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#### Attempts to create new cultural systems of relation that do not recognize capital ensures the ability of capital to coopt it

Ebert and Zavarzadeh in 2008 (Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p. 27-29)

On the theoretical level, **the attacks on labor focused on the material logic**: the question that Sumner H. Slichter had raised, namely that the U.S. was "shifting from a capitalistic community to a laboristic one-that is to a community in which employees rather than businessmen are the strongest single influence." **This second** cultural **front developed new arguments for the legitimacy, permanence, and transhistorical moral and social authority of capitalism as an economic regime** that was seen as the condition of possibility for human freedom. This is what, for example, F. A. Hayek's writings did. Not only did they provide the grounds for a Neoliberal economics that marginalized Keynesianism, but they also offered an ethics and a philosophy for capitalism (The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism). In a subsequent move, **post-theory** ("post" as in postcolonialism, postrnarxism, poststructuralism, etc.) **translated Neoliberal economies into a new philosophy of representation that made discourse the primary ground of social reality**. Discourse was not simply a "text" in its narrow sense but the ensemble of the phenomena in and through which social production of meaning takes place, an ensemble that constitutes a society as such. **The discursive is** not. therefore, **being conceived** as a level nor even as a dimension of the social, but rather **as being co-extensive with the social**.. .. There is nothing specifically social which is constituted outside the discursive, it is clear that the non-discursive is not opposed to the discursive as if it were a matter of "'1'0 separate levels. History and society are an infinite text. (Laclau, "Populist Rupture and Discourse" 87) **Class in post-theory was turned into a trope whose meanings are wayward and indeterminate**-**a metaphor for a particular language game** (Jenks, Culture 4). **This move has de-materialized class by hollowing out its economic content and turning its materialism into "a materiality without materialism and even perhaps without matter**" (Derrida, "Typewriter Ribbon" 281). **This** de-materializing **has taken place through a network of "post**" interpretive **strategies: Such as "destruction**" (Heidegger, The Basic Problems of Phenomenology 22- 23); **"deconstruction"** (Derrida, "Letter to a Japanese Friend"); **"schizoanalysis"** (Deleuze and Guattari, Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia 273-382); **"reparative reading"** (Sedgwick, Touching Feeling 123-151), **"cultural logic"** (Jameson, Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism); **"performativity"** (Butler, Gender Trouble); **"immaterial labor"** (Hardt and Negri, MultItude), **and "whatever** (qualunque)" (Agamben, The Coming Community). **The goal of both the populist and** the **theoretical campaigns against the labor movement**-which capital often referred to as "socialistic schemes" (Fones- Wolf 52}---**has been the blurring of class lines by depicting class antagonisms as cultural differences,** and to persuade people that, as Wallace F. Bennett, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers put it, **"We are all capitalists"** (quoted in Fones-Wolf 70-73). In other words, **as far as capitalism is concerned, there are no class differences in the U.S. and what makes people different are their values, lifestyles, and preferences. We call this obscuring of class relations by cultural values and the play of language the "cultural turn."** The term "cultural turn" is often used to designate a 'particular movement in social and cultural inquiries that acquires analytical authority in the 1970s and is exemplified by such books as Hayden White's Metahistory and Clifford Geertz's The Interpretation of Cultures , both of which were published in 1973. White describes history writing as a poetic act and approaches it as essentially a linguistic (tropological) practice (Metahistory ix). **The view of history and social practices as poiesis**-which is most powerfully articulated in Heidegger's writings and is re-written in various idioms by diverse authors from Cleanth Brooks through Jacques Derrida to Giorgio Agamben-**constitutes the interpretive logic of the cultural turn**. Geertz's argument that culture is a semiotic practice, an ensemble of texts (Interpretation of Cultures 3- 30), canonizes the idea of culture as writing in the analytical imaginary. **The cultural tum is associated by some critics with the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s,** whose cultural activism they assume energized rebellion against "scientific" social and cultural inquiries and ushered in the cultural tum with its linguistic reading of culture and emphasis on the subjective (Bonnell and Hunt, ed., Beyond the Cultural Turn 1-32). **Other critics have also related the cultural tum to the radical activism of the post-1968 era and to postmodemism as well as to a tendency among radical intellectuals,** as Larry Ray and Andrew Sayer put it, **to approach language no longer as reflecting "material being" but to read it** (in Heidegger's words) **as the "house of being"** (Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn I). **These and** similar **explanations of the cultural tum are insightful in their own terms**. However, **"their own terms" are not only historically narrow but are conceived within the very terms that they seem to critique: they are, in other words, accounts of the cultural tum from within the cultural tum**. As a result, **in spite of their professed interest in material analysis, their interpretations, like the writings of the cultural tum, remain culturalist. They** too **analyze culture in cultural terms**-that is, **immanently**. **Culture cannot be grasped in its own terms because its own terms are always the terms of ideology. Therefore to understand culture, one needs to look "outside**."

#### The focus on mediums of cultural significations, such as the body, creates an inversion of materialism that confuses the result of the modes of production with the cause. The reduction of materiality into materialism dehistoricizes class structures.

