

Critical Habits:

Ideology, immanent critique and second nature

Honors thesis written by

Emma M. Young, 5630681

Utrecht University, Faculty of Humanities

Department of Philosophy and Religious
Studies, Philosophy

Submitted on

14-06-2019

First Supervisor

dr. Jesse M. Mulder

Second Supervisor

dr. Joel H. Anderson

Summary

In this thesis, I define a conception of anthropology based on habits that proves suitable to figure in a theory of ideology critique. In the first part, I reconstruct neo-Hegelian theories of ideology and immanent critique to articulate a challenge for Karen Ng's dialectical theory of ideology critique. To answer this challenge in the second part of this thesis, I adapt Ng's theory by supplementing it with Hegelian anthropology and contemporary work on self-consciousness. Drawing on a conception of habits provided by Sebastian Rödl, I define a threefold structure that provides us with the positive side of habits in their constitutive role in self-consciousness. Given the negative role of habits in the Hegelian conception of historical change, I am able to explain how habits exist on a societal level and how habits may become stagnant and oppose change. This leads to the contradictory character of habits that illustrates how habits could form both an oppressive and a liberating force. As such, I arrive at a theory of ideology critique with habits as its object and its ground.

Contents

Introduction: Reason’s Reflexivity.....	4
Part I. The Ground for Immanent Critique.....	6
1. Ideology Critique and Immanent Critique.....	6
1.1 Immanent Critique	7
1.2 Critical Naturalist Anthropology	11
1.3 Transformative Power and Immanent Norms	13
Part II: Naturalist Anthropology Based on Habits	15
2. The Habits of Reason	15
2.1 Reason in Person: Habits and Second Nature.....	15
2.2 Reason in People: Habits and Practices.....	19
2.3 The Contradictory Character of Habits	21
3. Immanent Critique of Habits	23
3.1 Ideological Habits	23
3.2 Transformative Power: Changing Habits for the Better.....	26
3.3 The Practice of Immanent Critique	28
Conclusion: Critical Habits.....	30
References	31

Introduction: Reason's Reflexivity

Any human inquiry into reason fundamentally is reason turning to itself. In other words, it is a life form understanding its own way of being. Reason is at once the object of critique, and just that activity which makes the critique possible. There is something curious about this kind of reflexive reference, on account of the subject and object of the understanding being one. In any form of critique of a system that is given from *within* this same system, one will come to an impasse. For, in the attempt to articulate the standard against which to measure the object of critique, one is faced with two options: either the measure is the object's own measure, it is internal to that which is criticized, or the measure is external to the object. In the case of the critique of reason, both of these options appear problematic. On the one hand, it is impossible to step *outside* of reason to formulate an external standard. After all, the critique of reason operates *within* the bounds of reason. On the other hand, it is unclear how reason itself can provide the measure for its own validity. To borrow Karen Ng's metaphor, reason being the judge and the accused does not make for a fair trial.¹

This seems at first hand to be a rather pressing problem. If neither route provides a ground for critique, the self-referentiality of the critique of reason is the source of our inability to put it to practice. Yet, it is the acceptance of this dichotomy as not only *not* being a problem, but as forming the basis for the essential dialectic to this form of understanding that is the legacy of the Frankfurt School Critical Theory. The dialectic of immanence and transcendence, as the two horns of the dilemma are called, forms the ground from which to practice ideology critique. The illustration of the dialectic as related to reason in its generality is abstract, but in the case of the critique of ideology, the dialectic takes on a more determinate shape. It implies that the truth or rightness of social practices or structures is neither something 'out there', nor an internal given that we are simply mistaken about.

Furthermore, critical theory takes the critique of reason itself to be *social* critique: forms of life are understood as actualizations of reason and the ultimate aim of the critique of reason is the realization of freedom. Ideology critique is the method of assessing the life form's realization of freedom in its historical manifestation. The trouble with the self-referentiality of ideology critique in this dialectic is again twofold. Foremost, for a purely immanent approach there is the problem of totalization: in an ideological social system, any subject who attempts to formulate criticism will themselves be a part of the social reality they are trying to criticize, living by its rules and through the forms of life deemed rational by its standards. Any critique coming from this internal position seems to be fully integrated into what it criticizes, thereby providing no foothold to distinguish between forms of life that might be ideological, and as such problematic, and those that are not. The problem of transcendence is even more damning from the perspective of a critical theorist: by formulating a transcendental standard, one may be accused of a form of absolutism or paternalism. Moreover, what is even worse: by attempting to formulate an external standard one denies the evident position of immanence of the theorist, stepping away from just that which sets the inquiry into reason apart from any other critique.

¹ Karen Ng, 'Ideology Critique: From Hegel and Marx to Critical Theory,' *Constellations* 22:3 (2015): 393.

And so, the question emerges: how can one practice ideology critique? How does one navigate this dialectic without falling into either of those faults? More specifically: how does one critique reason according to a non-external standard? The epistemological and normative task for constructing a theory of ideology critique is to lay the groundwork for defining such a non-external standard that in form adheres to the dialectic of immanence and transcendence. A commonly proposed way to proceed is through *immanent critique*. Nevertheless, before we commence with the application of this critique to a myriad of possible objects, like forms of life, practices or beliefs, the method itself deserves critical evaluation. In this thesis, I will not apply immanent critique, as I understand it, to locate any particular instance of ideology in society. My aim, as will be apparent from the above, is rather to evaluate the possibility for practicing immanent critique as such.

