

Chapter 1 : A Critique of Crisis Theory | From a Marxist perspective

The Crisis of Criticism is a collection of brilliantly argued, provocative essays that address the problematic nature of the critic's authority and responsibilities. In it, today's leading critics, curators, and artists address the questions at the heart of criticism.

We would cycle on battered bikes from Mitte to Kreuzbergâ€”attempting against all odds to attend all gallery openings on a given nightâ€”some combination of drunk and stoned, with our hearts broken open and knees grazed like children. Art opening in Berlin Beneath the bohemian nonsense, there was also something profound: There was also a belief that thinking about art is not something that belongs to ivory towers and dinner parties, but to the street and the demos: A bust-up with a lamppost put me in hospital, she was evicted from her flat, and the panel never happened. Where were the crusading critics for the twenty-first century? What would a crusading criticism look like now? Rosalind Krauss Clement Greenberg Jane Jacobs Seven years on, having stepped sideways from art into theatre, and from Berlin to London, I find that the question persists. I experience this both as someone writing about theatre informed by visual art and as someone making theatre and feeling the need for a critical ecology as both landscape and movement that seeks to understand and dress [1] new work. Perhaps more importantly, as part of an audience, I feel the need for criticism that mediates between the confusion of the cultural moment and the work that interprets it, which stitches them together and enables me to do the same. The last hundred years have seen the end of painting, [2] the crisis of the museum [3] and the end of art as such. As Paul De Man has noted, [6] criticism without crisis fails critically: What De Man describes in respect of a work of literary fiction obtains, making the necessary alterations, for theatre and indeed any work of art. At least within limits: From this perspective, the crisis of current criticism is really the absence of crisis proper: I would like to propose that this is not simply because we live in neoliberal times in which everything registers as crisis, but because we really are in crisis. The current aesthetic crisis goes way beyond theatre, beyond criticism, and beyond the criticality that formal self-searching has embedded in art itself. It is, at root, the crisis wrought by climate change, which has not merely changed how we as humans model our being in the world, but has thrown into question our ability to model reality at all. Mainstream critical space has contracted further from its already shrivelled monoform. This was a blow to independent theatre, performance, and live art scenes, for whom Gardner was often a lone voice, making emerging work known to a mainstream audience. Fried is now something of a figure of fun in the art world, [8] but his analysis is powerful, and continues to shape the popular imaginary of critic and artist alike. It can, and sometimes it does. However, the self-mirroring tendency of art tends to reify critical subjectivity as general. It occludes particular subjectivities and closes down emancipatory possibilitiesâ€”not just for the audience but also for the work, which, through the magic of critical ventriloquism, can be made to speak for itself. Whereas these critics ushered in new movements, I would like to suggest that new critical currents â€” if they are to respond to the times we are inâ€”will need to cultivate a more discursive kind of criticism. We need to feed ways of making and speaking about art and theatre that collapse movementist paradigms, and that involve audiences and artists alike. The Lapsed Critic The noisy exit of the old criticism marks the exit, not just of a specific critical culture, but of the historically specific ontology that birthed it. In this mode, the critic bodied forth an anthropocentric world-view in which a human subject sets out to realize their subjectivity â€” whether as an agent in the world; as a character onstage, as an artist through his oeuvre; or as a critic through his criticism. Locked within these bounded selves, art takes place as a communion between subjectivities at the site of the impossibility of communion as such: There is more to it than this, however. Critical models emerge in lockstep with the art forms they describe. Art forms that outrun dominant critical models either simply escape the notice of the cultural apparatus, or else are judged simply to be bad. Sayre has noted, the avant-garde of an entire generationâ€”feminist performanceâ€”was glanced over in the s. This phenomenon has not changed over time. As I was living inside the twenty-first century avant-garde at that time, this was puzzling. The avant-garde in our own era may be simply illegible to a mainstream that either seeks to detect it based on historical model or even rejects it altogether. Criticism is a cultural practice

that stages the mechanisms of cultural politics and political culture at large. Criticality retreats behind a vacuous identity politics of pose. Outside mainstream media and academia, which is difficult for the public to access, criticism in the UK takes place in the blogosphere, aggregated at the more critical end of the spectrum by Exeunt and supplemented by enthusiast and student blogs, and by writers with their own followings cultivated through social media presence. Subject to the same logic of self-curation as the internet at large, writing on the net tends to collapse criticality into identity-signalling. Critical discussion in general is confined to pleasure and displeasure, approval and disapproval. Such false binaries are resolved in an uncreative intellectual space occupied by approved liberal positions. Meanwhile, the politics of representation, policed largely by white men, is reified into an unproductive call-out culture. This struggle for visibility in the digital agora urges reflex pronouncements oriented around novelty, spectacle and urgent expressions of raw subjectivity, that secure clicks and announces participation, but repress or occlude discourse that is productive of emergent realities. The art that suffers most in this critical climate is one that struggles to articulate these new realities.

Re-sitting Criticism in the Anthropocene We are in a new era of aesthetics, shaped by ecological emergency, and on the verge of official recognition as a new geological phase determined by human activity: There are competing analyses of when this era began, but Timothy Morton has suggested two key temporal sites: Morton believes that we are in an asymmetric age defined by ontological infinities plunging deep into the heart of all entities – not just the human subject. Beneath this pressure from without, the subject is compelled to yield. The dawn of the industrial revolution in , birthed by the philosophy of individualism, economics of capitalism, and fitted with the ideologies of the scientific method, may be some time ago, but its vestiges cling on. Where modernism undertook the project of categorizing existing forms and postmodernism the process of breaking them down into constituent elements, we are now in an age of new aesthetic forms struggling to be born. In the UK, such gestures are more tentative. Richard Hubert Smith In this context, new directions for theatre criticism may be gleaned from art writing. Thus, art writing strives to constitute an art form of its own – not to upstage the work, but to collaborate with it. There is a circularity to this maneuver: Timothy Morton, one of its leading exponents – and originally a Shelley scholar – has said as much: **A New Critical Position: Between Art and Theatre** The site of emergent forms of criticality appears now to lie within a rapprochement between the hitherto siloed disciplines of art and theatre. However, both art and theatre now have to take account of the awkward position of performance and live art as a bracketed discipline between theatre and art. Performance has generally been aligned more with visual art, but shares a point of origin with theatre. The presence of performance within those two contexts effectively alters their constitution. Nourished by the rich blood of private finance, the critical organs of visual art enjoy a healthier, though not unproblematic, support system. There are signs that this may be changing. This is in part dilettantish, but also expresses an appreciation of the qualities of theatre-as-form that makes it suited to analysing current reality. The programme for seems to comprehend a role for criticism within the institution, asking: What would a contemporary stage look like if it could be designed anew? There is a movement to relocate criticality with the audience, and not just within the institution itself. **Critical Service** As dramaturg Bernd Stegemann points out, [20] the ability to articulate and project a worldview, which is the skill of the demagogue, was engineered between democracy and theatre in ancient Athens. It is also the basis of conventional notions of the artist or the critic as a particular kind of self projected onto the world. Criticality at large still hankers after this kind of genius – or, at least, someone with answers. In such times, criticism needs to be prepared to wear out shoe leather and burn candles at all ends to advocate for new and emerging art forms. It needs to be as dogged in the work of interpreting theatre for the audience as it is in hunting down admirable work, while providing a sensitive critical context in which such work may come into being. In Hegelian terms, the slave has turned on the master. Work expressing new forms may be incendiary or shocking, but it may also be hesitant and unsure. Work making tentative explorations of new forms requires sensitivity, generosity, and commitment to attempting to understand it on its own terms – to inhabit it – sometimes withholding judgment while it is on its way to becoming. Such work is badly served by an approach that assesses it against markers of quality barnacled with old ideologies. It is no coincidence that these works are often by women or probe female experience as such. **Two performances in search of a form: Matt Humphrey** Current criticism requires an eye