**Ebert and Zavarzadeh in 2008**(Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p. 38-41)

**In order to represent media as** material, that is, **as economic**, **Hall reduces the economic to finance and banking**. His interpretation of the economic (and therefore of the base) is exemplary of the way the cultural tum has converted the material/economic into the cultural and placed (mostly aesthetic) values in place of labor. In Hall's scheme, **media are economic because they "sustain the global circuits of economic exchange on which the worldwide movement of information, knowledge, capital, investment, the production of commodities, the trade in raw material and the marketing of goods and ideas depend**" (209). **The economic in his narrative is exchange** (of what is obviously produced somewhere else). It is, in short, "trade," which in Neoliberal economic theories is the source of wealth (Hayek, *The Fatal Conceit;* Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom).* The dynamic of Hall's economics is the movement of capital across borders through banking systems, stock markets, and other financial activities. The media truncate the ... distances across which commodities can be assembled, the rate at which profits can be realized (reducing the so-called 'turn-over time of capital'), even the intervals between the opening time of different stock markets around the world-the minute time-gaps in which millions of dollars can be made or lost. (210) **The fact that the media make money does not turn them into material/ economic agents. Money**, itself, **is not a material object** (as positivists maintain), **nor is it the materiality of a "sign" or the sign of materiality,** as such Left writers as Gayatri C. Spivak have argued and who, after some relays, represent economics/economy as a structure of writing-textuality in play ("Speculation on Reading Marx: After Reading Derrida" 41). **Economy is "the material basis of the world"** (Marx, *Capital* I, 175), and **its structure is not** one **of representation but** of **objective class interests**, or as Engels puts it, "**'economics deals not with things but with relations between persons, and** in the last resort, **between classes**, these relations are, however attached to things and appear as things" (Engels, "Review of Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy"* 514). **Media speed up the process of realizing "profit**" made at the point of production. Thus, **they remain secondary and dependent on the materialism of the relations of production**. **The** quiet, mediated **redefinition of the material and economic and the** consequent **substitution of banking for production** put **money in place of** surplus **labor**, **trade in place of exploitation**, and **investment** **in place of class** relations. **Hall is**, of course, **repeating a cultural notion of the economic, wealth and work popularized by bourgeois economics in which "supply and demand" constitute the fundamental law and "trade" is the driving force in creating value** (Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations).* In the analytics of "base and superstructure," however, **the base is not finance capital. It is the totality of the relations of production** that are formed in connection with a particular level of productive forces. It is not about the "turnover time" of capital; it is about "production" of capital. **The source of wealth is not "interest"-**a representation legitimated by Jacques Derrida *(Specters of Marx)* and canonized in cultural theory (Jameson's "Culture and Finance Capital"; Kumar, ed., *World Bank Literature).* **Money does not produce** (more) **money**. **Profit is the effect of the particular social relations of capital and labor** that produce surplus value and not from trade or investment. . Hall's **erasure of base/superstructure-**as well as most of the other Left theory discourses aimed at demolishing the materialist analysis of culture- **depends on a theory of materialism that equates materialism with materiality.** But **materiality in these** Left **narratives is** actually a mode of **matterism**: **the me- dium of cultural practices**. **Since** all **cultural acts take place within a medium** eating, filming, writing, religion, etc.), **they are assumed to be material**, and in most Left theory, **this becomes the same as materialism**. **Equating the "material" (materiality) with "materialism" is one of the major contributions of Left writers to the legitimation of capitalism.** The issue here is not simply such innocuous subjects as the status of filmic apparatus or the tropes of a text or its affects. **What is at stake here are the conditions of historical possibility for all of these factors and their connections to the social relations of production within which they become what they are**. In other words, **the question of materiality and materialism is,** in the end, **a *class question.* By equating materiality and materialism, the Left obliterates the class lines dividing consumption from production, wages from profit, and capital from labor**. In doing so, **it normalizes the capitalist ideology that "We are all capitalists" and**, therefore**, concedes that there is not outside to the existing social relations**. The analytics of base/superstructure explains why--why the way people think is conditioned by the way they live and how this is determined by their place in the social division of labor. **Left theory has normalized the market's inversion of this relation**, and in subtle ways and through interminable relays, **it has implied that in the "new" times, the way people live is the effect of the way they think**. **Thought is given an independent existence that, furthermore**, **is endowed with the agency to produce the social world**. Here **the ideas of the Left converge with those of the Right** (Gilder, "Triumph Over Materialism") because both are products of the same class interests. **The Left in the global North has become the advance guard for the market's inversion of materialism into objective idealism (materiality):** it has accepted as given that if something exists in the mind it is real, and what is real is material and what is material is real. But, "**it is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness"** (Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* 21). **To marginalize materialism, the** cultural **turn represents it as an object-ism, namely, an attempt to build a pre-figural origin for an ontology.** Subsequently, by following its familiar formula, **it "deconstructs" what it has constructed as an ontology ("**materialism") **into the rhetorical effects of tropes and concludes that materialism is spectral representation, inscription, and memory.** But **where speculation ends, materialism begins**. **Materialism is the worldliness of human practices**-**practices that** constantly **revolutionize** (the relations of) **production and make human history**, namely, the progress of humans toward freedom from necessity**. Materialism is the objective, productive activities of humans involving them in social relations under definite historical conditions that are independent of their will and are shaped by struggles between contesting classes over the surplus produced by social labor. A materialism that excludes historical processes is a theology of the corporeal.** Materiality, on the other hand, is the objective idealism of the cultural turn which, in the speculative tradition of Feuerbach, produces a spiritualized "materiality without materialism and even perhaps without matter" (Derrida, "Typewriter Ribbon" 281). It is **the** contemplative **corporeality of difference**, which is **the effect of the textual sensuality of language**-**the medium of representation, the body and its affective resistance to conceptuality and determinate meanings.** In the turn to culture, **materiality becomes a performativity**, **a species of meaning, an effect of archives, of memories, which is another way of saying: it is the effect of "matter as a sign**" (Butler, *Bodies That Matter 49).* **Matter**, however, **is not a sign or any other physical body, nor** is it **the self-alienated spirit** or an invention to support atheism (George Berkeley). **To identify matter with an object**, an indivisible atom or any immutable substance/ motion, or to equate it with a quanta of light, zero-dimensional point particles, or one-dimensional "strings" ("superstring theory"), **is to make the local modalities of matter absolute and to yield to the urge for physicalism and its metaphysical twin,** (unchanging) **substance**, **in bourgeois philosophy and its ontology and epistemology. Matter is objective reality in history-materialism; it is not corporeality-matterism**. **Owning a house and not owning a house are both social relations and both are materialist**-articulations of labor relations in history. **Matter is the shared property of the totality of different and transforming elements, historical processes, and social practices; these are independent from the will of the individual and exist in conflicts** (motion) **objectively outside the consciousness of the agent**. **The** cultural **turn disperses matter into substance** (body, language, sign ... ) **and** thus **dehistoricizes it-**separates matter from production and its contradictions-**and consequently "substantiates" the class interests of the owners.**

#### Class is the driver of all social and existential conditions. Only emancipation from the status quo modes of production can enact any form of human freedom