Ng's proposal for the basis and method of ideology critique is based on a genealogy of the critique of reason traced from Hegel to Marx and Critical Theory. She argues, on that basis, that to navigate the dialectic and avoid being arbitrary, immanent critique needs to be based on a critical naturalist anthropology. This is a ground from which to evaluate practices or forms of rationality, found in the formal conditions of the mere existence of such a form of life. However, what is lacking in her proposal is the transformational element of ideology critique. It is not clear how, by locating ideology in the distortion of the dialectic, the situation can thereafter be changed. Moreover, it is not clear how Ng's version of immanent critique engages with the practices that are supposed to be ideological. In this thesis, I will propose a specification of Ng's formal naturalist anthropology based on the Hegelian concept of habits. This is grounded on the claim that habits are that through which freedom is restricted *and* realized, or in other words, where reason finds its socio-historical determination. In this way, habits can be seen to be the cradle of normative authority. The aim is to show that by basing our anthropology on habits, we can locate the transformational element of ideology critique precisely in those habits.

This thesis consists of two parts. In the first part, I will reconstruct theories of ideology and immanent critique to articulate a challenge for Ng's theory of ideology critique. The second part will adapt Ng's theory by supplementing it with Hegelian anthropology and contemporary work on self-consciousness. This should serve to define a conception of habits that proves suitable to figure in a theory of ideology critique. In what follows, I will start developing this argument in chapter 1 with a short introduction to ideology and its relationship to immanent critique. In section 1.1, I will draw on Rahel Jaeggi's definition of immanent critique to distinguish it from other forms of critique. I will then consider Ng's theoretical framework in more detail and articulate a challenge for her theory in sections 1.2 and 1.3. In the second part of this thesis, I will start to answer the challenge by defining 'habits' in the works of G.W.F. Hegel and Sebastian Rödl in section 2.1, and supplement this with a theory of habits on a societal level in section 2.2. This presents us with a contradictory picture of what habits are in section 2.3. Consequently, in chapter 3, I will argue that this contradictory character at once explains the constitution of *and* liberation from ideology. In section 3.1 I explain how habits can be understood as ideological, whereas the liberating function of habits is to be found in their transformative potential, which will be explicated in section 3.2. Finally, I will conclude with some reflections on ideology critique as a practice.

Part I. The Ground for Immanent Critique

1. Ideology Critique and Immanent Critique

Ng's aim is to rethink ideology critique as fundamentally tied to the critique of reason and to a materialist conception of history.² Critical theory, she explains, starts from the insight that the critique of reason is self-critique. This critique is inherently aimed at understanding and advancing human freedom as the actualization of reason. Furthermore, with the Hegelian turn from pure reason to reason that is actual in historical and social form, ideology critique becomes necessary as the actuality of freedom is embedded in social reality.³ In the analysis of the dialectic of immanence and transcendence, or the practice of formulating a critique of social reality according to a non-external standard, Ng's genealogy serves to show how the dialectic is not a problem for ideology critique, but is, on the contrary, its fundamental structure. According to Ng, the dialectic between life and self-consciousness is what defines the universal form of rational and free activity. The distortion of this relation is what turns the conditions for freedom into relations of domination and oppression. Here, ideology is understood in terms of social practices and forms of rationality.⁴ What is important is that ideology is thus not understood as mere false ideas or beliefs. The way in which practices and the rationality governing them are false is exactly what makes ideology critique difficult: ideologies are 'phantoms' with the force of shaping the material reality from which they emanated, and thus, in a sense, become *true*. Ng proceeds by drawing a parallel between Hegel's Idea and Marx' species-being. Hegel and Marx propose roughly similar dialectics between the immanence of life and the transcendence of self-consciousness, but with different reasoning. Hegel's dialectic serves to understand the critique of reason as critique of rational forms of life, and Marx' serves to understand rational forms of life as a critique of ideology: 'The critique of ideology becomes necessary as soon as reason ceases to be pure reason, as soon as the actuality of freedom becomes wedded to social reality.'⁵

Ideological structures in society must in some way lead to contradictions: if not, on what grounds can we even consider condemning them? What makes ideology such a tenacious problem is that the contradictions that it entails are systematically hidden from view. Raymond Geuss articulates 'the nightmare' for a critical theorist: the society in which ideology is so encompassing that people cannot even realize that their needs are being frustrated. The repression of true needs has advanced so far

² Ng, *Ideology Critique*, 400.

³ *Ibid*, 393.

⁴ *Idem*. In *Ideology Critique: From Hegel and Marx to Critical Theory*, Ng argues for a definition of ideology understood as the distortion of the dialectic of life and self-consciousness. For more extensive discussions on various definitions of ideology, see Geuss (1981) *The Idea of a Critical Theory*, and Eagleton (1991) *Ideology: An Introduction*.

⁵ Ng, *Ideology Critique*, 393.

that people are not aware of their oppression or anything even remotely resembling it.⁶ Contextualist theories like that of Adorno⁷ that rely solely on the agreement of the subjects of the theory for its confirmation cannot denounce this kind of ideology, even if they would locate certain implicit or structural contradictions. For such theories assume that even 'contradictions' themselves are not given, and as such, the theorist can only conduct their critique in a non-authoritative way by ultimately relying on the agreement of the subjects of the critique.⁸ However, this problem is to some extent alleviated by Ng's characterization of ideology: the contradiction in this case *is* the frustration of the dialectic of life and self-consciousness of life. Namely, that self-consciousness cannot even adequately reach the conditions of life. The designation of the contradiction is at least *theoretically* possible, even in the nightmarish case. Yet the question of the position of the theorist remains a challenge for ideology critique.⁹ Ng's critical naturalism forms the difference between her theory and contextualist theories like Adorno's. For it, to some extent, defines what a contradiction would entail, and as such does not leave this standard to the realm of internal norms. Immanent critique can only escape relativism if it relies on a theory of history, anthropology or rationality which to some degree defines contradictions.¹⁰ These contradictions are the basis of what makes immanent critique more than just moral condemnation: there is something contradictory in ideological societies according to their *own* standards, not merely according to mine. Neither immanence, understood as the quality of a society according to its own norms, nor transcendence, understood as the quality of a society according to norms with no bearing within that society, are sufficient to come to an analysis of this sort. A position of transcendence from immanent norms is required to the degree that these norms can be evaluated to a society's *own* standards.

