

The editor's preface: *In support of the new student movement in Austria Claudia von Werlhof wrote the presented paper. I am convinced that her analysis also represents the situation at places anywhere in the world as the struggle finally aims against the global system. With regard to her analysis it is inevitable to understand that patriarchy has nothing in common with dominance of mothers. Matriarchy is anti-hierarchical, egalitarian, democratic from the roots, - it has nothing to do with any form of dominance. Matriarchy represents a natural balance between all parts of existence, solidarity, the inter-relatedness of all being to speak with the words of Javier Lajo and other authors.*

It is one of the fatal pitfalls of patriarchy, the predominant system with its marginalizing splittings, monopolisations, hegemonies and competitions that a majority of people only knows to think within this exclusive, unique and destructive frame. The perspective on the simple whole issue, on a sound and sane normality, on salvation and welfare of all and everything almost gets lost. (1)

A balance between patriarchy and matriarchy therefore never can be a prosperous ambition. It is to expose patriarchy in its timeless violence, abusiveness, destructiveness thus to debilitate this system. The destination is to leave this system behind, to readopt individual as well as social responsibility and hence to continue the path of joy and affluence of nature, of the „social“ and the „ecological“ which represents the path of matriarchy, the path of indigenous wisdom, the Quapac Ñan of the Andean Culture.(2)

- 1) A "matriarchal philosophy of nature" and a "patriarchy-critical philosophy of history" - Towards the foundation of a "critical theory of patriarchy" - An interdisciplinary project of political science in the light of the contemporary crisis of civilisation by Mathias Behmann - [pdf](#)
- 2) Ways out of Misery, Decline and Despair - Building Bridges to a Harmonious Future: Thoughts and Perspectives on necessary conditions for the emergence of a peaceful Humanity - The current Paradigm-shift from Civilising towards Humanisation (<http://emanzipationhumanum.de/english/humanisation.html>)

Student Movement (since October 29th 2009)
“**Autonomous lecture**”, occupied SoWiMax on 31th Oct 2009, 2 pm,
University of Innsbruck, Austria

Claudia von Werlhof
(Department of Political Science)

Social movement, society, education and science today, conditions of academic studies and practical consequences

(- online by Emanzipation ad Humanum <http://emanzipationhumanum.de> - <http://mensch-sein.de>)

After you had occupied the SoWiMax, I came to visit you two days ago and all I could say was “at last!” Finally I have the chance to witness a student movement once before I will have to quit university. By now I can see that you have made a good deal of experiences in terms of self organization on the foundation of basic democratic principles. For sure, you will need these experiences again at a later point in time.

I am going to address four issues today:

1. What is a social movement, what kind of social movement is yours?
2. What does the societal situation look like today and how does it affect education and science?
3. What does this mean for your study conditions at the university?
4. What to do?

1. What is a social movement, what kind of social movement is yours?

Since I have taken an active part in several social movements up to now, I dare to provide a definition for it, consisting of four theses:

Thesis a)

In the end, a social movement is in all its depths a declaration of love

-to life

-to the search of truth and

-to the self-evidence of domination-free existence

However, these three theses lack several aspects nowadays:

-Life resembles a laboratory stay

-The search of truth does not take place, but it rather is a squeezing in of pieces of “information”, above all the ones concerning mere procedural questions (“education”)

-The self-evidence of domination-free existence gets transformed into subordination to increasing totalitarian “matter-necessities” and hierarchies of domination as well as into a radical heteronomy within the “mega-machine” (Mumford) of science, economy and society.

Thesis b)

Obviously, these conditions do not fit into the principle of being-human and into other human traditions that are re-appearing at the moment: as a memory, as a possibility, as an experience, as a vision and as a real – well, indeed a realistic – perspective.

This is about the revival of the *egalitarian heritage* from our basic-democratic, life-friendly and cooperative past, from the world of *matriarchal civilization*. It is obviously the still-existing model of the self-organization you are working on so naturally!

Due to this historic connection, social movements *cannot be made, but have to be born*. Therefore, they are in stark contrast to everything that is made: war, domination, commodity-production, money, the machinery and the obedience towards them. Social movements generally refuse the suppressed condition of being human. The social community thus gets pregnant with those movements until they crowd out in an irrefutable, inevitable, so to speak in a “volcanical” way.

Social movements arise absolutely *against* the will and the intention of the rulers, the makers, and their “creations” and they thus induce them with a feeling of deep anxiety! Such movements are basically anti-domination and egalitarian...