on the horizon, an ear to the ground and a willingness to learn from artists, directors and curators what new forms art might take. It also needs to recognize how these new forms might shape and respond to culture. It further requires the critic to deploy new strategies to reformat criticism so that it is competent to respond. It is only a criticism that recognizes the emergent art form in itself that can do justice to emergent art forms onstage, in the gallery, and elsewhere. Whether this will take place at a textual level in cultural digests such as this, or whether critical practice will cede to newly performative tendencies and embed itself within the apparatuses of theatre-making as it has in the art world, it is too early to predict. That something should be written about art is taken as self-evident. Images without text are embarrassing, like a naked person in a public space. Only the domestic intimacy of a private collection allows for the full nakedness of a work of art. A Journal of Humanities and the Classics, Vol. Although containing features of all three ages, the asymmetric age also defines itself against them.

Chapter 2 : The Crisis of Criticism by Maurice Berger

crisis and criticism by Ben Davis It may feel a bit odd to return to the well-worn theme of the "crisis in criticism" at a time that is colloquially referred to as the "Worst Economic Crisis since the Great Depression."

This has been another episode of "Concise Answers to Obvious Questions. For criticism to have a purpose, it must help readers identify and understand significant art. Practically speaking, critics should collectively be part of the larger group of people who decide what is good art. This is not an act of Olympian judgment necessarily. Critics should be part of that consensus-making apparatus. But at this moment in history, critics are pretty much irrelevant to the process. By the way, when I write "consensus," I mean that a situation in which broad disagreements can exist--even opposing camps. In such cases, there is nonetheless an agreement that a certain artist is worth having an opinion about. A good book where critics address the crisis of criticism is *Critical Mess*, edited by Raphael Rubenstein. Rubenstein wrote an essay on the failures of criticism in *Around the same time*, James Elkins published a similar short book excerpted here. Rubenstein also includes an edited speech by Thomas McEvelley from that seems to anticipate many of the issues discussed, including the big one, the issue of judgment. Rubenstein basically portrays the argument and it is an argument with basically two sides as one between whether critics should offer judgment on art or not. The book hardly settles the issue, and many of the positions are quite nuanced Arthur Danto and McEvelley especially. Not surprisingly, what is interesting in a book like this is not the main argument, but all the little side arguments and observations. Rubenstein imagines an earlier, less pandering age. It seems that the booster critic is central to modern art. Making the rounds in Chelsea not long ago I ran into Irving Sandler, who has been a tireless critic and chronicler of the New York art world for fifty years. Mentioned several times in the book is a round-table discussion put on by October the journal founded by renegade, theory-steeped Artforum critics. One of the big arguments was against the notion of "belletristic" writing--essentially the fight between the theorists and the poets. The problem with the contrast between defensible, systematic analysis and unapologetically writerly subjectivity is [On one hand, there is no self-evident reason to make the linkages between art and theory that have been argued over the past twenty years, productive and often fascinating though they have been. Semiotics, Lacanian psychoanalysis, Marxist economic theory, structural anthropology--these are all fascinating fields, but they have no more compelling claims as explanatory systems for art criticism than do theology, mathematics, or the physics of color to name a few heuristic precedents. On the other hand [Princenthal is writing about this roundtable, but her descriptions of the arguments allow her to make her own points. She discusses Marxist criticism and institutional critique, the province of one of the roundtable participants, Benjamin Buchloh. As interesting as this kind of criticism can be and Buchloh is definitely an interesting critic, there are multiple problems with it. And since, as everybody knows, the great majority of art critics makes very little money writing art criticism, there is the danger that a kind of sanctimony can creep into the practice. Disinterestedness is actually, in some ways, a handicap. It is a dubious exception. Princenthal is not the greatest writer, but she is a good thinker about critical writing and is capable of great pith. For example, "In critical writing, clarity is close to an ethical imperative. He even gives us a little history. Artforum was formed in response to ARTNews, and it was where the theorists wrote. While the Artforum guys excoriate Clement Greenberg, Ratcliff accuses them of wanting to be Greenberg in the sense that their work would have "rigor. In short, Ratcliff inverts the judgment argument, saying that it is not the poets and belletrists who are imposing Olympian judgments, it is the theorists with their pretensions of quasi-scientific analysis. Ratcliff knows that when he makes a judgment, it is inherently conditional. The best criticism feels at home with this uncertainty, or at one with it, and wants to illuminate it. Personally, I found the book useful. It will probably have an effect on my own writing--not the least of which is to make me more self-conscious. Posted by Robert Boyd at 6:

Chapter 3 : Crisis in Criticism

From this perspective, the crisis of current criticism is really the absence of crisis proper: a failure to put the work into question by relating to its actual origin or intent. I would like to propose that this is not simply because we live in neoliberal times in which everything registers as crisis, but because we really are in crisis.