1.1 Immanent Critique

Having shortly explained the relevance of immanent critique to ideology critique, we may now examine in more detail the seemingly promising way out of the impasse of transcendence-immanence that is immanent critique. In defining immanent critique, first of all, immanent critique is contrasted with external and internal critique.

⁶ Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 83-84. For more illustrations of this image of repression, see Herbert Marcuse's conception of 'comfortable unfreedom' in *One Dimensional Man* (1964) and Aldous Huxley's dystopia in *Brave New World* (1932).

⁷ Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory*, 63.

⁸ *Ibid*, 78-83.

⁹ For extended consideration of this issue, see Rick Roderick, *Habermas and the Foundations of Critical Theory* (London: Macmillan, 1986), 12; Robin Celikates, 'From Critical Social Theory to a Social Theory of Critique: On the Critique of Ideology After the Pragmatic Turn,' *Constellations* 13:1 (2006): 21.

¹⁰ For an extended articulation of this argument and a discussion of Habermas' relationship to immanent critique, see Rick Roderick, *Habermas and the Foundations of Critical Theory*, 22-61.

External critique is a call upon 'transcendent' norms that do not belong to this particular society, or, in the case of a general such critique, 'calling culture as a whole into question from the outside.'¹¹ Maeve Cooke defines the problem of external critique similarly: 'Critical social thinking that succumbs to 'bad utopianism' is open to the charge of authoritarianism in that it projects images of a 'good society' whose validity is unquestionable, not open to challenge in public processes of critical interrogation.'¹² This image of the 'good society' is attributed to a Kantian strand of transcendental justification which is defined by the 'non-substitutability' of the mental apparatus that conceives of what is good.¹³ External critique understood as judgement of something on a basis of standards that are alien to it, reflects a detachment from actual historical situatedness. In the case of ideology critique, this method lacks justificatory power.

At the other end of the spectrum, Rahel Jaeggi distinguishes *internal critique*, which is more similar to immanent critique but is not to be confused with it. For internal critique is what would suffer from the problem of totalization: it is the extraction of norms from a society to simply be applied to the society again. This would constitute the critique as a demand for the society to live up to its own standards.¹⁴ However, this is not sufficient, as in some cases the society's standards themselves should be put into question. Internal critique lacks transformative power in this sense. The defining point of immanent critique is that through the critique of society, the norms that exist within society are *transformed*, and the new norms may then guide societal transformation to a less-ideological situation. In Karl Marx' words: 'We develop new principles to the world out of its own principles.'¹⁵

Immanent critique, according to Michael Becker, is generally given two definitions in neo-Hegelian literature: the first in terms of a *method* of critique in which standards that somehow 'belong' to an object are used as its measure (let us call this *internal immanence*), the second in terms of a self-critical *stance* from which to exercise critique that accounts for one's own standpoint as belonging to the object of critique (let us call this *reflexive immanence*).¹⁶ Becker shows that Jaeggi employs the first definition, while Ng employs the second. Whereas Becker grounds his argument for the thesis that the two definitions are related in an analysis of the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, it is also quite simply seen directly. Namely, when one accepts 'reflexive immanence' as the correct diagnosis of one's epistemic position, it follows that 'internal immanence' is the way to proceed: if one finds oneself 'within' the object of critique, the dialectics of immanence and transcendence as described by Ng are

¹¹ Theodor Adorno, 'Cultural Criticism and Society,' in *Prisms*, trans. Samuel and Shierry Weber (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1967), 31.

¹² Maeve Cooke, 'Redeeming Redemption: The Utopian Dimension of Critical Social Theory,' *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 30:4 (2004): 414.

¹³ Jürgen Habermas, 'Philosophy as Stand-In and Interpreter,' in *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. C. Lenhardt and S.W. Nicholsen (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990), 1-2.

¹⁴ For an extensive discussion of internal critique, see Rahel Jaeggi, *Critique of Forms of Life*, trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2018), 177-189.

¹⁵ Karl Marx, 'For a Ruthless Criticism of Everything Existing,' in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978), 14.

¹⁶ Michael A. Becker, 'On Immanent Critique in Hegel's *Phenomenology*,' *Hegel Bulletin* (forthcoming): 1-3.

pertinent. As such, to avoid the problems of totalization and of transcendence, 'internal immanence' is the method that does epistemic justice to one's critique (not to be confused with *internal critique*).

Immanent critique in relation to ideology is not a simple method, which is illustrated by the amount of literature on the subject. According to Jaeggi, immanent critique of ideology is defined by two contradictions: ideology is necessarily false but true, and immanent critique is normatively founded yet not normative.¹⁷ The necessarily false but true aspect lies in the dynamic between general concepts and their historical manifestations. In an ideological society, actors are subject to wrong states of affairs, while simultaneously in the grip of a distorted interpretation of these states. Yet this distortion is not constituted by mere false beliefs: the origin of the distortion is ideology. The notion of 'wholesale falsity' does not pertain to ideology critique.¹⁸ In a Hegelian fashion, the relationship between a 'false reality' and its 'true essence' is essential to the criticism. This explains the tricky character of ideology. Ideology is false because the non-contingent norms that are constitutive of social practices are realized in an *inverted* manner, yet reality conforms to these inverted norms and is in that sense true. Ideology is characterized by historical conditions that necessarily contradict themselves by inverting the realization of their own norms.