**Ebert and Zavarzadeh in 2008**(Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p.ix-xii)

**Class** is everywhere and nowhere. It **is the most decisive condition of social life: it shapes the economic and**, consequently, **the social and cultural resources of people**. It determines their birth, healthcare, clothing, schooling, eating, love, labor, sleep, aging, and death. Yet **it remains invisible in the every day and in practical consciousness because,** for the most part, **it is dispersed through popular culture, absorbed in cultural difference, obscured by formal equality before the law or explained away by philosophical arguments**. Class in Culture attempts to trace class in different cultural situations and practices to make its routes and effects visible. However, the strategies obscuring class are cunning, complex, and subtle, and are at work in unexpected sites of culture. Consequently, this is not a linear book: it surprises class in the segments, folds, vicinities, points, and divides of culture. It moves, for example, from Abu Ghraib to the post-deconstructive proclamations of Antonio Negri, from stem cell research to labor history, from theoretical debates on binaries to diets. It is also written in a variety of registers and lengths: in the vocabularies of theory, the idioms of description and explanation, as well as in the language of polemics, and in long, short, and shorter chapters. Regardless of the language, the plane of argument, the length of the text, and the immediate subject of our critiques, our purpose has been to tease out from these incongruous moments the critical elements of a basic grammar of class-one that might be useful in reading class in other social sites. Our text on eating, for example, unpacks two diets that, we argue, reproduce class binaries in the zone of desire. The point here is not only when one eats, one eats class, but also class works in the most unexpected comers of culture, Eating as a sensuous, even sensual corporeality, is seen as the arena of desire which is represented in the cultural imaginary as autonomous from social relations. **Desire is thought to be exemplary of the singularity of the individual and her freedom from material conditions. One desires what one desires. Desire is the absolute lack: it is the unrepresentable.** We argue, however, that **one desires what one can desire; one's desire is always and ultimately determined before one desires it, and it is determined by one's material (class) conditions.** Our point is not that **individuality and singularity** are myths but that they **are myths in class societies**. **Individuality and singularity become reality**-not stories that culture tells to divert people from their anonymity in a culture of commodities-**only when one is free from necessity beyond which "begins that development of human energy which is an end in itself'** (Marx, Capita/III, 958-59). **Class is the negation of human freedom**. **A theory of class** (such as the one we articulate) **argues that class is the material logic of social life and** therefore it **determines how people live and think**. But this is too austere for many contemporary critics. ("Determinism" is a dirty totalizing word in contemporary social critique.) Most writers who still use the concept of class prefer to talk about it in the more subtle and shaded **languages of overdetermination, lifestyle, taste, prestige, and preferences**, **or** in the **stratification** terms of income, occupation, and even status. These **are all significant** aspects of social life, **but they are effects of class and not class**. This brings us to the "simple" question: What is class? We skip the usual review of theories of class because they never lead to an answer to this question. The genre of review requires, in the name of fairness, "on the one hand, on the other hand" arguments that balance each perspective with its opposite. The purpose of Class in Culture is not review but critique not a pluralism that covers up an uncommitted wandering in texts but an argument in relation to which the reader can take a position leading to change and not simply be more informed. This is not a book of information; it is a book of critique. To answer the question (what is class?), we argue-and here lies the austerity of our theory-**class is essentially a relation of property, of owning**. Class, in short, is **a relation to labor because property is the congealed alienated labor of the other**. By owning we obviously do not mean owning just anything. Owning a home or a car or fine clothes does not by itself put a person in one or another class. What does, is **owning the labor power of others in exchange for wages.** Unlike a home or a car, labor (or to be more precise "**labor power**") **is a commodity that produces value when it is consumed**. Structures like homes or machines like cars or products such as clothes do not produce value. Labor does. **Under capitalism, the producers of value do not own what they produce**. The capitalist who has purchased the labor power of the direct producers owns what they produce. Class is this relation of labor-owning. This means wages are symptoms of estranged labor, of the unfreedom of humans, namely the exploitation of humans by humans-which is another way to begin explaining class. **To know class, one has to learn about the labor relations that construct class differences**, that enable the subjugation of the many by the few. **Under capitalism labor is unfree**, it is forced wage-labor that produces "surplus value"-an objectification of a person's labor as commodities that are appropriated by the capitalist for profit. **The labor of the worker,** therefore, **becomes "an object" that "exits outside him**, independently, as **something alien to him, and it becomes a power on its own confronting him" which**, among other things, **"means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien**" (Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,272). The direct producers' own labor, in other words, negates their freedom because it is used, in part, to produce commodities not for need but for exchange. **One**, therefore, **is made "to exist, first, as a worker; and, second as a physical subject**. The height of this servitude is that it is only as a worker that he can maintain himself as a physical subject, and that it is only as a physical subject that he is a worker" (273). Under wage labor, **workers**, consequently, **relate to their own activities as "an alien activity not belonging to [**them]" (275). **The estranged relation** of people to the object of their labor **is not a local matter but includes all spheres of social life**. ln other words, it is "at the same time the relation to the sensuous external world, to the objects of nature, as an alien world inimically opposed to [them]" (275). **The scope of estrangement in a class society**, of human unfreedom caused by wage labor, is not limited to the alienation of the worker from her products. It includes the productive activity itself because what is produced is a "summary of the activity, of production," and therefore it is "manifested not only in the result but in the act of production, within the producing activity itself' (274). **The worker, in the act of production, alienates herself from herself because production activity is "active alienation, the alienation of activity, the activity of alienation**" (274)-an activity which does not belong to her. This is another way of saying that the activity of labor-life activity-is turned against the worker and "here we have self-estrangement" (275). In his theory of alienated labor, Marx distinguishes between the "natural life" of eating, drinking, and procreating which humans share with other animals and the "species life" which separates humans from animal. This distinction has significant implications for an emancipatory theory of classless society. "Species life" is the life marked by consciousness, developed senses, and a human understanding himself in history as a historical being because "his own life is an object for him" (276}--humans, as "species beings," are self-reflexive. To be more clear, "conscious life activity distinguishes man immediately from animal life activity" (276). The object of man's labor is the actualization, the "objectification of man's species-life" (277). Alienated labor, however, "in tearing away from man the object of his production, therefore, ... tears from him his species-life" (277). Consequently, "it changes for him the life of the species into a means of individual life ... it makes individual life in its abstract form the purpose of life of the species, likewise in the abstract and estranged form" (276). This is another way of saying that **the larger questions that enable humans to build their world consciously are marginalized, and sheer biological living** ("individual life in the abstract") **becomes the goal of life in class society structured by wage labor. "Life itself appears only as a means to life"** (276). **Class turns "species life" into "natural life."** Since society is an extension of the sensuous activities of humans in nature (labor), **the alienation of humans from the products of their labor, from the very process of labor, which is their life activity, and from their species-being, leads to the estrangement of humans from humans (**277)-**the alienation in class societies that is experienced on the individual level as loneliness**. In confronting oneself, one confronts others; which is another way of saying that one's **alienation from the product of one's labor**, from productive activity, and from "species life" **is** at the same time **alienation from other people, their labor, and the objects of their labor**. In class societies, **work**, therefore, **becomes the negation of the worker:** he "only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself" (274). **Ending class structures is a re-obtaining of human freedom.** Freedom here is not simply the freedom of individuals as symbolized, for instance, in bourgeois "freedom of speech" but is a world-historical **"freedom from necessity**" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme). **Class struggle is the struggle for human emancipation by putting an end to alienated labor** (as class relations). Alienated labor is the bondage of humans to production: it is an effect of wage labor (which turns labor into a means of living) and private property (which is congealed labor). **Emancipation from alienated labor is, therefore, the emancipation of humans from this bondage because "all relations of servitude," such as class relations, "are but modifications and consequences" of the relation of labor to production** (Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,280). **Class**, in short, **is the effect of property relations that are themselves manifestations of the alienation of labor as wage labor. Wage labor alienates one from one's own product, from oneself, from other humans, and, as Marx put it, "estranges the species from man**" (276).

#### Capitalism’s preoccupation with endless accumulation will result in total ecological destruction and extinction

Foster 11,[John Bellamy ] Dec. 2011, Capitalism and the Accumulation of Catastrophe, Monthly Review, Vol. 63 Issue 07, <http://monthlyreview.org/2011/12/01/capitalism-and-the-accumulation-of-catastrophe> (Aug 2012)

Yet, the continued pursuit of Keynes’s convenient lie over the last eight decades has led to a world far more polarized and beset with contradictions than he could have foreseen. It is a world prey to the enormous unintended consequences of accumulation without limits: namely, global economic stagnation, financial crisis, and planetary ecological destruction. Keynes, though aware of some of the negative economic aspects of capitalist production, had no real understanding of the ecological perils—of which scientists had already long been warning. Today these perils are impossible to overlook. Faced with impending ecological catastrophe, it is more necessary than ever to abandon Keynes’s convenient lie and espouse the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. Capitalism, the society of “après moi le déluge!” is a system that fouls its own nest—both the human-social conditions and the wider natural environment on which it depends. The accumulation of capital is at the same time accumulation of catastrophe, not only for a majority of the world’s people, but living species generally. Hence, nothing is *fairer*—more just, more beautiful, and more necessary—today than the struggle to overthrow the regime of capital and to create a system of substantive equality and sustainable human development; a socialism for the twenty-first century.