The Crisis of Criticism First and foremost, criticism is a very virulent poison. It damages in every case the one who criticizes, and hurts still more the one who is criticized. It can be based on many things, but is usually rooted in jealousy, thwarted ambitions, or pride of individual intellect. The problem is that no one person can truly know all the responsibilities that exist, and criticism is, therefore, easy. Far from uniting the group, this criticism can divide it and cause harm, both physically and to the subtler bodies. Whether spoken or thought, these negative energies can weaken, confuse, and dispirit even the strongest of groups. Although unvoiced criticism is very dangerous because it is powerfully focused and strongly directed, it is when criticism is voiced and strengthened by the cooperation of others that it becomes truly lethal. These produce results in the aborted effectiveness of the whole group and also in the actual physical health of the members. Quite often where this negative criticism is evident, there are cases of heart troubles, intestinal problems, cancers, and bone disorders. The emotional body can also be affected by nervous breakdowns, addictions, relationship problems, and the tendency to be overwhelmed. It is hard for the individual group member to appreciate the dire effects when one or two persons are the target for group criticism. The more highly evolved the person who is targeted, the greater the pain and suffering. Willful people who naturally have a "technique of isolation" suffer less, for they know how to shut off these directed streams of force. People who are not deeply spiritual can even return the energies to their originators and wreak havoc in those lives. Loving, wise people do not and cannot work this way. They are natural absorbers and magnetically attract all that is directed towards them in their environment. That is why such great leaders as the Christ, Ghandi, Lincoln, and King paid the penalty of death. They were killed not only by their enemies but also by their so-called friends. Then there is the reverse of criticism that must be faced by many group leaders. That is, being "smothered" by the devotion of the group members. It is not as poisonous as criticism because it is along the line of love, but it is nonetheless handicapping and leads to many forms of difficulty, misunderstandings and group reactions. It produces the "crippling of the one who seeks to serve and the binding of their hands and feet. The major mistake of the groups during year Piscean age now coming to a close was that they remained attached too strongly to the leader, or, when aroused emotionally, violently disrupted or severed the tie between group and leader. In the Aquarian age the cord will be cut early in the life of the group, but the leader or group of leaders will remain for a long time as the mother of a child the guiding inspiration, the loving protective force, and the source of teaching. When this is the case, the group can proceed upon its way and live its life as a self-directing agent, even when the leader passes away or where there is needed a change in leaders. Groups in the coming age will be held together by a subjective link and not so much by the emotional reactions induced by outer contact. The more frequent the physical contact between group members, the more definite will be the group problems and difficulties. Ponder this carefully for it holds the clue to the successful working of the new groups. In these early stages of true group work, the difficulties which arise from group contact are frequently of a purely physiological nature and are not so deeply seated as those with which we have earlier been dealing. Physical troubles and disease are not of so serious a nature as are psychological. This is a point to be remembered. What can a leader or group member do in these unfortunately normal and usual circumstances? Nothing but continue in the work, retreat within themselves, speak the truth with love, and refuse to become bitter over the pain inflicted. Then wait until the group members learn the lessons of responsibility, cooperation, silence, loving appreciation, and the wise realization and understanding of problems with which all groups are faced in these difficult and individualistic days. That time will come. In the coming cycle we can know that the true work of spiritually welding the world into a synthesis of a recognized unity of souls will be carried forward only by those who refuse to be separative and whose words are watched, so that no evil is spoken. These are workers who see the divine in all and refuse to think and impute ill. Their lives are

colored by understanding and love. Their minds are characterized by a trained spiritual perception and that spiritual awareness which employs a keen intellect as the corollary of a loving spirit. The importance of this theme is vital and the effects of the work of these groups on the world is immense. Such men and women whose mission is to inaugurate the new world order have learned the secret of silence. They are animated ceaselessly by a spirit of inclusive love, their tongues do not lead them astray into criticism, and they permit no condemnation of others. They are filled with a spirit of protection. To them will be committed the work of fostering the life of the new world order. Teaching adapted and quoted from Alice A.

Chapter 4 : Criticism in a Time of Crisis – Critical Stages/Scènes critiques

The Crisis of Criticism. First and foremost, criticism is a very virulent poison. It damages in every case the one who criticizes, and hurts still more the one who is criticized.

And yet, at the very least, it gives some new urgency to the topic -- does art criticism have the sense of purpose to make it through hard times? Does it have anything to say about its own plight? I have to say: I do not personally feel in crisis. It turns out that, while everyone seems to agree that there is a "crisis in criticism," no one agrees what that crisis is, or what it means. McEvelley declares the problem for criticism today is that "the lingering dominance of the issue of quality and of the value judgment seems to outsiders to render our discourse elitist and irrelevant. Elsewhere, James Elkins suggests the "crisis" stems in part from "the lack of restraint that is granted to art critics by the absence of an academic home"; Carter Ratcliff, on the contrary, argues that the problem is academic-minded "critic-theorists," who "address those who want to be told what to think. You get the point. Moving past this unpromising circular firing squad routine, what is most striking is the lack of any kind of well-developed explanation, on all sides, for why there would be a crisis; why now and not some other time? On the panel I was on, Jan Avgikos asserted that the problem was "pluralism," and seemed to say that Cai Guo-Qiang -- an artist who lived for 10 years in New York, and was successful abroad well before he was accepted at home -- represented something radically unassimilable to Western thinking about art. What can we say about the actual historical circumstances that gave birth to the "Artforum mode" of criticism? Here are some actual facts about the magazine: As laid out in *Challenging Art*: This was the first period when relatively young American artists could hope to achieve star status and make money off of what they did Jasper Johns set the stage when he sold out his debut show in at Castelli gallery, an unprecedented achievement. The other distinctive contribution of Artforum, of course, is its heady theoretical language. This created the base for the shift to the new criticism, as well as the climate for an expanded discourse about art in general. Lastly, if the "Artforum mode" of criticism -- first strident formalism, and later the muesli of psychoanalysis, deconstruction and critical theory we know today -- served partly to establish some seemingly objective criteria to examine brand new work that had no established historical worth, it is also the case that there was every reason to feel that art had a new, more "objective" importance for U. In , the National Endowment for the Arts was founded, putting the stamp of official recognition on a field formerly perceived to be pretty out-there. Well, for one thing, the economic background is totally different. The "art boom" ebbed. These policies were a stable feature of the establishment for this entire period, for Reagan "government is not the answer, it is the problem" as much as for Clinton "the era of big government is over". And at the end of 30 years of such developments, here is where art criticism finds itself: A RAND study of the art market sums up the outcome for art: There has been a strong lure, therefore, for new art to take the character of a tradable luxury product. According to the same study, "museums have had less success in raising interest levels among the various educational groups, especially those with less education," adding as explanation that "large sections of the population feel uncomfortable with the atmosphere of museums and believe that museums are not welcoming to those who are not knowledgeable about the arts. Education is more expensive and more stratified than it was when Artforum hit the scene. In this context, the academic leanings of the discourse around art would seem to be increasingly an objective hindrance to promoting art, rather than a boon -- I remember well a British museum director extolling the virtues of Martin Creed to me: Finally, to sell a pro-corporate agenda, Reagan detonated the "culture wars," appealing to the wingnut right as his claim on mass appeal. The whole thing was a political kabuki show: Such political attacks open up a rift for criticism. They produce pressure towards traditionalism and quiescence for anyone with a popular platform, on the one hand, and sharply underline the impotence and cloistered nature of academic criticism, on the other. All this is not meant to be an exhaustive list of factors weighing on art writing. Nor do they swamp the subjective component, the ability of individual voices to push against the tide. But the point is this: The diverse "crises" perceived by assorted, apparently contradictory viewpoints today actually coalesce out of a common background noise. The idea that popular writing about art has become less rigorous -- more cheerleader-ish,