Thesis c)

Every social movement is a mystery because of the impossibility of its manufacture.

Since the movement puts domination into question, it is alarming for the rulers. As a new born movement it is still like a child. The child primarily has to be kept alive, has to get to know itself bit by bit, to grow, to gain experiences and to try to fathom its own depth, height, broadness and how they can be expanded and further developed.

Above all, the young social movement has to learn how to protect itself against threats. These threats consist of attempts of “patriarchalization”, hence the attempt to functionalize it for alien purposes, namely the ones serving authorities and “politics”, and thus being forced to return to “normality”. Things like these always end in its splitting.

Should your movement be a declaration of love, then certainly not one to money- or is it? I have heard about your demands for money, but I do not believe that this is your “mystery”. Then it would not be one. So, you could ask: What do we really want?

For instance, I am sure that you too want, as every human being does, to be loved and to be needed, to be meant and to be wanted by this society, actually on a very personal basis. This means: You want to find or to create conditions for *a life in dignity*, wherever this may not be the case. And indeed, it is not the case now! In present times of neo-liberalism, dignity is not longer understood. However, without dignity, the principle of freedom and self-determination becomes useless; furthermore it results in the freedom of the powerful to define themselves through the victory over the weak.

Thus, dignity means *to be appreciated and hence accepted* in terms of what someone is and desires and also to appreciate and accept others in the same manner.

Thesis d)

The thesis I have drawn from my time as a professor at Innsbruck University is that *in our times* a student movement can evolve at the latest when people start to realize that:

They have *no future*, even as academics. This thesis has turned out to be right. Now it is important to examine this thesis.

By now, even in schools a certain discomfort has evolved, and still, when you enter university, no changes of positive nature are taking place. How come?

So you have already felt for a while that *something is not right there*, and that if you adapt, once again, this will be of no use for you. Therefore, you want your *freedom* at first, namely the freedom to look around, to gather experiences and to orientate yourself before taking long-term decisions. But exactly this freedom is (no longer) granted. Why?

The question is therefore how a humane life in dignity would look like for you and under which conditions such a life should take place.

Are such conditions in our current society still achievable, – even if they are not intended?

-Does the willingness to adaptation suffice these days? It does obviously not.

-Is your anxiety about the future justified these days? Yes, obviously it is.

-Thus you need a movement, unchained from the principles of adaptation and anxiety, in order to work out, what kind of changes are possible to start a better future. Probably this is what your movement is about.

In the end it has to be found out to what extent something like “*different*” education, university, science and even society will be essential for it!

These questions are needed to be asked. Since your movement resulted from the collective social conditions, your movement is an answer to that and retroacts to them.

In one word: You are confronted with your *coming of age*, namely the decision about how and by which kind of education you want to arrange your life.

2. How does the societal situation look like today and how does it affect education and science?

Up to now, all analyses of the entire societal situation and of the miseries within education and university are defective and incomplete. At the utmost, the economic aspect is seen – keyword “*education=commodity*” or “(re-)commodification” and “commercialization” of education. In one word: “Education is not for sale!” (Krautz, Kellermann, Sambale).

But at the same time the result -“commodity” - is not asked about the conditions of its *production*. What does it mean to transform education into a commodity? How has this commodity arisen? How, from whom, why, for whom and what was it made from? In which ways does education-transformed- into- a -commodity differ from education that is not a commodity?

A commodity is something produced out of something that once has been alive and now encounters us as a “past”, “congealed” life, as something that was *killed*, or rather something *dead* (Marx), a form of capital. The commodity is made out of a process of destruction-and-re-arrangement, namely the process of modern (machine) technology that was brought about in the course of industrialization and mechanization. I entitle this as the product of a “*creation through destruction*” (Werlhof 03, cf. Schumpeter).

The fact that commodity is not by accident “cadaver-like” (Bloch) gets veiled by its “value”, i.e. the price that is paid for it, and which at the same time is used to manifest the “preciousness”, the alleged “better” and “higher” character of it in comparison to a non-commodity.

On the contrary, education which is not a commodity would be *alive* and “born”, the kind of education you are demanding for: an education organized around your needs and not around the needs of capital and accumulation. Not an education that is destroyed and destroying, but an education founded on *quality*, allegedly claimed to be valueless, but which is actually *priceless!* - in fact the kind of education you require and you are demanding for. This would be an education freed from exploiting interests and methods of destruction.