#### Method is key- our alternative is dialectical materialism which provides the best method for understanding social and political relations-this education is key to achieve class consciousness and stop capitalism

**Lukacs in 67** (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

If the question were really to be formulated in terms of such a crude antithesis it would deserve at best a pitying smile. But in fact it is not (and never has been) quite so straightforward. Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research had disproved once and for all every one of Marx's individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious 'orthodox' Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and hence dismiss all of Marx's theses in toto—without having to renounce his orthodoxy for a single moment. **Orthodox Marxism**, therefore, **does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx's investigations**. It is not the 'belief in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a 'sacred' book. **On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened** only along the lines laid down by its founders. It is the conviction, moreover, that all attempts to surpass or 'improve' it have led and must lead to over-simplification, triviality and eclecticism. Materialist dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic. **This definition is so important** and altogether so crucial for an understanding of its nature **that if the problem is to be approached in the right way this must be fully grasped before we venture upon a discussion of the dialectical method itself**. **The issue turns on the question of theory and practice**. And this not merely in the sense given it by Marx when he says in his first critique of Hegel that "theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses".1 Even **more to the point is the need to discover those features and definitions both of the theory and the ways of gripping the masses which convert the theory, the dialectical method, into a vehicle of revolution**. We must extract the practical essence of the theory from the method and its relation to its object. **If this is not done that 'gripping the masses' could well turn out to be a will o' the wisp**. **It might turn out that the masses were in the grip of quite different forces**, that they were in pursuit of quite different ends. **In that event**, there would be no necessary connection between the theory and their activity, **it would be a form that enables the masses to become conscious of their socially necessary or fortuitous actions, without ensuring a genuine and necessary bond between consciousness and action**. In the same essay\* Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible. "It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought." Or, as he expresses it in an earlier work:3 "It will then be realised that the world has long since possessed something in the form of a dream which it need only take possession of consciously, in order to possess it in reality." **Only when consciousness stands in such a relation to reality can theory and practice be united. But for this to happen the emergence of consciousness must become the decisive step which the historical process must take** towards its proper end (an end constituted by the wills of men, but neither dependent on human whim, nor the product of human invention). The historical function of theory is to make this step a practical possibility. Only when a historical situation has arisen in which a class must understand society if it is to assert itself; only when the fact that a class understands itself means that it understands society as a whole and when, in consequence, the class becomes both the subject and the object of knowledge; in short, **only when these conditions are all satisfied will the unity of theory and practice, the precondition of the revolutionary function of the theory, become possible**. Such a situation has in fact arisen with the entry of the proletariat into history. "When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing social order,” Marx declares, "it does no more than disclose the secret of its own existence, for it is the effective dissolution of that order." \* **The links between the theory that affirms this and the revolution are not just arbitrary, nor are they particularly tortuous** or open to misunderstanding. **On the contrary, the theory is essentially the intellectual expression of the revolutionary process itself. In it every stage of the process becomes fixed so that it may be generalised**, communicated, utilised **and developed**. **Because the theory does nothing but arrest and make conscious each necessary step, it becomes at the same time the necessary premise of the following one**. <1-3>

#### Our method is the only way to stop capitalism-their knowledge only values individual epistemologies and identity. This cuts analysis off from the totality of capitalism ensuring the case fails.

**Lukacs in 67** (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

**It is not the primacy of economic motives in historical explanation that constitutes the decisive difference between Marxism and bourgeois thought, but the point of view of totality**. **The category of totality, the** all-pervasive **supremacy of the whole over the parts is the essence of the method which** **Marx** took over from Hegel and brilliantly **transformed into the foundations of a wholly new science**. **The capitalist separation of the producer from the total process of production**, the division of the process of labour into parts at the cost of the individual humanity of the worker, **the atomisation of society into individuals** who simply go on producing without rhyme or reason, **must all have a profound influence on the** thought, the science and the **philosophy of capitalism**. **Proletarian science is revolutionary not just by virtue of its revolutionary ideas** which it opposes to bourgeois society, **but above all because of its method**. The primacy of the category of totality is the bearer of the principle of revolution in science. The revolutionary nature of Hegelian dialectics had often been recognised as such before Marx, notwithstanding Hegel's own conservative applications of the method. But no one had converted this knowledge into a science of revolution. It was Marx who transformed the Hegelian method into what Herzen described as the 'algebra of revolution\*. **It was not enough**, however, **to give it a materialist twist.** **The revolutionary principle** inherent in Hegel's dialectic **was able to come to the surface** less **because of** that than because of **the validity of the method itself, viz. the concept of totality**, the subordination of every part to the whole unity of history and thought. **In Marx the dialectical method aims at understanding society as a whole. Bourgeois thought concerns itself with objects** that arise either from the process of studying phenomena in isolation, or from the division of labour and specialisation in the different disciplines. **It holds abstractions to be 'real' if it is naively realistic, and 'autonomous' if it is critical**. **Marxism**, however, **simultaneously raises and reduces all specialisations to the level of aspects in a dialectical process**. This is not to deny that the process of abstraction and hence the isolation of the elements and concepts in the special disciplines and whole areas of study is of the very essence of science. **But what is decisive is whether this process of isolation is a means towards understanding the whole** and whether it is integrated within the context it presupposes and requires, **or whether the abstract knowledge of an isolated fragment retains its 'autonomy\* and becomes an end in itself.** In the last **analysis Marxism docs not acknowledge the existence of independent sciences of law, economics or history**, etc.: **there is nothing but a single, unifed— dialectical and historical—science of the evolution of society as a totality**. The category of totality, however, determines not only the object of knowledge but also the subject. **Bourgeois thought judges social phenomena** consciously or unconsciously, naively or subtly, consistently **from the standpoint of the individual**.1 **No path leads from the individual to the totality; there is at best a road leading to aspects of particular areas, mere fragments for the most part**, 'facts\* bare of any context, or to abstract, special laws. The totality of an object can only be posited if the positing subject is itself a totality; and if the subject wishes to understand itself, it must conceive of the object as a totality. In modern society only the classes can represent this total point of view. By tackling every problem from this angle, above all in Capital, Marx supplied a corrective to Hegel who still wavered between the "great individual and the abstract spirit of the people." Although his successors understood him even less well here than on the issue of'idealism' versus 'materialism\* this corrective proved even more salutary and decisive. <27-28>

### Case

#### Their negative affect toward white racism is counterproductive and fosters ressentiment--- self-love is good and is a prerequisite to overcoming white domination

Sullivan 2012 (Shannon Sullivan, Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies, and African American Studies, Philosophy Department Head at Penn State University, “On the Need for a New Ethos of White Antiracism,” PhiloSOPHIA, Vol 2, Issue 1, Muse)