An example of such an inversion that seems to me particularly pertinent to the present, is the promotion of creativity and autonomy in the workplace. The need for self-fulfillment in one's labor calls for the transformation of laborers into the 'employers of their own labor-power', which in turn causes developments in the work conditions to be appointed to the laborers' own decisions stemming from the inherent value of their jobs.¹⁹ However, in the more robust structures of the workplace, in the case of managerial hierarchy, this level of autonomy cannot be achieved. Instead, the attribution of autonomy in their current jobs leads laborers to willingly accept a greater workload and less security in their career, without in the end realizing the intended level of autonomy or creating the conditions for self-fulfillment. Moreover, the main beneficiaries of this movement in the 1970's were those who were 'best endowed with the skills prized by capitalism,' and as such the system that caused the demand for change in the first place is only further reproduced.²⁰ If this situation was simply and wholly false, one would come to a contingent contradiction without any relation to reality's 'true essence,' i.e. the constitutive norms of a society. In the case that we would live in a society where autonomy and authenticity are constitutive values, the contradiction could be solved without threatening the continued existence of the society in its current form. As such, a contingent

¹⁷ Rahel Jaeggi, 'Rethinking Ideology Critique,' in *New Waves in Political Philosophy*, eds. Boudewijn Paul de Bruin and Christopher F. Zurn (London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009), 66-74.

¹⁸ Andrew Buchwalter, 'Hegel, Marx, and the Concept of Immanent Critique,' *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 29:2 (1991): 267.

¹⁹ Axel Honneth, 'Recognition as Ideology,' in *Recognition and Power: Axel Honneth and the Tradition of Critical Social Theory*, eds. Bert van den Brink and David Owen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 343.

²⁰ Eve Chiapello, 'Capitalism and Its Criticisms,' in *New Spirits of Capitalism: Crises, Justifications, and Dynamics*, eds. Paul du Gay and Glenn Morgan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 73.

contradiction is not sufficient to explain ideology.²¹ It becomes clear that the constitutive values of this society are somehow in conflict with autonomy and authenticity, as they cannot be realized consistently. Ideology is a form of self-contradiction; not *mere* contradiction but 'those bearing on the real's conflict with its true essence or self.'²²

The normative yet non-normative aspect, meanwhile, is the foundation for immanent critique's transformative character. As we will see, this is a problematic, yet essential, aspect of the theory. Critique cannot be a separate act from the propaedeutic endeavor of description. Immanent critique is critique *by* description of the case. Thus, the norms that are defined are not just pulled out of the current situation and then re-applied for the betterment of society, but the norms *themselves* are transformed in the process. What Jaeggi calls 'a reality in which the norms can be realized only inconsistently'²³ calls for the development of new norms through the critique of that reality, not just the adjustment of reality in the light of the given norms. This is what sets immanent critique apart from mere internal critique, and what gives it its critical value. In Jaeggi's words: 'Immanent critique, then, does not confront, as Marx put it, "'reality with a prefabricated ideal," and it does not just extricate such an ideal from it but instead develops it from the contradictory "dynamic of reality" itself.'²⁴ To learn how this development exactly works, we can turn to Hegel's *Science of Logic*.

The *Science of Logic* is Hegel's fundamental description of the structure of thought. For Hegel, new principles develop through the existence of the universal idea in a particular determination. What drives development is contradiction. A particular may be criticized in terms of its (lack of) conformity to the universal idea it is an expression of. The particular determination of an idea is, as such, just a moment in its development. According to Sebastian Rödl's reading of the *Science of Logic*, contradiction occurs in 'imperfect' concepts, which is what we find in every kind of social-historical knowledge.²⁵ As such, contradiction occurs within societies, practices, concepts themselves, etc. An imperfect form of thought is a particular manifestation of a universal. When this concept 'realizes' that it is in contradiction with itself, i.e. with what it is supposed to be, by facing a substantial problem, it strives to realize itself more fully. Through this development towards a universal, a new particular is developed. After its development towards the initial universal, it appears that the particular is no longer a determination of the initial universal, but it now adheres to a *new* universal, for it is a different particular. As such, development of the new norm, the new universal, does not come 'from outside', but is in some way determined by its previous stage.

Now, we might advance our understanding of this abstract theory with some foothold in a concrete example. In an overly schematic display - which is meant to be merely illustrative, not demonstrative

²¹ For an example of a definition of contingent contradiction and its difference from Hegel's conception, see Dewey's definition of contradiction in Rahel Jaeggi, *Critique of Forms of Life*, 266-268.

²² Buchwalter, *Hegel, Marx, and the Concept of Immanent Critique*, 269.

²³ Jaeggi, *Rethinking Ideology*, 76.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 75.

²⁵ Sebastian Rödl, 'The Science of Logic as the Self-Constitution of the Power of Knowledge,' in *German Idealism Today*, eds. Anders Moe Rasmussen and Markus Gabriel (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017): 157.

– one could argue that individualism as the realization of modern freedom is a replacement of the premodern normative authority of tradition and the church.²⁶ Drawing on Taylor's *Malaise of Modernity*, this form of liberation from immutable social orders meant that authority was to be found in the individual: we now defend the right to choose one's own lifestyle and convictions.²⁷ We can interpret this as the particular (pre-modern social orders) of a universal (normative authority) developing from some shortcoming (restricted freedom) into a new particular (modern individualism) that aims to be a form of normative authority, specifically authenticity. However, with the realization of individualism in just about all aspects of western civilization, we come to see that the universal that individualism really is not a manifestation of normative authority: Taylor's analysis is that individualism is the source of the loss of shared values and as such the possibility for making authentic meaning.²⁸ It is because of individualism that authenticity cannot be attained. As such, the development from one particular to another formed a *new* universal, in this case a particular kind freedom. However, this form of freedom itself gives rise to suspicion of being itself flawed in its manifestation. And so, the development continues. In the case of ideology, the particular necessarily follows from the universal by being a determination deemed reasonable in its own light yet *inverted* in its realization, in other words 'the real being in conflict with itself'. The development from a state of ideology thus also would require the development of a new particular *and* a new universal, not merely a new particular.