Therefore, the transformation of education into a commodity is scandalous, and it is not only scandalous because three billion dollars a year, one of the biggest assets in international economic scenery, will be used to make education a part of the commodification and the profit-making-process.

However, the essential problem resulting from education that gets transformed into a commodity is not frequently mentioned, namely a *technique* that constantly and thoroughly *destroys* the *quality of education* from behind. A global profitable bargain can only be achieved through standardized, quantified and “canned-education”. This is a kind of education that does not even deserve its name, as it is only a commodity that

corresponds with the accumulation interests of the educational industry. For this reason, the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) was enforced in 1995, which tries to achieve these goals on the basis of the neoliberal politics of *liberalization, globalization and privatization* of all services, including education (Mies/Werlhof 1998).

At the same time the concrete lively interests in education are ignored. Obviously, no one of the profiteers or politicians is interested in knowing how education gets transformed into its own caricature. Why?

For an answer we have to go further beyond.

The techniques of the transformation of things or creatures into commodities derive from science and therefore from university, from "*our university*". This has been the most "*highbred*" product since modern age. Generally speaking, its *method* consists of the domination over and the exploitation of nature that goes ahead with the segmentation, quantification, intermixture and the new-composition of nature/matter/life-forms. Nature involved in this process is not understood as being alive, but as a dead "matter" and for this reason it does not get noticed from outside; this is a process of destruction. Only a person that is directly concerned with this process gets confronted with the violent character of modern sciences.

And *you are aware* of it, because now it concerns you, *it hits you*, but you do not know how, what and why.

This means that modern science and technology systematically began to include education as well as people to turn within their wheelwork. Since their existence they have started to destroy the world and have gradually expanded commodity production, the "realization of value" and the formation as well as the accumulation of capital to always larger sectors and territories. This is the reason why nowadays the "formation of education" ("Bildung") gets in fact turned into a formation of capital ("Kapital-Bildung"). In other words: Do you want to be free human beings or do you want to be transformed into "capital", actually into "human capital", like commodities and machines?

In the scientific-technical civilization of modern age, criticism on technology is seen as a taboo par excellence. It is seen as an offence to mention that economy and modern sciences have been turned into a *war*, if not into a "war system", against nature and human beings.

It already started with the inquisition. Its *method* had been adapted by the natural sciences and then gradually by almost all other sciences, above all by the medical one. This method has remained the same up to this day- it is an experiment: hence, the segmentation and fragmentation, thus the damage and/or destruction of the discrete animate forms, -human being, animal, plant, element and mineral- and their intermixture and new-composition with other matters and so-called "raw materials" to commodities, machineries –"system"– and "capital"(Collard/Contrucchi).

European *inquisition*, lasting for 600 years, set the beginning, namely with "shaping" *human beings* and especially, from the second half of the 15th century onwards, with shaping *women* as "witches" (Federici). At this time, inquisition developed methods to break human will and resistance, to make people obedient to the project and system of modern rule and to their repression and exploitation in favor of the modern nation state (Bodin, cf. Opitz-Belakhal), colonialism and the modern international economy of capitalism as a "world system" (Wallerstein) that is based on it. Likewise, the integration of women and the colonized as unpaid workers ("housewife-ization of work", New Slavery; cf. Mies), the "domination of nature" in terms of exploitation of nature and its transformation in the name of progress (Merchant) as well as modern warfare (Heidelberger/Thiessen) are part of this system.

Are we now going to face a kind of second inquisition?

Yes, even more than that. Modern science has resulted in an industrial-military complex and in the power of corporations (Chossudovsky) as well as in the boomerang that now falls on our heads: the beginning apocalypse initiated by the climate catastrophe (Gore) that still can neither be understood nor stopped. This would only be possible if the project that has triggered off this catastrophe would be immediately abandoned. Since the consequences of lethal sciences have by now become globally visible, *all of us* are aware that we find ourselves –without exception – among the victims.

This means that the *end of modern era* has begun (Werlhof 2007, Projektgruppe 2009). The rule to rather ignore than to identify the world-destroying character of modern civilization does not prevent the currently all over perceivable effects from making their appearance in form of crises in all sectors: in the economy, as for the value of money, the markets, especially the labor market and consequently the production of commodities. This also involves the so-called "resources" that are running short, the ecological problems that are the result of our relationship with nature, and the problems in the field of human ecology, namely the human condition. After all, the crisis also involves policies that are per definitionem not only up to the crisis' depth, but have indeed contributed so much to its development.