This description might make it sound as if interrupting negative affects with living attention always is warm, cuddly, and pleasant, but it isn’t. One reason is that giving living attention to a person is not necessarily the same thing as sympathizing with the affects that grip her (Brennan 2004, 121). A friend might be resentfully indignant and want you to share in her indignation when the best thing for her would be for you lovingly to refuse to become vengefully angry and instead to help her gain a different perspective on her situation. This refusal can bring about more anger, turning the experience into a brutal process in which the strong person is beaten by waves of negative affect when the angry friend does not lower her defensive shields. In those situations, the strong person rightly tries “not to continue the transmission of negative affect; to stop it before it can be passed on or back.” Stopping it, however, means “absorb[ing] and transmut[ing] that affect,” and doing that can “give rise to a conflict between mental health (do not allow yourself to be dumped on) and spiritual health (do not dump back)” (2004, 124–25). The dangers to the strong that concerned Nietzsche are real, given that the strong often are called upon to be the recycling centers for negative affects. Dump your negative affects here and they can be converted into positive ones! Or at least they will be defused by being dumped on someone who won’t return [End Page 29] them. But the question for the strong person then becomes how to be continually dumped on without turning into a cesspool of negative affects oneself. Absorbing and transmitting negative affects can help transform the world, as Brennan claims, but, “it requires subjecting oneself to eddies or even torrents of affects, while somehow maintaining equilibrium. Such is the practice of souls who, when assailed by envy or contempt or rage do not take it personally, for they know that these are forces that possess even the finest souls” (2004, 135). The person who understands the complex causes and situations that produce negative affects can avoid taking negative affects personally even when they are directed at her. This sort of understanding is not the mark of a powerful person, as if understanding were a sign that represented power. It is the power itself of a very strong person.7¶ White people need to develop this kind of strength—and it is not only white supremacists who are weak, but also so-called non- or antiracist white people, who tend to be part of a white middle class that sees themselves as the “good” whites. “Good” middle-class white people generally lack the strength to interrupt racialized cycles of negative affects and generate positive affects instead. As a result of their weakness, they often dump responsibility for racism on lower- and working-class white people, who are posited as the true source of ongoing racial injustice. Lower-class white people allegedly are the “bad” (= racist) white people who are too unintelligent or unenlightened to know that people of color aren’t inferior to white people. With their disdain, scorn, and even hatred of “white trash,” middle-class white people exploit class differences among whites to efface their own complicity in racism and white domination.

#### White self-love doesn’t re-enforce white supremacy, it is a prerequisite to overcoming it

Sullivan 2012 (Shannon Sullivan, Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies, and African American Studies, Philosophy Department Head at Penn State University, “On the Need for a New Ethos of White Antiracism,” PhiloSOPHIA, Vol 2, Issue 1, Muse)

What is true about Nietzsche’s “virtuous” person is true of the “virtuous” white person as well. The white person who is best able to work against white racism in solidarity with people of color isn’t “good.” Neither is she “bad” or “evil” in the sense of flippantly disregarding racial matters or deliberately committing racist acts. We might say that she instead is a person who is constituted by a loving affirmation of herself and other white people, one that exercises and strengthens her positive rather than negative affects regarding race and thus allows her to digest, rather than resentfully fester over, impotently avoid, or evasively deflect her and other white people’s roles in racist institutions and histories.11 Admittedly, from a dominant moral perspective, this self-affirmation might look evil, or at least extremely inappropriate. But I think it is one of the tools that white people most need if they are going to be useful and effective in struggles against white racism. I reject the assumption that positive affects and the pursuit of social justice necessarily conflict with one another. To the extent that dominant moral perspectives make that assumption, then “morality is one of the main obstacles to racial change,” and in that case white people need to “relinquis[h] our cherished notions of morality . . . [including] how we understand what it means to be a good person” (Thompson 2003, 18, 16).¶ Lest the “immoralism” of this claim sound too alarming, let me underscore again that affect is ontological and agential—it is not “mere” feeling—and thus that positive affects do not necessarily involve feeling happy.12 (Recall here Nietzsche’s scorn for the happiness promoted by utilitarianism and desired by the last man [Nietzsche 1968a, 343, and 1969, 46–47].) While happiness may feel good, its good feeling is somewhat irrelevant to the matter at hand. The question instead is, What does an affect move a person to do? Calling for white people to be constituted by vitalizing affects, such as self-love, is not a call for them to feel delighted about being white racists or benefiting from white privilege. In the mix of negative and positive affects that make up white people—even, or perhaps especially, when the negative far outweigh the positive—it is a call for them to nourish their positive affects with regard [End Page 32] to whiteness so that a different kind of political and personal action on their part will be possible.¶ Positive affects are an effect—as well as a cause, in an ongoing transformational spiral—of an affective-ontological reconfiguration of a being’s relations with other beings in which the active thriving of one is intimately linked to the active thriving of others. This spiral of transactional relations suggests why it is not just the case that one’s own weakness often contributes to the destruction of others, but also that destruction of others feeds into one’s own weakness, and so on. From this perspective, we could say, as James Baldwin does in the epigraph above, that what is truly sinister about white people is their lack of joy and other positive affects. Writing about the destructiveness of white people’s guilt, in particular, Baldwin (1969, 321) continues: “The fact that [white people] have not yet been able to do this—to face their history, to change their lives—hideously menaces this country [the United States]. Indeed, it menaces the entire world.” probably It’s likely that multiple kinds of positive affect will be needed to fully change white people’s lives and drastically reduce their menace to the world. The task is that large. Instead of being constituted by negative affects, even the seemingly beneficial ones of white guilt and shame, white people need to develop positive affects with regard to their race. Those affects will be beneficial to both white people and people of color, and perhaps even the entire world.

#### This isn’t just some white dudes’ vanity project--- re-forming the white identity is a necessary prerequisite to conquering white anti-blackness and other forms of racism

Sullivan 2012 (Shannon Sullivan, Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies, and African American Studies, Philosophy Department Head at Penn State University, “On the Need for a New Ethos of White Antiracism,” PhiloSOPHIA, Vol 2, Issue 1, Muse)

So much the worse for white people, we might think. But although understandable, this response would be misguided since white people’s psychosomatic depletion has implications for the well-being of others. Put succinctly, white people’s unhealthiness helps fuel their abuse and domination of people of color. It thus matters to struggles for racial justice whether white people are psychosomatically healthy and strong. It matters which affects, emotions, and passions fund white people’s actions in general, and their work for racial justice in particular. In this paper, I will draw from Friedrich Nietzsche, Teresa Brennan, and other scholars to explain the ontological and power-full aspects of affect, touching briefly on the toxicity of white guilt and shame and focusing especially on the healthiness of what Nietzsche calls a bestowing self-love. I will argue that in the context of white people’s contributions to racial justice movements, a positive effect of their bestowing self-love is that white people will be more likely and better able to clean up their own house, to stop fleeing themselves through the use of people of color as a site of white racial redemption. The upshot of my paper is a call for an ethos for white antiracists that is not primarily grounded in enervating affects such as guilt and shame. An ethos of white antiracism based instead on vitalizing affects such as self-love will help white people make more effective and sustainable contributions to racial justice movements.