more money-obsessed, less "big picture" -- hits home for the same reason that charges that theory-crit is out of touch are more likely to stick. Both are true, which means that people looking for something meaningful ping pong between the two sides without finding anything satisfactory. Both have a common root in the contradictory changes in the economy over the last 30 years. These changes have taken the form of an erosion, an incremental but relentless shifting of the balance of forces, which is why the "crisis of criticism" has manifested itself in the form of a nagging, recurring, but ever-more-insistent theme, rather than a sudden revelation. All of this is not just intellectual sparring. It is of real importance right now. For if a neoliberal boom has been the context for the "crisis of criticism" debate heretofore, the current, stomach-turning collapse represents the implosion of that economic model. Trickle-down economics has morphed into a shrieking economic super-hurricane. Our new president begins his term junking decades-old wisdom that even he himself touted a short year ago, under dual pressure from desperate bankers and an angry electorate: Mainstream ideas about what makes sense for society are in flux. In the year-end Artforum, editor Tim Griffin paints a picture of his team trying to grapple with the changed reality -- "one can sense the unease in the most modest of prose," he writes. Museum director Charles Esche has a solid, manifesto-like piece in that issue about how art might respond to the financial collapse. How to avoid the choice between random subjective assertion and blind theoretical correctness? In its broad strokes, the debate about the "crisis in criticism" seems a proxy for a real political debate: This, it should be noted, is one of the all-time classic false oppositions. Now is as good a time as any to return to the writings of Leon Trotsky on art. It is, true to form, a polemic, informed by an analysis of the crisis of art in that moment, faced with assaults on the avant-garde by both fascism and Stalinism. Yet underneath this is a more general idea about art. And yet, later they continue, "It should be clear by now that in defending freedom of thought we have no intention of justifying political indifference, and that it is far from our wish to revive a so-called pure art which generally serves the extremely impure ends of reaction. And yet this same society throws all kinds of roadblocks in the way. It suffocates the individual and degrades the imagination. Art is therefore not political because it adheres to some particular "critical" program. It is critical in its DNA. The esthetic flows into the political without the one being the other. They have a right to do it. It is even important to have an analysis of the world -- otherwise you end up with criticism that is eloquent when parsing esthetic influences, but falls back on the dopiest conventional wisdom when politics or economics come up, as they will. Arguing that art benefits from theoretical knowledge of the world beyond the temperature-controlled confines of the white cube, however, is very different than saying that critics must be the Debbie Downers of the art world, demanding that art Get Serious. Politically engaged but defiantly in love with art for what it is -- that is what criticism has to be if its own "crisis" is not to turn into a crash. He can be reached at.

Chapter 5 : theinnatdunvilla.com: Customer reviews: The Crisis of Criticism

Hours after Hurricane Harvey roared ashore in Texas, helpers rushed towards the coast as haters rushed to social media. Complaints about mega churches and their leaders, political rants, Red Cross.

You know the scene: Novels and novelists that is, might have ideas, but critics seem better at delivering them for consideration, or put more plainly, for consumption. I prefer good literary criticism. Thought and Fiction in America, is good literary criticism in this respect – and others too. In its emphasis on abstracted ideas, as much or more than the fiction that delivers them, it recalls the great critics that Tom Townsend brings to life in Metropolitan, even as it expresses a knowing appreciation for the limits and the aspirations of the language they once spoke. But only a precious few – who seemed quite regularly to cross paths in Hyde Park or Manhattan – could feel centuries of Western philosophical inquiry somehow emerging in a new postwar moment of ideological vertigo, religious impasse, and technological uncertainty. For men and women such as Robert Maynard Hutchins, Lewis Mumford, Karl Mannheim, Dwight Macdonald, and Hannah Arendt, the rhetoric and consciousness of crisis was a sign of distinction, a form of capital itself. The former had the Word; the others had the use of it. What others had the use of it? Greif extends this discussion with persuasive readings of Ellison and Bellow. The story of their friendship is well known, but Greif makes the contours of their shared affinities feel acutely relevant for understanding how their respectively iconic careers unfolded in the late s and early s. Greif appreciates that the intellectual history his book is after was a field full of outsized personalities prone to flights of rhetoric and blindness; and for the most part he himself remains in the role of latter-day Ishmael, commenting with complicit irony even as he chases many of the same whales. But some of the most revealing moments of The Age of the Crisis of Man are when its author clearly feels the pull of grander languages and critical motivations. Greif often assumes a more direct relation to the idioms we associate with Trilling and his circle, and sometimes writes in ways that conjure up their spirits unironically. At moments like this, Greif can seem a throwback to a bygone intellectualism – with its enclosing frames of reference and codes of sophistication, even its sense of humor – and less of a historian standing after and outside a cultural moment that he knows has passed. We are maybe more accustomed now to academics and professional critics scaling down their tastes and cultural priorities, trading just as readily on their playlists and their Netflix queues as on their dissertation topics and fields of research. Greif is decidedly not this sort of critic, at least not here. His book is consistent in its seriousness, and proceeds throughout with a formality that makes even its most personable turns of phrase and shows of feeling appear as artifacts of an intellectual habitus, to borrow from Bourdieu, that Greif in part admires for its untimeliness. I think there is, which means I guess that I do. Mark Greif has written a book about a whole lost world of thought that, by training, ideology, and inclination, many would have a hard time taking quite as seriously as he does. We are right to wonder along the way when a book insists that there are things we ought to do, and that some ideas are more important than others. Some readers will, like me, disagree with Greif at one point here or there, while others could conceivably disagree with him at most every turn. Greif knows that this is history now, but wants us to remember the commitments that shaped this discourse and its ambitions. Even if he understands that most of us are finally glad that they were not for everyone.

Chapter 6 : Glossary of Terms: Cr

The Crisis of Criticism is a collection of provocative, often insightful essays on the endangered state of contemporary arts criticism. Contributors include Richard Martin, Jim Hoberman, Arlene Croce, Wayne Kestenbaum, Joyce Carol Oates, and others.