Thus, we have to turn away from the *promises of the modern era*, including the socialistic one saying that if the scheme of technical scientific progress is maintained, then progress, advance, peace, democracy and welfare will be open for an increasing amount of people. However, the exact opposite is occurring and we already know the reason for it.

The utopia of progress to create a paradise on earth has turned into the complete opposite: a dystopia of a *hell* on earth is about to arise.

This is exactly the sensation you get when you think about your *future!*

The extinction of species, the drying of fresh-water resources, the rise of the sea-level and the collapse of the climate demonstrate that beside the disappearing of natural resources, actually the *disappearing of the world* (Jaeger 08), science has a *wrong understanding of nature*. Indeed, the modern age's promise to control nature has lead, totally unexpectedly, to a *nature out of control*. Our science is thus a *lethal science*.

This is the kind of science you are becoming familiar with, right her eat the University. *Do you really want this kind of science?*

Science has lead, next to economy and to war - its "other sides" - to an actual crisis of civilization. This happens because the *utopia of an artificial "re-creation of the world" through its very extinction* is being realized. We now entitle this project "*capitalist patriarchy*" (Werlhof 03). However, this is the "paternal" project of a modern re-creation of the world and not the maternal one that arises from "mother nature".

By now, this project has met its limits and can be considered as being a failure. But since society is rigidly adhering to it as long as it seems somehow possible, the system withdraws more and more from democratic rules and leans towards *totalitarianism*, which corresponds to a concept of "system" as "machinery", to the new "mega-machine" (Mumford). The machine and accordingly the system that has been formed upon the machine's pattern, are - like military and corporations - incapable of democracy.

The masculine obsession with "creation" as competition with "mother nature" has been existent since antiquity and accordingly since the beginning of patriarchy, and it actually destroys life on earth. The technological progress that since modern times is trying to achieve the realization of the utopia of patriarchy is neither an innocent project of human curiosity nor an act on behalf of a supposed nature-telos, but does deliberately create an anti-nature and an anti-world that is not in line with the earth and its living conditions.

We have to draw conclusions from it, whether we want to or not. The complete re-creation of the world on the basis of systematic industrialization, capitalism, mechanization and commodification does not only destroy the globe but also human beings, in other words, *you*. As modern times have begun with a complete re-modelling of human beings, they are also going to end with it. This means that now you are as well involved. You are supposed to become "*human capital*" or even "*post-human*" capital (Schirrmacher).

A perspective of enlightenment (Habermas, Ribolits, Liessmann, Menasse) does not suffice here, as it has itself always created, propagated and defended the conditions for such a kind of progress (Mumford, Sieferle, Noble, Wagner).

It is time to disclose the "secret" of modernity: To be aware of its secular nihilism towards life and its broadly applied, quasi-religiously legitimized "sacrifice" in the name of an alleged progress.

3. What does this mean for your study conditions at the university?

Now we have come to your personal situation and the study conditions that are depressing you. They are a direct consequence of current social changes that move towards a broad inclusion of the whole world in all its dimensions: the so-called "globalization". It forces human beings into a *process of technical control, appropriation, transformation and exploitation of everything that is alive, for the purpose of re-creating it in the shape of commodity/capital/machinery and, in the end, to profitably dispose of it*.

In comparison, slavery was presumably a naive endeavor. You are ought to become an object of this process, not only with neck and crop, but also with your emotions and your intellect. You would be downgraded to objects; you are actually forced to even become "*active objects*" (Genth), intended co-delinquents in terms of your own submission and adjustment to the modern "mega-machine" that is expanding progressively.

Science wants to make *customers* out of you, who are consuming education like a commodity; moreover, you will be trained to be producers of a commodity called "science", a kind of science that in truth is "capital" and which is deliberately destroying the world and you, the people, as well.

In particular the *ability to think* seems to disrupt the process; but be aware that thinking is the last resort of freedom. You are supposed to think only in a compliant manner that is corresponding to the logic of money, machines, orders or, in general, of capital; and you are not at all supposed to think different or even beyond the system (Werlhof 08). The computer serves as a model, as a "thinking-machine" (Genth). You should emulate it in its binary way of thinking: zero or one, one or zero? It is like a quiz show – scientific thinking degenerates to a

quiz. "I *don't* think, therefore I am."!? By now, protheses for thinking and thinking-substitutes are proclaimed as proper thinking.