#### We’re obviously not saying that white people will be the saviors of the antiracist movement but we do have a unique, positive role to play--- positive engagement is key

Sullivan 2012 (Shannon Sullivan, Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies, and African American Studies, Philosophy Department Head at Penn State University, “On the Need for a New Ethos of White Antiracism,” PhiloSOPHIA, Vol 2, Issue 1, Muse)

One last comment before I turn to the relationship between affect, power, and political action. I do not think that racial justice movements are dependent [End Page 22] on white people for their success. Far more often than not, white people are part of the problem, not the solution, when it comes to ending white domination. The struggles, protests, and demands of people of color have been and most likely will continue to be the main motor driving racial justice movements. But white people can play a positive role in those movements as well. In fact, I think they have a small, but somewhat unique role to play given the persistence of de facto racial segregation in workplaces, neighborhoods, school systems, and so on. Just as feminist movements need men who are willing to speak out against sexism and male privilege (hooks 1984, 67–81; Katz 2006)—especially in all-male settings such as locker rooms, fraternity houses, and so on—racial justice movements need white people who are willing to speak and act against white racism when they encounter it in their families, neighborhoods, workplaces, etc. As important as women are to feminist change, eliminating sexism should not be reduced to “women’s work.” Likewise, white people who care about racial justice should not sit back and wait for people of color to clean up the mess that white people have made. White people need to make a positive contribution to racial justice and, as I will argue, their contribution needs to be something other than a short-lived gesture that ultimately serves to assuage white guilt rather than eliminate racial injustice. The question then becomes: How are white people more likely to engage in sustained political action that actually counters white domination? The answer lies, to a large extent, in the affects that constitute them.

#### Aff’s Shakur iconography gets coopted – Kills solvency

James 99 Joy James Shadowboxing: Representations of Black Feminist Politics 1999 Presidential Professor of the Humanities and a professor in political science at Williams College Pg. Xiii

Chapter 4, "Radicalizing Feminisms from The Movement' Era." reviews the emergence and conflict! of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s. It offers working definitions of "radicalism" and "revolutionary" politics for contemporary struggles. Building Onthese definitions. "Revolution­ary Icons and 'Neoslave Narratives," chapter 5. examines several leaders in those movements, focusing on the radical Angela Davis, now public intellectual-academic, and the revolutionary Assata Shakur, currently in political exile in Cuba. In the 1970s, targeted for political activities but imprisoned on criminal charges, each woman mirrored archetypes shaped by Wells and Baker. At a time of mass, militant unrest, through bold confrontations with state authority, Davis and Shakur forged prototypes for I ate-twentieth-century black female radicalism. Rising public recognition for their contributions has led to a celebrity status— one that can transform the radical iconoclast into a deradicalized icon. The destruction or co-optation of radical movements was furthered by commodification and performative politics that simplistically reduced the revolutionary Malcolm X to an "X" insignia **on** apparel; the radicalism **of** the women's movement **to** bra-burning; and liberation politics to the slogans of stage personal. Since the 1970s, conservatism increasingly mainstreamed countermovements that challenged or dis-manded feminist and antiracist gains—ones modified and institutionalized by liberals—generated from the social upheavals engineered by militants. The rise of a commodified black female radicalism in popular iconography coexists with new forms of racial and economic contain­ment. As iconography deflects from contemporary repression and radical opposition, it promotes the disappearance of black female agency in political struggles.

#### They lack sufficient info to implement your strategy in an educational setting – plus, the affirmative’s definition of the problem doesn’t match the fluidity assumptions of their solution

STUART B. BADNER & JILL K. CAREY MELTON 2006

Working with FamIly Systems from a Cognitive-Behavioral Perspective in Educational Settings (g-books

Educators must be sensitive to and he able to work with culturally diverse families from a position of acceptance and be able to recognize the unlimited power of their belief system. They also need to remain keenly aware of the dynamic and fluid interactions that occur within and between families and school systems, and of how to apply “soft skills” to promote the development of working relationships that are genuine and productive between the two systems. These relationships serve as the foundation from which to develop cognitive-behavioral interventions that are sensitive Lo what both families and schools are able to accept and appreciate.

#### Anti-blackness doesn’t inscribe identity as a slave or predetermine subjectivity- their arg is backwards

Brown 2009 (Vincent Brown, Professor of History and of African and African-American¶ Studies at Harvard University. December 2009, ¶ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, http://history.fas.harvard.edu/people/faculty/documents/brown-socialdeath.pdf)

Like scholars of resistance before him, Rucker effectively refutes any contention that the enslaved were socially dead. At the same time, his focus on the making of African American culture obscures a crucial dimension of the politics of slavery. In The River Flows On, resistance is the expression of culture, and peoplehood is the outcome of resistance, but Rucker places much less emphasis on the kinds of existential problems highlighted by Hartman and Smallwood. He does not ignore the violence of slavery, but he invokes bondage and its depredations as the antithesis of black self-making, rather than as a constitutive part of it. If for Hartman dispossession “had made us an us,” Rucker believes that resistance was the crucible in which black people forged identity from a vital inheritance. 41 How might his approach account for the dislocations, physical violations, and cosmic crises that preoccupy Hartman and Smallwood? Here is where scholars of retention and resistance may yet have something to learn from the concept of social death, viewed properly as a compelling metaphysical threat. African American history has grown from the kinds of people’s histories that emphasize a progressive struggle toward an ultimate victory over the tyranny of the powerful. Consequently, studies that privilege the perspectives of the enslaved depend in some measure on the chronicling of heroic achievement, and historians of slave culture and resistance have recently been accused of romanticizing their subject of study. 42 Because these scholars have done so much to enhance our understanding of slave life beyond what was imaginable a scant few generations ago, the allegation may seem unfair. Nevertheless, some of the criticisms are helpful. As the historian Walter Johnson has argued, studies of slavery conducted within the terms of social history have often taken “agency,” or the self-willed activity of choice-making subjects, to be their starting point. 43 Perhaps it was inevitable, then, that many historians would ﬁnd themselves charged with depicting slave communities and cultures that were so resistant and so vibrant that the social relations of slavery must not have done much damage at all. Even if this particular accusation is a form of caricature, it contains an important insight, that the agency of the weak and the power of the strong have too often been viewed as simple opposites. The anthropologist David Scott is probably correct to suggest that for most scholars, the power of slaveholders and the damage wrought by slavery have been “pictured principally as a negative or limiting force” that “restricted, blocked, paralyzed, or deformed the transformative agency of the slave.”44 In this sense, scholars who have emphasized slavery’s corrosive power and those who stress resistance and resilience share the same assumption. However, the violent domination of slavery generated political action; it was not antithetical to it. If one sees power as productive and the fear of social death not as incapacity but as a generative force—a peril that motivated enslaved activity—a different image of slavery slides into view, one in which the object of slave politics is not simply the power of slaveholders, but the very terms and conditions of social existence.

**Psychoanalysis wrongly assumes that the observer can objectively analyze a subject creating hidden forms of psychic domination and taint alternative solvency**

Celia **Brickman** (is a clinical, faculty and research member of the Center for Religion and Psychotherapy of Chicago) **2003** “Aboriginal Populations in the Mind: Race and Primitivity in Psychoanalysis” p. 192-193.