Crowd gathering on Wall Street after the crash. Milton Friedman and Anna Schwartz stated that the Fed pursued an erroneously restrictive monetary policy, exacerbating the Great Depression. After the stock market crash in 1929, the Fed continued its contraction decrease of the money supply and refused to save banks that were struggling with bank runs. This mistake, critics charge, allowed what might have been a relatively mild recession to explode into catastrophe. Friedman and Schwartz believed that the depression was "a tragic testimonial to the importance of monetary forces. In 1933, the system nearly collapsed and there was an extraordinary intervention by an ad-hoc coalition assembled by J. In the years 1930-1933", the bankers demanded a central bank to address this structural weakness. Friedman suggested that a similar intervention should have been followed during the banking panic at the end of 1906. This might have stopped the vicious circle of forced liquidation of assets at depressed prices, just as suspension of convertibility in 1890 and had quickly ended the liquidity crises at the time. Friedman and Schwartz note that "[f]rom the cyclical peak in August 1929 to a cyclical trough in March 1933, the stock of money fell by over a third. The mechanism suggested by Friedman and Schwartz was that people wanted to hold more money than the Federal Reserve was supplying. People thus hoarded money by consuming less. This, in turn, caused a contraction in employment and production, since prices were not flexible enough to immediately fall. Friedman and Schwartz argued the Federal Reserve allowed the money supply to plummet because of ineptitude and poor leadership. Let me end my talk by abusing slightly my status as an official representative of the Federal Reserve. I would like to say to Milton and Anna: Financial crisis of 2008 Some economists, such as John B. Taylor, [29] have asserted that the Fed was responsible, or at least partially responsible, for the United States housing bubble which occurred prior to the recession. They claim that the Fed kept interest rates too low following the recession. Then-Chairman Alan Greenspan disputes this interpretation. The Fed did raise the short-term interest rate over which it has control in 2007. They argue that its monetary policies cause booms and busts when the Fed creates too much or too little fiat money. It was the credit expansion of the 2000s causing the stock market bubble that was the real cause of the crash. Because the regional Federal Reserve Banks are privately owned, and most of their directors are chosen by their stockholders, it is common to hear assertions that control of the Fed is in the hands of an elite. In particular, it has been rumored that control is in the hands of a very few people holding "class A stock" in the Fed. As explained, there is no stock in the system, only in each regional Bank. More important, individuals do not own stock in Federal Reserve Banks. The stock is held only by banks who are members of the system. Each bank holds stock proportionate to its capital. Ownership and membership are synonymous. Moreover, there is no such thing as "class A" stock. All stock is the same. This stock, furthermore, does not carry with it the normal rights and privileges of ownership. Most significantly, member banks, in voting for the directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of which they are a member, do not get voting rights in proportion to the stock they hold. Instead, each member bank regardless of size gets one vote. Concentration of ownership of Federal Reserve Bank stock, therefore, is irrelevant to the issue of control of the system italics in original. The Reserve Banks are not operated for profit, and ownership of a certain amount of stock is, by law, a condition of membership in the System. The stock may not be sold, traded, or pledged as security for a loan. For all practical purposes, however, member bank ownership of the Federal Reserve System is merely a fiction. The Federal Reserve Banks are not operated for the purpose of earning profits for their stockholders. All net earnings after expenses and dividends are paid to the Treasury. Bank ownership and election at the base are therefore devoid of substantive significance, despite the superficial appearance of private bank control that the formal arrangement creates.

Chapter 7 : The Great God Pan Is Dead: Is There a Crisis in Art Criticism?

A collection of provocative, often insightful essays on the endangered state of contemporary arts criticism. Alarmed by critics' failure to act as "aesthetic mentors" to difficult new work, editor Berger, a senior fellow at the New School's Vera List Center for Art and Politics, has selected.

As we are increasingly having a hard time finding places to publish our writings in printed media, we are being asked, more and more frequently, to self-analyze ourselves and redefine our roles in relation to the changing configuration of the international art scene. Here are some of my thoughts on the subject. The traditional art critic, whether professional or dilettante, performed a regulatory, introspective, and proscriptive function for the circulation and reception of art. Artists usually viewed his or her opinions as useful, insightful, or instructive, but sometimes also as speculative and even suspicious. Today, that informed insider has been largely replaced by a fast-moving, semi-professional, often freelance, critic-curator-art agent sometimes also an artist, who pursues a career that might or might not last longer than a few years, depending on the rapidity of the success of his or her program. Assessing the current state of art criticism in his book *What Happened to Art Criticism?* The anxiety persists, becomes omnipresent. While faced with the changing aspects of art and life, we seem to be getting increasingly nervous about the hollowing out of art and art criticism in the present world. Perhaps it is not a paradox that the present instability of the political, economic, and cultural situation is what is keeping the heated debate on both the future direction of the world and the arts alive around the globe. In *Travels in Hyperreality*, Umberto Eco observes that a simulacrum not only produces illusion, but, in fact, stimulates demand for it. We justify the need for simulacrum by talking about it endlessly. The meaning of the void has been debated ever since. Some recent scientific theories have reconfirmed the thesis that an absolute void is indeed impossible. In art this term is usually applied to works with an extreme accumulation of details. Mario Praz famously used it to describe the cluttered interior design of the Victorian age, but it has also been applied to, among others, Medieval illuminated manuscripts and some Islamic art, which in the thinking of some belong to the dark ages and civilizations. It has also commonly been used to speak of the art produced by schizophrenics, which, it has been argued, offers a particularly deep and dense insight into the subconscious. While the global population of artists increases, their conditions often worsen. Artists, like the rest of the population, might be divided between the 1 percent and the 99 percent. That division threatens to obliterate the middle class among them, e. To maintain an illusionary lifestyle based on fame and money—which, contrary to what we are being told, is not a matter of individual choice, or absolute individuality—art is promoted and advertised, advertised everywhere, because—as the Paraguayan art critic Ticio Escobar the recipient of the AICA Prize for Distinguished Contribution to Art Criticism explains: Artists still make art, we are still writing about it. The first man reaches the edge of a cliff but keeps walking; others follow him. Why do the men follow the first one if they know that it is impossible to walk in the air, that going over the cliff means dying? Because they do not know that we have reached the end of [art criticism]. The entire text is being prepared for a publication in France. His debut volume of poetry, *East Sixth Street*: He curated, among other exhibitions, Adja Yunkers:

Chapter 8 : What is CRISIS THEORY? definition of CRISIS THEORY (Psychology Dictionary)

U.S. political crisis deepens. On September 5, The New York Times published an op-ed by an anonymous author who claims to be a top official of the Trump administration.

