

cess. Even though Fukuyama sees the problem through his notion of *thymos*, one may agree with the criticism that points out the relevance of reality, within which the concept of activity should be taken more seriously, instead of in fact projecting a bridge between the ideal and actuality. What Hegel, for example, elaborates in the chapter on morality in the *Phenomenology of Mind*, imparts in its philosophical articulation the contours of a playground of ideology<sup>5</sup> related to activity. “The moral consciousness is, as a simple knowledge and Will of pure duty that has in its simplicity the object against itself, related in activity to the reality of the manifold cases, and so it gains manifold moral relationships” (Hegel, 1970: p. 339)

Speaking of extremism of today and its ideology, we can certainly assume that any kind of discourse of extreme ideology will respond to the state of affairs in the global society and to its effects in a local environment. Therefore, it will be addressed to the subjectivity, which is becoming moulded in the process: not only – sociologically speaking – to all kinds of threatened layers of a society (such as the unemployed, uneducated, youth, etc.), but to a larger society envisioned in a scope of separate identity. To understand this better, we can use terminology introduced by Martin Seliger, who may help us to avoid the sophisticated theoretical controversy concerning the definition of the notion of ideology in general. “/.../to whatever degree policies conform to fundamental principles, ‘operative ideology’ denotes the argumentation in favour of the policies actually adopted by a party. It is ‘ideology’ because it devises, explains and justifies action. It is ‘operative’ inasmuch as it is predicated on what is actually done or recommended for immediate action” (Seliger, 1976: p. 175).

Seliger’s book presents a quite formidable effort to delimit the meaning of the political ideology as well as to elaborate theoretical tools for the analysis of it. Seliger’s differentiating between fundamental and operative ideology makes it possible to place the extremism, as it develops within the ideology in general, in the context of antagonisms, which I attempted to explain through the controversy between Fukuyama and Derrida. These antagonisms might not be seen as simply objective situation, which would represent a clear ideological view, but they are as a rule mediated through ideologies themselves. The recent political changes, which trans-

5 Since Hegel’s language is dated, and the category of ideology had not been so apparent in the realm of philosophy at the time, we may attempt to construct inter-sections of older and later meanings. At the same time, no matter how narrow or wide our understanding of the notion of ideology may be, it quite indisputably comprises of signifiers of morality.