions‹, the essay traces his transition from an apparently orthodox Marxist-Leninist to a Marxist ›heretic‹ who becomes an unwilling witness to a theoretically ›savage‹ fusion of Machiavelli, Spinoza, Marx und Nietzsche in Negri's post-operaism. After an insufficient De-Stalinization in the 1950s, Althusser's criticism first turns against the influence of an allegedly bourgeois humanism and historicism in the French Communist Party. Fighting against the underlying ›mystifications‹ of Hegel's ›teleological‹ dialectics, he invokes Spinoza, but thereby attributes positions to him that Spinoza himself ›would never have admitted‹. Although Althusser defined himself as a »heretical Spinozist«, it was actually Machiavelli who ›awakened‹ him in the 1980s to become the philosopher of an anti-historical, ›aleatory Materialism‹.