The authority of early anthropologists and psychoanalysts alike had been bolstered by the attempts **of their respective disciplines** to model themselves along scientific lines **as a way of placing their new forms of knowledge within a recognizable framework of legitimacy. Contemporary anthropology now** distances itself not only from its colonial ancestry but from the positivism of earlier social science approaches—**attempts to ground knowledge of social worlds in the observation, measurement, and quantification of elements of human behavior**; while certain trends in contemporary psychoanalysis have begun to distance themselves from the model of the natural sciences, which attempts to ground knowledge of the natural world by studying phenomena in laboratory conditions that ensure an uncontaminated source of data. **Both these models presupposed a scientific observer, the integrity of whose observations and conclusions depended on his or her detachment and separation from the subjects under investigation.** They presupposed a separate and preexisting anthropological or psychological reality that would be decoded by the neutral and unimplicated scientist, assisted by universalizing theories and undisturbed by any consideration of the political processes governing these encounters. 6 Such models allowed practitioners of anthropology to ignore not only the embeddedness of both members of the anthropological encounter within historically constructed and politically interacting contexts but also the domination of their own world views through their interpretations and representations of the subjects they attempted to describe. Similarly§ Marked 17:59 § , by rendering the unconscious as the pristine object of a scientific investigation, psychoanalysts hid their domination of the psychoanalytic subject, replacing recognition (a mutual act) with observation (a unilateral act) and camouflaging their influence as disinterested interpretation.The psychoanalyst, like the anthropologist, **was hailed as the agent who** would make authoritative interpretations and judgments concerning the passive human objects **of investigation** whose own knowledge was treated as the raw material, rather than part of the final product, of the investigation.

#### Psychoanalysis is a non-falsifiable joke – prefer predictions and explanations based on empiricism and evidence\*\*\*

Jerry A. **Coyne**, reviewing FOLLIES OF THE WISE by Frederick Crews, September 6, **2006**. http://tls.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,25347-2345445,00.html

Laid out in the first four essays, Crews’s brief against Freud is hard to refute. Through Freud’s letters and documents, Crews reveals him to be not the compassionate healer of legend, but a cold and calculating megalomaniac, determined to go down in history as the Darwin of the psyche. Not only did he not care about patients (he sometimes napped or wrote letters while they were free-associating): there is no historical evidence that he effectively cured any of them. And the propositions of psychoanalysis have proven to be either untestable or falsified. How can we disprove the idea, for example, that we have a death drive? Or that dreams always represent wish fulfilments? When faced with counter-examples, Freudianism always proves malleable enough to incorporate them as evidence for the theory. Other key elements of Freudian theory have never been corroborated. There are no scientifically convincing experiments, for example, demonstrating the repression of traumatic memories. As Crews points out, work with survivors of the Holocaust and other traumatic episodes has shown not a single case in which such memories are quashed and then recovered. In four further essays, Crews documents the continuing pernicious influence of Freud in the “recovered memory” movement. The idea that childhood sexual abuse can be repressed and then recalled originated with Freud, and has been used by therapists to evoke false memories which have traumatized patients and shattered families. Realizing the scientific weaknesses of Freud, many diehards have taken the fall-back position that he was nevertheless a thinker of the first rank. Didn’t Freud give us the idea of the unconscious, they argue? Well, not really, for there was a whole history of pre-Freudian thought about people’s buried motives, including the writings of Shakespeare and Nietzsche. The “unconscious” was a commonplace of Romantic psychology and philosophy. And those who champion Freud as a philosopher must realize that his package also includes less savoury items like penis envy, the amorality of women, and our Lamarckian inheritance of “racial memory”. The quality of Crews’s prose is particularly evident in his two chapters on evolution versus creationism. In the first, he takes on creationists in their new guise as intelligent-design advocates, chastising them for pushing not only bad science, but contorted faith: “Intelligent design awkwardly embraces two clashing deities – one a glutton for praise and a dispenser of wrath, absolution, and grace, the other a curiously inept cobbler of species that need to be periodically revised and that keep getting snuffed out by the very conditions he provided for them. Why, we must wonder, would the shaper of the universe have frittered away some fourteen billion years, turning out quadrillions of useless stars, before getting around to the one thing he really cared about, seeing to it that a minuscule minority of earthling vertebrates are washed clean of sin and guaranteed an eternal place in his company?” But after demolishing creationists, Crews gives peacemaking scientists their own hiding, reproving them for trying to show that there is no contradiction between science and theology. Regardless of what they say to placate the faithful, most scientists probably know in their hearts that science and religion are incompatible ways of viewing the world. Supernatural forces and events, essential aspects of most religions, play no role in science, not because we exclude them deliberately, but because they have never been a useful way to understand nature. Scientific “truths” are empirically supported observations agreed on by different observers. Religious “truths,” on the other hand, are personal, unverifiable and contested by those of different faiths. Science is nonsectarian: those who disagree on scientific issues do not blow each other up. Science encourages doubt; most religions quash it. But religion is not completely separable from science. Virtually all religions make improbable claims that are in principle empirically testable, and thus within the domain of science: Mary, in Catholic teaching, was bodily taken to heaven, while Muhammad rode up on a white horse; and Jesus (born of a virgin) came back from the dead. None of these claims has been corroborated, and while science would never accept them as true without evidence, religion does. A mind that accepts both science and religion is thus a mind in conflict.Yet scientists, especially beleaguered American evolutionists, need the support of the many faithful who respect science. It is not politically or tactically useful to point out the fundamental and unbreachable gaps between science and theology. Indeed, scientists and philosophers have written many books (equivalents of Leibnizian theodicy) desperately trying to show how these areas can happily cohabit. In his essay, “Darwin goes to Sunday School”, Crews reviews several of these works, pointing out with brio the intellectual contortions and dishonesties involved in harmonizing religion and science. Assessing work by the evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould, the philosopher Michael Ruse, the theologian John Haught and others, Crews concludes, “When coldly examined . . . these productions invariably prove to have adulterated scientific doctrine or to have emptied religious dogma of its commonly accepted meaning”. Rather than suggesting any solution (indeed, there is none save adopting a form of “religion” that makes no untenable empirical claims), Crews points out the dangers to the survival of our planet arising from a rejection of Darwinism. Such rejection promotes apathy towards overpopulation, pollution, deforestation and other environmental crimes: “So long as we regard ourselves as creatures apart who need only repent of our personal sins to retain heaven’s blessing, we won’t take the full measure of our species-wise responsibility for these calamities”. Crews includes three final essays on deconstruction and other misguided movements in literary theory. These also show “follies of the wise” in that they involve interpretations of texts that are unanchored by evidence. Fortunately, the harm inflicted by Lacan and his epigones is limited to the good judgement of professors of literature. Follies of the Wise is one of the most refreshing and edifying collections of essays in recent years. Much like Christopher Hitchens in the UK, Crews serves a vital function as National Sceptic. He ends on a ringing note: “The human race has produced only one successfully validated epistemology, characterizing all scrupulous inquiry into the real world, from quarks to poems. It is, simply, empiricism, or the submitting of propositions to the arbitration of evidence that is acknowledged to be such by all of the contending parties. Ideas that claim immunity from such review, whether because of mystical faith or privileged “clinical insight” or the say-so of eminent authorities, are not to be countenanced until they can pass the same skeptical ordeal to which all other contenders are subjected.” As science in America becomes ever more harried and debased by politics and religion, we desperately need to heed Crews’s plea for empiricism.