1.2 Critical Naturalist Anthropology

In a genealogical fashion, Ng develops her conception of a formal anthropology by tracing the dialectic of life and self-consciousness through Hegel's Idea²⁹ and Marx' species-being. According to Ng, Hegel's insight in *The Science of Logic* is that the critique of reason is constituted fundamentally by the 'relation, opposition and necessary connection' between life activity and self-conscious activity.³⁰ Conceptual development through these categories is what is denoted by 'dialectics'. The crucial insight about reason in defining free and rational activity is that reason stems not from self-consciousness, but from *life*. The role Marx plays in this scheme is providing the theoretical framework to talk about ideology. Although Hegel's conception of immanent critique does engage in social critique through designating contradictions in his contemporary society, it was Marx who extensively developed his critique of capitalism through the categories of labor and alienation. Marx' conception of the species-being represents the same dialectical structure as Hegel's Idea, where the double constitution is the form of labor as human activity. Species-being provides Ng with the formal anthropology that is

²⁶ Simon Lumsden, 'Habit, Reason and the Limits of Normativity,' *SubStance* 37:3 (2008): 190.

²⁷ Charles Taylor, *De Malaise van de Moderniteit* (Kampen: Ten Have/Pelckmans, 2007), 16.

²⁸ *Ibid*, 29-30.

²⁹ The capitalization of certain terms like 'Idea' and 'Spirit' denote that they are meant in a particular Hegelian way, which in some cases might differ from the regular connotations of the word.

³⁰ Ng, *Ideology Critique*, 396.

needed to denounce certain forms of life as it allows one to determine modes of unfreedom.³¹ Ng's adoption of such a Marxist conception of anthropology leads to a 'negative' approach of immanent critique, for it only designates unfreedom without proposing a positive alternative. The critique does not presuppose a position of non-ideology as an a-historical human 'essence'. Defining a positive form of life would be a form of utopian thinking, a falling into the pitfall of transcendence. This is what sets Ng's form of anthropology apart from positive or 'traditional' theories. Whereas positive theories of anthropology usually aim to either to provide justification for or explanation of certain behavior, Ng's theory may be called critical for its function in providing a framework which allows for the condemnation of societal structures which constitute serious defects in the realization of this human activity.

What I regard as strengths in Ng's reconstruction, first of all, is that she locates the dialectic in the formal condition to any human activity. The interest in freedom is thus not merely incidental to the reflexive self-relation that governs rational activity, but it is intrinsic to its very structure, its very form. This reflexivity is what Ng calls the 'the thesis of double constitution'. This entails that both consciousness and self-consciousness are constituted through each other. It is the identity and difference between consciousness and self-consciousness that constitutes rational activity.

'Self-conscious activities are actualizations, transformations, and explicit appropriations of basic life-activities, and the particular self-relation of self-consciousness is constituted by the fact that it is a life that knows itself as life, a life that can consciously grasp and determine the conditions of its life.'³²

Second, Ng's reconstruction incorporates a nuance in the Marxist conception of false consciousness as 'embodied' ideology, which Cooke signals when she states: 'ideology is false or distorted consciousness, manifested, we should add, in embodied habits and dispositions, in sedimented patterns of behavior, and in habitualized social practices.'³³ As such, 'false consciousness' should not be understood as mere false beliefs, but as *embodied* reason.

Ng claims that there are two difficulties to a theory of critique: a theoretical one and a practical one. She claims that correctly handling the theoretical difficulty, i.e. reflexivity, allows one to secure the justification of the practical aim of liberation. The aim of the critique, which is liberation or emancipation, itself must be qualified. It is not enough to determine that some form of life suffers from ideological influences; the grounds for this claim must have reference to why the aim of liberation from this ideology is justified. It is not immediately clear how her reconstruction of the dialectics of life and self-consciousness has anything to do with the self-reflexivity of *the theorist*. My understanding is that by defining the position of the theorist through reflection on 'reflexive

³¹ Ng, *Ideology Critique*, 398.

³² *Ibid*, 396.

³³ Maeve Cooke, 'Resurrecting the Rationality of Ideology Critique: Reflections on Laclau on Ideology,' *Constellations* 13:1 (2006): 6.

immanence,' i.e. the dialectic of immanence and transcendence, the next logical step is to define the method of ideology critique as 'internal immanence,' the dialectic of life and self-consciousness. Through redefining the dialectic of immanence and transcendence as the dialectic of life and self-consciousness, Ng neatly ties the practical aim to the method of ideology critique. The ultimate justification of the aim of liberation rests on her naturalist anthropology, the contents of which itself are mirrored by the reflexivity of the method. Ng's theory of immanent critique is, as such, both a method and a basis for the critique. The basis is reflexive immanence, the method is internal immanence. The dialectic of immanence and transcendence as the position of the theorist leads to the specific critique of ideology on the basis of the dialectic of life and self-consciousness as the proper method, which takes up the standards immanent to free and rational activity. According to how much a practice distorts this dialectic, it may be called ideological. The cause for this distortion is found in the norms that govern ideological practices. Now, if, as claimed above, immanent critique functions through the transformation of internal norms, according to what should the internal norms transform?