"Heads? - Off!" – This is apparently the *secret curriculum of Bologna*, which is barely discussed in public with critical views on it. This kind of "guillotine" will rob your intellectual potential, an ability that is specifically human; instead, you become a brainwashed or even brainless *raw material of the education industry* on a global "level playing field", just now prepared by politics. You will be downgraded to a "*pass through of capital*" that is – with the remaining "residual risk" – easily adjustable to the "mega-transformation-profit-machine": brain death, step by step! The „*homo oeconomicus-maquina-vacuus*“ (Greco) faces his invention, though not his birth, the "femina" already included. In times of "gender" and in times when the "mother" is supposed to be replaced by genetic engineering and biotechnology, a more accurate differentiation is no more provided.

As a result you will not make your career, but rather be labeled with "*employability*", which is just a verification of your "usability" in terms of the system. Hierarchy and competition between you as well as violence and compulsion from above come along with it, because they belong to the essence of "machine-systems" (Genth). You even have to learn to love them, as Orwell says, and you have to become an intrinsic part of them by mimetically adapting to them (Genth). This is because the machine is the actual ideal of this civilization, an ideal that human beings have to match as well – becoming *human machines*. This kind of thinking may reach back to Descartes, but only nowadays it is in fact going to be implemented and allegedly proven.

This is the kind of *futurism* that the university reform process is based on. We should more precisely say: the deform process. You shall *not* take notice! And how many of you already believe that the attempted abolition of thinking and its substitution by "computer literacy" has really got to do with "excellence"?!

You should dissociate yourselves from arts and humanities, the last reservoirs where thinking is still possible. Anyway, these areas melt down like glaciers in times of climate change. Instead you are supposed to feed yourselves with the so-called "*big science*", namely management- and natural sciences (Werlhof 05). In the light of a machine-like logic, this will be preached as rational and right choice. In contrast, I plead for the occupation of animal research laboratories and the liberation of those animals, which in fact would really be a reasonable and forward-looking action.

Since education is going to be organized as a huge system – as if it were an *education-machine* - that is based on the systematic production of commodities, it is drawn into the overall destruction-process that comes from industrial transformation. As a result, education becomes destructive itself, which does affect all of you! All allegedly logical and rational justifications for this destruction can thus be ascribed to the "banality of evil" (Arendt), as it turns out nowadays.

This adds nothing to the kind of education you would need - far from it! Rather it could be compared to a straitjacket that pushes you into modules and schemes, into Anglicism and e-learning units of "canned education" that shape your study-programs today. At the end of the day, this type of education will "disburden" universities from teachers and supervising tutors, from co-operative ways of working and studying, even from books and, last but not least, from the remaining freedom and leftovers of democracy.

As a result, you will always more resemble inmates of the "*university-clink*", instead of becoming autonomous, free, self-determined, curious, young people that are in search for themselves and their place in the world. The latter is a *necessity* in order to learn to shape this world and its future. However, first of all the world as such will have to be preserved.

Even if some of you do not see it yet: there will be soon - and partly there already is – a focus on academics and scientists that carry on with a *new, non-destructive, cooperative, life-friendly, intelligent science, which is democratically organized and free from interests of others*. Such tendencies already exist and (or, depending on your point of view) still exist. Where they do not, they have to be built up.

If you want it or not, if you take notice or not: *the duty that objectively lies upon you as a social movement* is to shed light on the "not yet understood powers" (Dutschke 1968). And far beyond that you need to claim, to launch, to practice and to implement a *fundamentally different science* – wherever you are inside the education-system, whether you work in research or practice.

Or would you rather continue with the crimes that science committed and is committing against human beings and nature? Would you like to be complicit and add blindly to the final and global collapse of this civilization and the life on earth?

4. What to do?

You are the generation that will face the burden of solving the crises of the 21st century. This will not work by the same means that have led to the crisis (Orr). Therefore, you can claim that conditions and contents of your

study-programs will be rechecked, revised, changed and founded on a new basis or even completely revolved by you and with you, since you are the generation in charge with a huge responsibility.

Time is limited, so let no grass grow under your feet. In the light of crises, that are accumulating themselves more and more, there will not be much time left for you to experiment and orientate yourself in a free manner, even under changed and more unrestricted conditions. You have to mature earlier than generations before you. Hence, it is clear that without a free way of (re)searching and deciding, you will not find a way out of the dilemma of modern science. Therefore, you must fight for this in the first place. *Only free studies enable free science and vice versa: only a free science wants a free study.*

This kind of freedom does not mean: being free from responsibility and serving the interests of others. This freedom is a freedom towards responsibility and in this respect a freedom that is able to exclude those kinds of "third-party" interests. Such interests should be defined clearly: Those, which damage life further on and deny the cooperation with the human race and with nature should not be able to come to effect anymore. I know that this does implicate a scientific revolution, *a revolutionizing of science*, the university and the concept of "education". *Objectively*, nothing less is demanded from you, if you like it or not.