Why do we talk today about institutional critique in the field of art? The answer is very simple: Because we still believe that art is intrinsically equipped with the power of criticism. This includes, however, some sort of self-criticism, or more precisely, the practice of critical self-reflexivity, which means that we also expect of art - or at least used to expect - to be critically aware of the conditions of its possibility, which usually means, the conditions of its production. These two notions - to be aware of the conditions of its possibility, respectively, of the conditions of its production - point at two major realms of modern criticism: It was Kant who first posed the question about the conditions of possibility of our knowledge and who understood this question explicitly as an act of criticism. From that point on we may say that modern reflection is either critical - in this self-reflexive way - or it is not modern. But we are not going to follow here this theoretical line of modern criticism. We will concentrate instead on its practical and political meaning, which can be simply described as a will for radical change, in short, the claim for revolution, which is the ultimate form of practical and political criticism. French Revolution was not only prepared through the bourgeois criticism of the absolutist state. It was nothing but this criticism in actu, its last word turned into political action. The idea of revolution as an ultimate act of criticism has found its most radical expression in Marxist theoretical and political concepts. He meant this in the most radical sense as a criticism that "operates" in the very basement of social life, that is, in the realm of its material production and reproduction, something we understand today, quite simplified, as the realm of economy. In this way criticism has become one of the essential qualities of Modernity. For almost two centuries to be modern meant simply to be critical: But there is also another concept, which - as a sort of its complement - has accompanied for a long time the idea and practice of modern criticism, the concept of crisis. A believe that both, crisis and criticism, have something in common, that there is an authentic relation, or better, an interaction between them, equally belongs to the modern experience. Therefore, an act of criticism almost necessarily implies the awareness of a crisis and vice versa: Criticism is the child of the 18th century enlightenment. It was born and developed out of the separation between politics and morality, a separation that criticism has deepened and kept alive all along the modern age. It was only through the process of criticism - the criticism of all forms of traditional knowledge, religious believes and aesthetic values, the criticism of existing juridical and political reality and finally the criticism of the mind itself - that the growing bourgeois class could impose itself its own interests and values as the highest instance of judgement and in that way develop the self-confidence and self-conscience it needed for the decisive political struggles to come. It was precisely art and literary criticism that produced at that time among the intelligentsia the awareness of a contradiction between the "old" and the "modern" and in that way shaped a new understanding of time capable of differentiating the future from the past. But at the end of this period arises also the awareness of the approaching crisis: Whereas for the thinkers of enlightenment revolution is a synonym for an inevitable historical progress, which occurs necessarily as a sort of natural phenomenon Rousseau understands it as the ultimate expression of crisis, which brings about the state of insecurity, dissolution, chaos, new contradictions, etc. From now on criticism and crisis go together shaping the modern age of civil wars and revolutions, which instead of bringing about the expected historical progress, cause chaotic dissolutions and obscure regressive processes, often completely beyond rational control. The interaction between criticism and crisis is one of the major qualities of what later has been conceptualized as the dialectics of enlightenment. In the meantime the interplay of both notions became a sort of terminus technicus of modernist progress introducing a difference - and simultaneously a relation - between "old" and "new". To say that something has come into crisis meant above all to say that it has become old, that is, that it has lost its right to exist and therefore should be replaced by something new. Criticism is nothing but the act of this judgement, which helps the old to die quickly and the new to be born easily. This also applies to the development of modern art, which too follows the dialectics of criticism and crisis of its forms. So we understand for instance realism as a critical reaction to the crisis of

romanticism, or the idea of abstract art as a critique of figurative art, which has exhausted its potential and therefore came into crisis. Also the tension between art and "prosaic reality" was interpreted through the dialectics of crisis and criticism. So was modern art -especially in romanticism - often understood as a criticism of ordinary life, of ordinariness as such, which means, of a life that had lost its authenticity or its meaning - that is, a life that had also entered some sort of crisis. Let us now go back to the question, whether this dialectics of criticism and crisis still makes some sense to us today. A few months ago in Austria I had an opportunity to ask directly this question. I moderated a discussion, whose topic was the legacy of the artistic avant-garde today in the post-communist Eastern Europe. I hoped everybody would agree when I said that the avant-garde is still the most radical case of modernist art criticism - both in terms of a criticism of traditional art of its time and in terms of a criticism of existing reality, precisely in the moment of its - widely recognized and acknowledged - crisis. After 5 hours of debate the conclusion was, that there is no use whatsoever of the critical experience of avant-garde art today, at least not in Eastern Europe. Actually only the representative of Turkey was prepared to take the topic seriously and believed that the critical stance of the avant-garde still makes some sense to us today. The most open and most radical in his refusal of the avant-garde question was the representative of the Czeque Republic. He argued that the avant-garde experience is actually a problem of generations. For him, it is an older generation of artists and art historians which still sees some challenge in the avant-garde and is bothered by this question. The younger generation, as he believes, is already beyond the problem of the political meaning of art, or relations between politics and aesthetics. They have so to say a direct insight into her art without any political connotations. They see it as what it really is - a pure art in its pure aesthetic value and meaning. However, there was another issue I found much more interesting there. The participants were actually all members of the so-called Transit-Project. This is a project that was launched a few years ago by an Austrian bank with the purpose to help art in Eastern Europe. The participants were representatives of the project in their countries. Since I know that this particular bank has earned an enormous amount of money in Eastern Europe, I was curious whether they would have any opinion on that fact, that is, on the way they are paid for their artistic work, or on the role of art and art funding under these circumstances. I was also motivated by an article, which was published those days in the Viennese daily newspaper Der Standard. It was an article about the profits of Austrian banks and insurance companies in Eastern Europe. One could read there for instance that the result of the so-called business activity of the Generali Holding Vienna an insurance company had tripled the year before. The annual net profit had doubled in the same year. One can only wonder how this had been possible? The answer was given in the same article by the subtitle: It is due to the eastern expansion of the holding - and Austrian banks too - that they can make such profits. I wanted the participants to tackle somehow this issue, or speaking more openly, I wanted to provoke some sort of criticism. Nobody found the economic, material conditions of their art making worth mentioning. It seems that the critical legacy of the avant-garde in post-communist Europe is finally dead. Moreover, it also seems that there is no authentic interest among young artists in institutional criticism, that is, in what we have called above self-criticism: The reason for this is obvious: But let me, at this point, pose an "impossible" question: As far as I know, it is not only still alive, but also proves, in some fields, its superiority over capitalism. There has never been a real communism. I can remember very well that from the perspective of Yugoslav communism - also often dismissed, due to the market economy, as not being an authentic, real one - the Soviet and whole East-block communism was defined as a sort of state-capitalism. But before we ask the highest theoretical authority of the Chinese communism about the true meaning of criticism and self-criticism, let me remind you of a historical fact: In the historical reality of the nineteenth and twentieth century the idea of communist revolution became itself an institution - in the form of the communist movement, that is, in the form of communist political parties. As an institution, the communist movement also developed its own institution of criticism, the institution of so-called self-criticism, which played an extremely important role in its history: For Chairman Mao, conscientious practice of self-criticism was one of the most important hallmarks distinguishing a communist Party from all other political parties. Let me quote him: On the contrary, his definition of self-criticism seems to be completely non-ideological, simply a matter of trivial common sense: And, what is even more important, where is the crisis, where has it gone, why has it suddenly