The crucial point of Ng's view is that in immanent critique one cannot rely on purely internal norms. What is more, even when talking about the 'transformation' of internal norms, one is faced with the second order justification of what the internal norms can and should transform into. Ng's answer is a critical naturalist anthropology. Although her definition is successful in tying emancipation into the aim of ideology critique, and adheres to the structure of the dialectic, we need to critically evaluate this conception of anthropology in the light of the aim and method of immanent critique. According to what are the norms that are 'found' transformed? Where does the standard come from? In the next section I will articulate some problems for Ng's naturalist anthropology, the dialectic of life and self-consciousness, as the ground for immanent critique.

1.3 Transformative Power and Immanent Norms

Ng focuses on the location of the distortion of the dialectic. But what about the transformation of the distortion? How are the new or better forms of life theorized when the distortion of the dialectic is located? How is the epistemic aspect involved in the normative aspect of the critique? Ng's approach, as is, consists merely of negating the negative aspects. This is due to her anthropological theory, conceived as the Marxist species-being. Titus Stahl criticizes Marxist immanent critique for its rejection of Hegel's idea that practices have conceptual content. Stahl argues that, as a result, Marx can only demand that practices change *somehow*, not that they change in some *specific* way.³⁴ For Hegel, the conceptual content of a practice (the universal idea of a historical particular) is a form of justification, hence its evaluation requires no input from the critic. When evaluated, the conceptual content, as a standard of justification, can be enough to prove the particular to be lacking. As such, the development of the *determinate negation* is the overcoming of the wrong through 'sublation': the old situation is negated, preserved, and transformed into the new, and as such the new is necessarily related to the

³⁴ Titus Stahl, 'What is Immanent Critique?' *SSRN Working Papers*, (2013): 10.

old. Marx, however, rejects the idealist presupposition that the internal structure of social practices is always that of justification, and takes the standard of measure to be 'unresolved internal contradictions.'³⁵ Without the internal justification of social practices, there is no necessary relation in the development for immanent critique to uncover. According to Buchwalter, Marx emphasizes the *complete* falsity of social relations and denies self-realization in capitalism based on existing potentials.³⁶ There is no justifiable, critical form of rationality to be found in reality, the pursuit of which thus requires the negative approach of defining wholly new needs and forms of life. This is not compatible with the concept of immanent norms as previously defined, and as a result this conception of critique doesn't bring us much further than internal or external critique would. Ng's account also suffers from this problem. For this reason it is difficult to see why Ng's approach is immanent and not merely negative: if her critique is not engaged with the immanent norms of a practice that fulfill the criteria of her definition of an ideological practice, there is no guideline to *how* these practices may change after providing a reason for *why* they should change.

The aim of ideology critique thus understood is to realize emancipation and liberation by transforming social practices in such a way that they do not frustrate the dialectic of life and self-consciousness. Through immanent critique one wants to discover how a certain practice should change. To engage with practices in immanent critique, one must focus on the norms that constitute the practices. If only the consequences of the practices were criticized, it is doubtful whether such a critique could realize any substantial change in society, or whether one expression of ideology would just be replaced by another. To have any transformative potential, the paradox of the 'normative non-normative' character of critique must be navigated. That means that the norms 'immanent' to practices must be found. However, it is not immediately obvious what this entails. Stahl defines this as the question of social ontology that needs to be answered for any theory of immanent critique. What does it mean for justification in the form of a normative standard to exist in social practices? Ng does not engage with this question in her article, the need for which is also partially negated by the lack of talk about norms. I suppose that in the context of Stahl's question, her answer would have to draw on the Hegelian notion of conceptual content in practices. Yet it seems that this requires some more explication, as this Hegelian notion appears to be in conflict with the Marxist aspect of her theory and, moreover, is tied up with a method of critique that is nothing short of controversial. Although I do not pretend to tackle the systematic problems of Hegelian immanence in their full scope, I will offer an addition in this Hegelian spirit to Ng's theory which to some extent helps demarcate the hunting grounds of the practitioner of immanent critique by clarifying the social entities that are dealt with and their immanent dimension.

³⁵ Stahl, *What is Immanent Critique?*, 9.

³⁶ Buchwalter, *Hegel, Marx, and Immanent Critique*, 268.

Part II: Naturalist Anthropology Based on Habits

2. The Habits of Reason

Determining the basis of moral commitments and claims has been a significant philosophical problem since the enlightenment with the fall of the unquestionable authority of tradition and the church.³⁷ To avoid authoritarianism, it must be established how people can be held to a norm while allowing for revision or correction of the norm. One trait of ideology is that the norms of the ruling social structures do not seem up for revision. Ideology critique is a response to this big question. The common Kantian theme of many recent approaches to this question is to place authority in the rational deliberative structure of the public sphere – a central theme in Habermas' thought. Focusing on habits provides a very different approach to the authority of norms and, more specifically, to their origin.

Habits are not widely discussed in the literature surrounding normative theory or ideology critique.³⁸ An exception is Bourdieu with his concept of complex social embodiment as 'habitus', but he does not engage in ideology critique. However, the place of habits in Hegel's thought has not been ignored as habits play a crucial role in Hegel's conception of 'second nature', and the interpretation thereof. Ng mentions 'second nature' as a 'bridge concept' between animal life and self-conscious life which could help in locating the distortion of the dialectic of life and self-consciousness. But are they merely another instance of 'intramundane transcendence', which is reducible to the fundamental dialectic? Given that habits in form conform to the dialectic of life and self-consciousness, I believe habits may provide the missing positive side of the anthropology. This is also where the transformational force of the critique is located, for habits, in a naturalist reading of Hegel, are the locus of normative authority.