In this respect you must prepare yourselves also *subjectively*. This is what you want to achieve anyway by filing a suit for your freedom and your autonomy. Without it, nothing will be possible. The times of adaptation have already passed! Indeed the near future will demand complete different things from you. Therefore: Do not waste your time and your energy by investing it in your adjustment to the machine; refuse obedience by pointing at the responsibility that will hit us all. Adjustment is myopic. You were not given heads to get nice haircuts. So get them used, before you get rid of them.

It is right to demand money: but you have to say what you want the money for and what you *do not* want it for (anymore)! In any case: money alone is too little, since you have to prepare nothing less than a new civilization, its universities and sciences.

What kind of abilities and skills, what kind of knowledge, what kind of methods and what kind of insights do you need? How can in this respect the collapse of modernity be intercepted, endured and answered?

Your future is not a reduced life-form as "machine-human" (Bammé et al.), but rather beyond the machine. Such a life must be prepared, inspected and claimed. For this purpose, you have to be as much *uninjured, "unusable" and incorruptible as possible – and you have to be equipped with all senses, especially with appreciation, empathy, curiosity and openness.*

You will not get somewhere, where life is worth living, by obeying to competition and even more adjustment to something that allegedly has no "outside" and what we call the "mega-machine". That is the *new realism!* Autonomy today should be seen as the departure from modern patriarchy as well as the leaving-behind of its genuine obsession, whose essence is "creation by destruction"!

Hence, the following should be claimed: a type of education that corresponds to the needs of our time, and not to its excruciating abyss; a type of education that has contrary characteristics compared to those that lead to the crisis of our civilization today.

Education in terms of "the machine" has to be refused, because it is a life-threatening imposition. Appreciation for the responsibility of science must be demanded. The idea of man that derives from neoliberalism, namely the "homo oeconomicus-vacuum", has to be declined, because it is an obscene idea.

Education has to enable emancipation again, instead of enslaving everybody.

Your reasoning powers have to take center-stage again. They are the main tool of survival and culture. *The spirit should blow through universities again - it has left them long-ago.*

For that purpose we have to leave behind the "frozen desert of abstraction" (Benjamin) that shapes modern science. We have to reenter everyday life and everyday questions again. There is so much to do – *you shall take notice!*

It is clear that these things will only be achievable if the university will become (again) a place that is democratically organized; and a place where everybody will be able to start a dialogue on how to proceed, what to check, what to know and what to do – provided that everyone is aware of the *seriousness of the situation*. This seriousness has to be claimed for a start. Departments and lecturers have to be confronted that you all need a new and a different science as well as a different education. In this respect, criteria must be established and inspected. With regard to such a project, it should precisely be investigated what is required in terms of content, literature, methodology and what kind of lecturers would be needed for such a purpose.

Vacancies have to be filled with appropriate people; research has to be carried out in new directions, which should be encouraged; curriculums have to be revised and become open to everyone; team-taught lecture series concerning important subjects should be organized; a call for international conferences should be initiated. The opening-process within universities after 1968 had already brought up a bunch of alternative views on science that built the kick off to an enormous spate of new theories and methodologies. It is possible to tie in with that again. Despite neo-liberalism, the growing criticism of globalization since the 1990ies also advanced new ways of scientific work and knowledge.

Nowadays, there are new approaches in every single discipline all over the world. All of them must be collected and be looked through. The borderlines between every single scientific discipline have to be annulated, because the situation today can not adequately be understood in the light of *disciplinary* thinking alone.

Maybe you should set up work-groups that at the beginning look for alternatives in their own disciplines, until they reach their particular borders. After that you should go through the material that the work-groups bring up and draw your own conclusions from that; then you meet up with other groups to exchange your findings. Doing so, something new will emerge quite soon.

And above all: you do not need to wait concerning all these questions; you do not need to wait until someone will conform to your requirements; *you can and you should immediately get active yourselves* – this is the most important point.

Nothing and nobody can stop you, if you approach contents and questions of a new science, which is not damaging the world anymore and which is not based on destruction, but rather on reparation and on cooperation with nature and the world.