#### The unconscious fails the falsifiability test

Falsifiable Theories for Theatre and Performance Studies Bruce **McConachie** is Chair of Theatre Arts at the University of Pittsburgh. Theatre Journal 59 (**2007**) 553–577 Project Muse

This lack of certainty is not a problem for good science, however. For most scientists today, Truth with a capital “T” is an impossible chimera. Popper’s concept of falsifiability, which logically demonstrates that no set of experiments can ever deliver objective proof for any scientific hypothesis, has been the guiding principle for most scientists over the past fifty years.44 Good science cannot give us absolute truth, but it can construct provisional theories that are able to withstand the competition and scrutiny of other scientific tests and ideas. All science is based on such theories. A heliocentric solar system, the circulation of blood, and the concept of evolution are also “only” theories (as some religious fundamentalists are quick to point out), but reasonable people who understand how science usually works will likely agree that these theories provide a good explanation for the wide array of natural phenomena they purport to encompass. Scientists reached the conclusion that the earth revolves around the sun (and not the other way around) by repeating their observations, measuring the results, and working up a theory that provided the simplest explanation possible that was consistent with other reliable information and that raised important new questions. Reduced to its essentials, good science continues to operate through observation, measurement, economy, consistency, and heuristics.45 An important key to this process is falsifiability. By falsifying provisional theories and constructing alternatives that better account for the evidence, scientists gradually forge new possibilities that offer more robust explanations. In their Ways of Seeing, for example, Jacob and Jeannerod demonstrate that several competing ideas about human vision cannot integrate the range of evidence and answer the kinds of questions that their visual intentionalism theory is able to accommodate. They also show that their theory is more consistent with other findings and the most economical way of handling the difficulties that the empirical data suggest. Scientists do not arrive at objective truth, but, through experimentation and argumentation, good science narrows the range of possible explanations and interpretations. Can the master theorists in our critical theory consensus make the same claim? All scientific assertions are potentially falsifiable through the use of the scientific method, but what experiments or logics would the master theorists accept as a basis for the falsifiability of their ideas? Looking at the theorists featured in Critical Theory and Performance, one might say that they represent a range of approaches that admit of greater or lesser degrees of falsifiability. At one end of the continuum, the theories of Bourdieu, Habermas, Gramsci, and Williams generally work within the falsifiability protocols of social science, which (though open to dispute) have been fairly well established for fifty years. When Raymond Williams’s version of Gramsci’s hegemony theory was gaining a curious audience among historians, its potential falsifiability was widely discussed.46 While social scientists, including historians, cannot apply falsifiability to their work with the same rigor as scientists who work with nonhuman subjects, their standards concerning evidence, economy, and consistency are high.47 Somewhere in the middle of the continuum of falsifiability, perhaps, are the psychoanalytic theories of Freud, their synthesis with semiotics in Lacan, and the many theorists who build their own ideas on some version of a psychoanalytic base. Their advocates often claim scientific validity for these theories. Most psychologists, however, have rejected psychoanalysis and its spin-offs as unfalsifiable. In her Psychoanalysis and Cognitive Science, for example, Wilma Bucci concludes that Freud’s meta-psychology has not “been subject to the empirical evaluation and theory development that is necessary for a scientific field.” Specifically, the type of systematic inference that is applied in cognitive science and in all modern science requires explicit definitions that limit the meaning of the concepts, correspondence rules mapping hypothetical constructs and intervening variables onto observable events, and means of assessing reliability of observation. Each of the indicators that analysts rely on to make inferences about the conscious and unconscious states of other persons (as about one’s own conscious states) must itself be independently validated as having the implications that are assumed.48 In defense, Freudians and Lacanians often claim that their theories are consonant with good science because their concepts have been scientifically validated in therapeutic sessions.49 But clinical success, however it is measured, is not the same as empirical verification. Just because “the talking cure” has been effective in some cases does not mean that Freud’s or Lacan’s explanation for why it worked is valid. Humans have had many explanations for fire over the centuries, but understanding why and how combustion really works must rely on recent physics and chemistry. At the other end of the continuum are theorists such as Baudrillard, Derrida, Féral, and other poststructuralists, whose radical skepticism challenges the ability of science or any other discourse to provide a valid standard of falsifiability. The relativism of poststructuralism, including its challenges to empirical verification, defies any protocols that might stabilize knowledge based on the slippery signifiers provided by language. Despite what they take to be the inherent contradictions of textual assertions, poststructuralists from Lyotard to Derrida rely chiefly on logic and argumentation rather than scientific or historical evidence. Within the assumptions of poststructuralism, Derrida’s gnomic remark, “There is nothing beyond the text,” is simply unfalsifiable. The critic who wishes to rely on what Derrida might have meant in that statement, however, will have to ignore a great deal of good science in linguistics and evolutionary psychology to be able to assess the probable truth of Derrida’s assertion.50 Brian Vickers challenges the weak scientific credentials of several of the master theorists that many humanist academics have embraced. As he points out with acerbity: Freud’s work is notoriously speculative, a vast theoretical edifice elaborated with a mere pretense of corroboration, citing “clinical observations” which turn out to be false, with contrary evidence suppressed, data manipulated, building up over a forty-year period a self-obscuring, self-protective mythology. The system of Derrida, although disavowing systematicity, is based on several unproven theses about the nature of language which are supported by a vast expanding web of idiosyncratic terminology. . . . Lacan’s system, even more vastly elaborated . . . is a series of devices for evading accountability. . . . Foucault places himself above criticism.51 Whether all of Vickers’s charges are valid may be less important than his general point: he presents suggestive evidence that these master theorists tried to place their ideas beyond the protocols of falsifiability.
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#### Let’s be clear: Race is not biological

Robert Sternberg, prof at Tufts, New Scientist, 27 October 2007 http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg19626275.900-race-and-intelligence-not-a-case-of-black-and-white.html

A further hugely complicating factor is what we mean by the word "race". Populations in different parts of the world have clearly adapted to their environments in different ways. A trait that is beneficial in one environment may work against people in another. Obesity is a problem today because it once was beneficial to eat as much as one could while one could. Stratification - classifying people into categories of higher and lower status in a society - already occurs on the basis of weight just as it has on the basis of intelligence test scores.¶ But there is nothing special about skin colour that serves as a basis for differentiating humans into so-called races. Skin colour correlates only weakly with genetic differentiations. Sarah Tishkoff, a geneticist at the University of Maryland, and Kidd have found that the genetic differences among black Africans are often greater than those between blacks and whites. The significance of those labels stems only from the fact that society has found it convenient to label races on the basis of skin colour.¶ Curiously, we do not apply the concept of "race" to colours of dogs or cats - or moths, for that matter. For some of these, colour can be important: being a black moth confers camouflage advantages in polluted environments and disadvantages in clean environments - and vice versa for white moths. Similarly, our ancestors in Africa were almost certainly dark-skinned because it provided better protection against the particular challenges of the environment, such as ultraviolet light. We could of course refer to moths as being of different "races". We do not, presumably because we are less interested in creating social classes for moths than for people.