2.1 Reason in Person: Habits and Second Nature

According to Hegel, habits are the core of what is called a person's 'second nature'. Second nature is crucial to being a person in general: it is coming to be oneself according to one's nature by being freed from this nature. This has to do with what Hegel calls 'Spirit', that which sets humans' way of being apart from that of animals and plants. Spirit as contrasted with nature has an 'artificial' character, for to some extent Spirit is self-creating. The development of second nature is the emergence of Spirit from nature, and its consequent realization is the 'return to itself' in nature.³⁹ For Hegel, second nature is

³⁷ Lumsden, *Habit, Reason and the Limits of Normativity*, 190.

³⁸ For the reference concerning normative theory in general, see Lumsden, *Habit, Reason and the Limits of Normativity*, 189. Whereas second nature is a term of importance in certain theories of ideology critique, e.g. Lukács', the specific interpretation of second nature as habits appears to me less prominent in this field of literature. Although there is too little space to discuss this at length, Lukács' theory of reification is a prominent example of how second nature can be understood as functioning as an oppressive force in capitalism, which, as shall become clear, is one half of my proposal. It is my aim, however, to show how second nature understood as habits could also take up a *liberating* function. Those who are interested may consult Titus Stahl, 'Georg [György] Lukács,' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (Spring 2018 Edition).

³⁹ Steven Levine, 'Hegel, Dewey and Habits,' *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 23:4 (2015): 639-640.

habit: 'This being-together-with-one's-own-self we call habit.'⁴⁰ Second nature is realized when its relation to its otherness, or first nature, is turned into self-relation. Second nature, then, is the natural way of being for Spirit which is distinct from 'first nature', yet 'at home' in it. Its 'artificiality' is natural to Spirit. Rational self-determination, or intentional action, is made possible by, to some extent, taking distance from one's immediate bodily 'first nature'. The experiences from our senses are habituated to be experienced in a less direct fashion, allowing a person's focus to not be engulfed by their experiences. As such, habits condition the body to allow for experience and thought that can focus beyond the immediacy of the body through a form of 'making unconscious' certain aspects of experience. Habit is the primary form of a person's relation to the world; its broad and fundamental character makes habit a difficult concept to determine. Foremost, however, one can see that habit is a precondition of self-consciousness. Habituation plays a key role in how persons develop skills: through the bodily habituation of repeated movement, a person is able to focus on the 'universal' aspect of her action.⁴¹ In writing, for example, the writer does not need to be immediately aware of how she holds her pen or moves her wrist. She may be occupied with what she is writing instead. Instead of bodily immediacy, habit is 'an immediacy posited by the soul' that is the structuring and organizing principle to feelings and sensations that allow for the experience of a 'self' – an essential aspect of 'self'-consciousness. Steven Levine explains this form of immediacy as follows: 'habits are not self-legislated features of our subjectivity in the way that our thoughts and actions are, but are an intermediate zone that lies between the givenness of our body's materiality and the responsiveness to reasons that governs thought and intention.'⁴² The immediacy of second nature is 'being thus', not 'will be' or 'was'.⁴³ They differ from particular thoughts or intentions in this respect. But habits, and actions that accord to them, are *mine*, are cultivated by me and as such I am responsible for them.⁴⁴ I am not absorbed by my habits, yet I do not distinguish myself from them.⁴⁵ This is the intermediate zone of determination.

While the term 'the habits of reason' may seem contradictory at first, this characterization actually alludes to the multi-faceted character of reason, which is pivotal to understanding how habits could be

⁴⁰ G.W.F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Mind*, trans. by W. Wallace and A.V. Miller, introduction by Michael Inwood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), §410.

⁴¹ Levine, *Hegel, Dewey and Habits*, 644.

⁴² *Ibid*, 648.

⁴³ G.W.F. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Spirit 1827-8*, trans. and introduction by Robert R. Williams (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 154. Hegel expresses this relationship of being and habit as follows: 'On the other hand, habit is [a second, cultivated] nature, it is a being — I am thus — this is my habit. This latter quality preserves this aspect of natural immediacy in itself.'

⁴⁴ Andreja Novakovic, *Hegel on Second Nature in Ethical Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 35.

⁴⁵ Cf. Hegel, *Philosophy of Mind*, §410. For further detail, compare with how Hegel describes this intricate relationship: 'That the soul thus makes itself into abstract universal being, and reduces the particularity of feelings (of consciousness too) to a determination in it that just is, is habit. In this way the soul has the content in possession, and contains it in such a way that in such determinations it is not actually sentient, it does not stand in relationship to them by distinguishing itself from them, nor is it absorbed in them, but it has them in itself and moves in them, without sensation or consciousness. The soul is free of them, in so far as it is not interested in or occupied with them; while it exists in these forms as its possessions, it is at the same time open to other activity and occupations, in the sphere of sensation and the mind's consciousness in general.'

relevant to criticizing ideology. The contradictory character is explicitly acknowledged by Hegel, which is clear when he writes: "Habit resembles a natural quality, but it has been posited. So in one of its aspects habit resembles natural qualities. But habit also has an aspect that is related to the will as such, and from this perspective it appears as a necessity in relation to freedom."⁴⁶ The natural quality of habit refers to its givenness, which stands in contrast to the freedom of willing. Rödl's writings on the habits of reason and self-consciousness are helpful in understanding the relation between habit and freedom, in particular to autonomy. As Rödl says: 'Reason is actual only in socio-historic form', that is to say, in its habits.⁴⁷ This claim alludes to his Hegelian conception of reason as being fundamentally historical and social, and thus not an essentialist, ahistorical universal. Yet, crucially, this does not mean that we must interpret Spirit in a social-constructivist sense. The intricate structure of the habits of reason shows that they are not purely contingent determinations of reason but also somehow share in the universal form of the power of reason. Whereas the power of reason itself is per default not-yet determined, it is its essential feature that it *may* be determined in different manifestations. This is what constitutes autonomy in a person: acting in accordance with my reasons by recognizing reasons for acting to be *mine*. The exercise of the power of reason, resulting in an action, is intentional by cause of the agent knowing herself to be determining herself *in that act*. This is what constitutes a rational agent, the recognition of herself *as* rational in her actions and beliefs. Thus, the exercise of the power of reason as self-determination is also self-actualization. It is the constitution of oneself as how one is.