May the "alma mater" rise up again and may the spirit blow through universities!

In the end: if you begin to understand the "mega-machine", it will become clear to you, who in this society is occupying which position inside the machine and how your own interests correspond to or differ from other groups and classes within the society. This will help you in increasing solidarity with your objectives; and by doing that, you should be fully conscious of the extraordinary significance for the society of everything you intend to achieve.

There is nothing good to expect from politics at the moment. Politics have not failed, as some people assume; politics have rather become the lackeys of corporations, which have built up the "mega-machine" in order to control it and to functionalize it in the name of their own interests.

Thus, anything new will only arise from the bottom - it has to be done by you, or no one.

Translated from German to English by Hanna Pallua and Gianluca Crepaldi, Innsbruck, December 2009

Bibliography

- Arendt, Hannah, 2003, Über das Böse. Eine Vorlesung zu Fragen der Ethik, München/Zürich (Piper)
- Bammé, Arno u.a., 1983, Maschinen-Menschen – Mensch-Maschinen. Grundrisse einer sozialen Beziehung, Reinbek (Rowohlt)
- Behmann, Mathias, 2009, Idee und Programm einer *Matriarchalen Natur- und Patriarchatskritische Geschichtsphilosophie*. Zur Grundlegung der *Kritischen Patriarchatstheorie* angesichts der 'Krise der allgemeinsten Lebensbedingungen', in: Projektgruppe „Zivilisationspolitik“, S. 107-177
- Benjamin, Walter, 1970, in: Adorno, Theodor W: Über Walter Benjamin. Aufsätze, Artikel, Briefe, Frankfurt a. M. (Suhrkamp), S. 39
- Chossudovsky, Michel, 2002, Global Brutal. Der entfesselte Welthandel, die Armut, der Krieg, Frankfurt a. M. (Zweitausendeins)
- Collard, Renée und Contrucci, Joyce, 1989, Die Mörder der Göttin leben noch – Rape of the Wild -, München (Frauenoffensive)
- Dutschke, Rudi, 1968, zit. in: grauzone: Student*Innen Flugblatt, verteilt bei der Demonstration in Innsbruck, 29.10.2009
- Federici, Silvia, 2004, Caliban and the Witch. Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation, New York (Autonomedia)
- Genth, Renate, 2002, Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis. Erfindungsgeist und mimetische Begabung im Widerstreit und ihre Bedeutung für das Mensch-Maschine-Verhältnis, Frankfurt a. M. (Peter Lang)
- Gore, Al, 2006, Eine unbequeme Wahrheit. Der drohende Klimawandel und was wir dagegen tun können, München (Riemann)
- Greco, Monica, 2000, Homo Vacuus. Alexithymie und das neoliberale Gebot des Selbsteins, in: Bröckling, Ulrich/ Krasmann, Susanne/ Lemke, Thomas (Hg.): Gouvernamentalität in der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen, Frankfurt a. M. Suhrkamp), S. 265-285
- Habermas, Jürgen, 2003, Bildung als Selbstbildung. Zur Kritik postmoderner Vorstellungen von der Bildung des Subjekts, Hamburg (Verlag Dr. Kovac)
- Heidelberger, Michael und Thiessen, Sigrun, 1981: Natur und Erfahrung. Von der mittelalterlichen zur neuzeitlichen Naturwissenschaft, Reinbek (Rowohlt)
- Jaeger, Michael, 2008, Gobar Player Faust oder Das Verschwinden der Gegenwart. Zur Aktualität Goethes, Berlin (wjs)
- Kellermann, Paul /Boni, Manfred /Meyer-Renschhausen, Elisabeth (Hg.), 2009, Zur Kritik europäischer Hochschulpolitik. Forschung und Lehre unter Kuratel betriebswirtschaftlicher Denkmuster, Wiesbaden (vs)

Krautz, Jochen, 2007, Ware Bildung. Schule und Universität unter dem Diktat der Ökonomie, Kreuzlingen (Hugendubel/Reihe Diederichs)

Liessmann, Konrad Paul, 2006, Theorie der Unbildung. Dir Irrtümer der Wissensgesellschaft, Wien (Paul Zsolnay)

Marx, Karl, 1974, Das Kapital 1, in: MEW, Vol. 23, Berlin (Dietz)

Menasse, Robert, 2009, Vortrag zu den Bildungsprotesten, besetzter HS 381, Kultur -und Gesellschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät, Universität Salzburg