disappeared? Why this particular form of communist criticism - a self-criticism that is not related to any sort of crisis? In the guise of the communist political movement both the crisis of capitalism and its criticism have merged into one single institution in which there is no possibility to differentiate between them. For the communist movement the crisis of capitalism was suddenly out there, in the outside of its own institution. But for capitalism too, the criticism of its crisis can now be perceived only as coming from its own outside. The problem was that communism and capitalism, or if you want, capitalism as crisis and its communist criticism have never reached the point of a radical mutual exclusion, but on the contrary, were helping each other in moments of crises. Why should we forget that it was precisely American capital which helped the Bolshevik Russia to recover from the destructions of the civil war? Why forget the role of art in this story? The Soviets, as it is well known, were exchanging some of the most precious and also most expensive art works, mostly French paintings from the nineteenth century, for new industrial technology from the United States. In our liberal jargon we would call it today a perfect win-win situation. The one side could get rid of what it considered at that time meaningless and historically obsolete, that is, of the bourgeois art, whereas the other side could expand its markets, push forward employment and consequently stabilize the social situation, pacify its working class, that is - prevent the crisis. They knew very well, and this according to the pure capitalist logic, about the market value of those art works. They treated them exclusively as commodities. But this became possible only after these art works were artistically devaluated, after they had lost their artistic value as a consequence of an authentic art-criticism. It was actually the avant-garde art that stated the crisis of traditional art and - within what we today understand as pure history of art - radically criticised all these French paintings and destroyed their artistic value. And who could provide these factories and this working class that it needed? This is a wonderful example of how crisis and criticism of both capitalism and art can successfully work together, of course within an overall capitalist setting, in order to produce - normality! It is - to translate the reality into the dialectics of crisis and its criticism - precisely the rule of an institutionalized criticism of capitalism, that is, the rule of the Chinese communist party, that today helps the capitalist crises to survive, which means to persist. They have not betrayed Mao. On the contrary, they stick faithfully to his true legacy. Let me quote again the Chairman, when he, talking about the necessity of self-criticism, advocates the need for personal sacrifice: Can we be willing to allow political dust and germs to dirty our clean faces or eat into our healthy organisms? Famous Stalinist mock trials would have never been possible without the institution of self-criticism and personal sacrifice. As it is today well known, they were introduced at the beginning of thirties, precisely at the moment when the collectivization started to bring about catastrophic results, that is when Soviet society came into deep crisis. It was the self-criticism that then helped to project this crisis into an outside, to present it as an effect of the subversion from the outside, a work of imperialist spies and agents. It was therefore completely understandable that the institution had to be cleaned up from all those "germs and parasites" which had eaten into the healthy organism of Soviet society. Criticism - in the guise of communist self-criticism - was used or if you like misused - not to disclose the real crisis and its antagonisms, and to intervene in it which would have been a classical Marxist approach, but on the contrary to hide it and in this way to make it permanent, that is, to transform or translate crisis in some sort of normality.

Chapter 9 : Critical theory - Wikipedia

Lately, I have been involved in an ongoing discussion about a crisis in contemporary criticism, and perhaps properly so, after assuming in the position of President of AICA International, an art critics' association with a membership of over 4, in 63 national sections worldwide. As we are.

Cracker Those who break the security of a computer system. Crackers are often times relative neophytes, gathering in small tightly knit groups, usually detached from the computer community, as opposed to hackers, many of who participate in large communities such as the GNU project, etc. Some organised groups exist who use cracking as their economic sustenance. Some of these groups have ethical codes Samurai while others who sell their labour to the highest bidder are referred to as Sneakers, or in military use, Tiger Teams. Credit Credit is the separation between purchase of a commodity and payment for it. Credit is essential for the development of production and distribution, but credit is also debt. In his Comments on James Mill, Marx showed how credit in its normal day-to-day manifestation serves to accentuate the class character of bourgeois society: Here it is also glaringly evident that distrust is the basis of economic trust; distrustful calculation whether credit ought to be given or not; spying into the secrets of the private life, etc. The whole system of bankruptcy, spurious enterprises, etc As regards government loans, the state occupies exactly the same place as the man does in the earlier example In the game with government securities it is seen how the state has become the plaything of businessmen, etc. The creation of bankers, the political domination of the bank, the concentration of wealth in these hands, this economic Areopagus of the nation, is the worthy completion of the money system. For the wealthy, the credit system invents new and newer forms every year. Since the s, forms of credit operating in the world of finance " future, commodity speculation, the purchase and sale of debt itself, and so on " have far outstripped paper money and constitutes a huge burden of fictitious capital on the backs of the working class and an enormously unstable ocean of value that can sweep whole economies away in its ebb and flow. A conjunctural crisis can only be discussed in connection with the specific conditions involved in the given case, and generalisation is impossible. For example, such crises can be caused by defeat in war, or by being overtaken economically by a rival power, or as a result of a weak or incompetent government, or as a result of the loss of the natural conditions for production, such as where the environment has been destroyed by industry. It is, however, particularly the cyclical and historical crises of capitalism which have absorbed the attention of Marx and other revolutionaries over a long period of time, and have been the subject of important theoretical debate down the years. In the opening chapters of Capital Marx explains why cyclical crises are characteristic of capitalism: The antithesis, use-value and value; the contradictions that private labour is bound to manifest itself as direct social labour, that a particularised concrete kind of labour has to pass for abstract human labour; the contradiction between the personification of objects and the representation of persons by things; all these antitheses and contradictions, which are immanent in commodities, assert themselves, and develop their modes of motion, in the antithetical phases of the metamorphosis of a commodity. These modes therefore imply the possibility, and no more than the possibility, of crises. The conversion of this mere possibility into a reality is the result of a long series of relations.. Or, to put it another way, capitalism is unsustainable development by its very nature. As this mass of paper value and speculative capital grows, the system becomes more and more unstable, the recession more devastating. Tweaking the interest rates and money supply to stave of this crisis is like driving a Formula One racing car; the central bankers of the capitalist powers are very skilled at the art, but the task of avoiding a crash gets harder and harder and fictitious capital circulates around the world in greater and greater masses. One of the central concerns of Marx, in his study of the capitalist mode of production , was to identify and understand its inner contradictions , the source of the historic crisis which would eventually create conditions for its overthrow and replacement by a more humane and rational system of production. Marx did not come to a definitive answer on this question, and nor could he, for the answer to this question must be the work of all of humanity, not one person. This is because capitalists use more and more developed materials and machinery in their production as the labour process becomes more and more socialised over time, and use smaller and smaller amounts of