Merchant, Carolyn, 1987, Der Tod er Natur. Ökologie, Frauen und neuzeitliche Naturwissenschaft, München (Beck)

Mies, Maria, 1988, Kapital und Patriarchat. Frauen in der internationalen Arbeitsteilung, Zürich (Rotpunkt)

Mies, Maria und Werlhof, Claudia von (Hg.), 1998 (2003), Lizenz zum Plündern. Das Multilaterale Abkommen über Investitionen – MAI – Globalisierung der Konzernherrschaft und was wir dagegen tun können, Hamburg (Rotbuch/EVA)

Mumford, Lewis, 1977, Mythos der Maschine. Kultur, Technik und Macht, Frankfurt a. M. (Fischer)

Noble, David F., 1999, The Religion of Technology. The Divinity of Man and the Spirit of Invention, London (Penguin Books)

Opitz-Belakhal, Claudia, 2006, Das Universum des Jean Bodin. Staatsbildung, Macht und Geschlecht im 16. Jahrhundert, Frankfurt a. M. (Campus)

Ort, David, 1991, What is Education For? Six myths about the foundations of modern education, and six new principles to replace them, in: The Learning Revolution, In Context No. 27, Winter. S. 52-58

Projektgruppe, „Zivilisationspolitik“, 2009, Aufbruch aus dem Patriarchat – Wege in eine neue Zivilisation?, Frankfurt a. M. (Peter Lang)

Ribolits, Erich, 2002, Wieso sollte eigentlich gerade Bildung nicht zur Ware werden? In: Österreichische Hochschülerschaft. ÖH (Hg.): Education not Profit, Wien, S. 35-40

Schirmacher, Frank (Hg.), 2001, Die Darwin AG. Wie Nanotechnologie, Biotechnologie und Computer den neuen Menschen träumen, Köln (Kiepenheuer & Witsch)

Schumpeter, Joseph A., 1962, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, New York (Harper Torchbooks)

Sieferle, Rolf, 1984, Fortschrittsfeinde? Opposition gegen Technik und Industrie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart, München (Beck)

Wagner, Friedrich, 1970, Weg und Abweg der Naturwissenschaft, München (Beck)

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1979, Aufstieg und künftiger Niedergang des kapitalistischen Weltsystems, in: Senghaas, Dieter (Hg.): Kapitalistische Weltökonomie. Kontroversen über ihren Ursprung und ihre Entwicklungsdynamik, Frankfurt a. M. (Suhrkamp), S. 31-67

Werlhof, Claudia von, 2003, Fortschrittsglaube am Ende? Das Kapitalistische Patriarchat als „Alchemistisches System“, in: dies., Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika und Faraclas, Nicholas (Hg.): Subsistenz und Widerstand. Alternativen zur Globalisierung, Wien (Promedia), S. 41-68

Werlhof, Claudia von, 2005, „Speed kills!“ Hochschulreform als neoliberaler „Putsch“, in: Dimmel, Nikolaus und Schmee, Josef (Hg.): Politische Kultur in Österreich 2000 – 2005, Wien (Promedia), S. 284-292

Werlhof, Claudia von, 2007, Alternativen zur neoliberalen Globalisierung oder Die Globalisierung des Neoliberalismus und seine Folgen, Wien (Picus)

Werlhof, Claudia von, 2008, Kopf? – Ab! Die GATS- Guillotine. Realsatire zur neoliberalen Bildungsoffensive, in: Sambale, Jens, Eick, Volker, Walk, Heike (Hg.): Das Elend der Universitäten. Neoliberalisierung deutscher Hochschulpolitik, Münster (Westfälisches Dampfboot), S. 205-223

Werlhof, Claudia von, 2009, Das Patriarchat: „Befreiung“ von Mutter (und) Natur?, in: Projektgruppe „Zivilisationspolitik“, S. 59-103 (cf. Werlhof, Claudia von y Behmann, Mathias: Teoría Crítica del Patriarcado. Hacia uns Ciencia y un Mundo ya no Capitilistas ni Patriarcales, Frankfurt .a M. 2010 (Peter Lang)

<http://emanzipationhumanum.de/downloads/studentmovement.pdf>

German Version: <http://emanzipationhumanum.de/downloads/studentenbewegung.pdf>

Spanish Version: <http://emanzipationhumanum.de/downloads/movimientoestudiantil.pdf>

Italian Version: <http://emanzipationhumanum.de/downloads/movstudentesco.pdf>