wage-labour per unit output. Left to itself, this process would bring about a situation where a handful of immensely rich capitalists would find themselves confronted by a vast mass of proletarians with nothing in between. Likewise, the US, Japan and Europe use tariffs and subsidies to protect small farmers even though cheaper food could be imported from overseas. After the Roman Empire collapsed, it took centuries for the feudal system to establish itself in Europe and regain what had been lost in the collapse of the Roman Empire, because slave society did not generate any class capable of overthrowing the old system and rebuilding society anew. Capitalism however, not only creates the proletariat, but organises and educates the proletariat for the task of destroying capitalism itself. This conception of the crisis of capitalism is most clearly expressed in the Communist Manifesto: At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. Modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past, the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeois and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that, by their periodical return, put the existence of the entire bourgeois society on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises, a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises, there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity - the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand, by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented. These labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market. Wage labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by the revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable. Never has capital been as unnecessary as it is today. The Marxist perspective should be contrasted with conception of capitalism as a system which necessarily leads simply to universal immiseration and pauperism, with growing unemployment as a result of mechanisation and automation. As most clearly expressed in the Communist Manifesto, Marx saw capitalism as a system which would revolutionise the world, and foremost among its achievements was the creation of the proletariat: But as sellers of their own commodity "labour-power" capitalist society tends to keep them down to the minimum price. Although large cartels had grown up and banks grown to significant proportions, industry was still the dominant sector of capital. By the turn of the century, there was no more room for expansion for any capitalist in search of new markets or resources, except at the expense of competing colonial powers. In those days, colonialists jealously guarded their exclusive right to exploitation of their own colonies, and the exhaustion of new opportunities

meant war between the imperialist powers and every time the balance of power changed for one or another reason, a new war would have to be launched for a redivision of the markets. The new epoch which opened up under these conditions is called Imperialism. As an epoch of wars and revolution, imperialism now expresses a new form of the crisis of capitalism: The post-War boom from 1945 was the longest boom in history, and was based on the accumulation of vast amounts of fictitious capital. Many people believe that the kind of analysis Marx makes of the cyclic crisis of capitalism, just as it led to the Great Depression of 1929, could lead to another catastrophic collapse, and that such a crisis would be of such a scope that it would take on the character of an historic crisis and stimulate not just a New Deal, but provide the social impetus for the overthrow of capitalism and reconstruction on the basis of new social relations of production. Critique Critique is the practice of exposing the social basis underlying an argument. Marxist critique is generally immanent critique, that is, critique springing from inside. Critique differs from simply countering an argument with a different one or proving it to be wrong, in fact, critique implicitly recognises that the argument it opposes is right, but right in the context of a specific form of social practice which may not be declared. Immanent critique accepts the terms of a theory and pursues it thoroughly and consistently until it arrives at contradiction with itself, as must any consistent theory which pretends to be complete. This disclosure of the immanent self-contradiction implicit in a system of ideas opens the way to disclosure of its social basis and interest. Critique has its origin with Kant, whose Critique of Pure Reason can be said to mark the beginning of modern philosophy. Kant proved that Hume, the proponent of scepticism, was in fact dogmatic, since he denied absolutely, but without proof, the possibility of knowing the cause of things. Hegel was the first to develop criticism systematically. Hegel saw human history as expressing successive stages in the development of the Idea. Every truth is for Hegel, then, a relative truth, since it expresses one stage in the unfolding of history. As the logical Idea is seen to unfold itself in a process from the abstract to the concrete, so in the history of philosophy the earliest systems are the most abstract, and thus at the same time the poorest. The relation too of the earlier to the later systems of philosophy is much like the relation of the corresponding stages of the logical Idea: This is the true meaning of a much misunderstood phenomenon in the history of philosophy - the refutation of one system by another, of an earlier by a later. Most commonly the refutation is taken in a purely negative sense to mean that the system refuted has ceased to count for anything, has been set aside and done for. Were it so, the history of philosophy would be, of all studies, most saddening, displaying, as it does, the refutation of every system which time has brought forth. Now although it may be admitted that every philosophy has been refuted, it must be in an equal degree maintained that no philosophy has been refuted. And that in two ways. For first, every philosophy that deserves the name always embodies the Idea: The refutation of a philosophy, therefore, only means that its barriers are crossed, and its special principle reduced to a factor in the completer principle that follows. These figures of gods are the various stages of the Idea, as they come forward one after another in dialectical development. One of the Young Hegelians, Ludwig Feuerbach developed a new approach to criticism which he turned against Hegel. Feuerbach took statements of Hegel and interchanged the subject and object, showing that the sentence made more sense this way. For example, whereas Christianity asserted that the family was an image of the Holy Family, Feuerbach asserted that the Holy Family was an imaginary image of the Earthly family. See *Essence of Christianity*. Subjectivity is a characteristic of subjects and personality a characteristic of the person. Social relations underlie ideology and provide the key to understanding ideology, but at the same time, ideology provide the clearest possible window into social relations. Thus, Marx entitled his magnum opus, *Capital*: But it has never once asked the question why labour is represented by the value of its product and labour-time by the magnitude of that value. These formulae, which bear it stamped upon them in unmistakable letters that they belong to a state of society, in which the process of production has the mastery over man, instead of being controlled by him, such formulae appear to the bourgeois intellect to be as much a self-evident necessity imposed by Nature as productive labour itself. For Marx on the other hand, the argument and the social conditions spoken of, expressed by and revealed in the text are inseparable. Another tradition in critique begins with Nietzsche and Freud up to Lacan and Zizek, in which concepts of psychology and psychoanalysis are used to disclose personal interest disclosed in an argument. There is also a linguistic or semiotic current in criticism which shares with Derrida the exclusion of anything outside the text and

focuses on disclosing hidden meanings in the linguistic structure of the argument. It is this rule which must be changed if we are to construct a view of the world in which both sexes are accorded equal value. The claim for male superiority will no longer seem reasonable and the male monopoly in power will be seen as problematic. We select, pattern and interpret the flux of events in the attempt to make life meaningful and few of us suspect how deeply entrenched, and arbitrary, these rules are. We impose them on the world so that what we see conforms to what we have been led to see.