How the power of reason and the habits relate is presentable in the image of a three-runged ladder. The top rung is the power of reason, which is universal: this is what is shared by all persons, and undetermined in shape. The middle rung are the habits of reason: these are a middle position which are the first determinations of the power of reason, determinate shapes of thought, habits. In terms of practical reason, Rödl here talks about 'infinite ends', which occupy just this middle rung; examples are taking care of your belongings, being hospitable, a healthy lifestyle. An action is intentional in that it manifests one's infinite end: this end is the ultimate answer to the 'why' for that action. No matter how many actions are done in line with this end, it will never be 'achieved' – hence their 'infinity'. They can manifest in indefinitely many actions. As such, an infinite end is a determinate shape of the general form 'having a reason for acting' (the unspecified top rung). Rödl illustrates the nature of infinite ends by contrasting the example of repairing a bicycle with pursuing health: whereas one's 'end' of wanting to repair a bicycle is complete after the congregate of actions needed to repair is has been completed, one does not cease to pursue health once one acknowledges oneself to be healthy.⁴⁸ If I work out today, have a nutritious meal, and go to bed early, all these actions have been carried out in the light of my end of acquiring 'health', but my end is not thereby satisfied. I continue to pursue this end *habitually*. In this way, infinite ends differ from 'finite ends', like the repair of a bicycle. The bottom rung, finally, are the specific thoughts, actions or beliefs through which the habits are manifested. This is the most

⁴⁶ G.W.F. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Spirit 1827-8*, 154.

⁴⁷ Sebastian Rödl, 'Education and Autonomy,' *Journal of Philosophy Education*, 50:1 (2016): 84.

⁴⁸ Sebastian Rödl, *Self-Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 35-36.

particular, determinate rung. What is of importance in this scenario, is the relationship between these three rungs.

Rödl's project can be read as with the aim of describing the formal characteristic of distinctively human activity: an understanding of itself. Self-consciousness is the key concept to this project. His theory of action and in general philosophy of mind are therefore especially helpful in substantiating the role of self-consciousness in action, belief, and reason in general. With regard to the ladder sketched above, self-consciousness resides throughout all three rungs, constituted by their distinction. The fact that the habits do not coincide with the power of reason is what allows for self-determination: otherwise the manifestations of the power would already be determinate in their content before being realized. In 'animal powers' this is the case: a fish's power to swim will in every manifestation lead to an action of 'swimming', which takes on the same general shape every time it is exercised. However, the power of reason may now be exercised to believe P, but later be exercised to believe not-P. This idea goes back to Aristotle, who called it a two-way power.⁴⁹ The structure of a two-way power is crucial to understanding habits. They are not pure potential like the power of reason, for they are to some degree determined, yet they are not pure actuality like an action, for they are not fully and finally determined. They are more like a disposition towards particular actions: possible to be engaged, but not necessarily. This specific state is 'second potential', in its relation to the top rung, or 'first actuality', in its relation to the bottom rung, and is thus distinguished from both 'first potential' and 'second actuality'. This in-between state of habits is what allows for self-determination, which is autonomously acting in accordance with one's habits.⁵⁰ Hence, according to Rödl's reading, habits are not merely a pre-condition of self-consciousness, but a constituent feature of freedom.

By introducing this second rung in the ladder, the habits as in-between the universal and the particular, the distinction between the universal and the particular gains a new dimension. The habits serve the role of both. This is the significance of our talk of habits as an 'in-between'. In relation to particular actions, habits function as the universal of which the action is a determinate instantiation. As such, the action is measured as an action insofar as it adheres to the habit it is supposed to be an instantiation of. As such, habits are a measure of justification: according to them, an action can be said to be 'good'. However, habits themselves fulfill the role of the particular in relation to the power of reason as a universal. This again is a relationship of justification, in this case habits being rational when they are an instantiation of the power of reason. Since the power of reason is not an inherently determined concept, but rather the formal criterium of intentional action and true belief, this relationship in itself has no bearing on what a habit concretely *should* be like. Reason only is actual in socio-historical form, formally it is but an order of justification.⁵¹ This is why a particular habit may only be judged in a certain historical context, and particular actions only in relation to the habits that govern them.

⁴⁹ Matthias Haase, 'Social Nature of Thought,' unpublished manuscript (2013): 30.

⁵⁰ Cf. Rödl's discussion of '*Meta Logou*' in *Self-Consciousness and Objectivity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 118-124; *Education and Autonomy*, 85.

⁵¹ Rödl, *Self-Consciousness*, 104-110.

Let us now connect this conception of habits to the idea of 'Spirit' emerging from nature, in order to arrive at a naturalism that can play a fruitful role for immanent critique. Whereas Spirit is always to some extent a determination of *itself* (by developing through sublation from the previous situation), Spirit's 'origin' still plays a role in the determinate forms Spirit takes. Spirit emerges from nature and as such is conditioned by its embodiment. This reading of Hegel is characterized by naturalism, a form of which Ng defends when arguing that 'life' is constitutive of self-consciousness.⁵² Levine argues that a naturalist reading of Hegel first must show that Spirit emerges from nature and continues to be conditioned by nature, but above this, must answer to the question why nature maintains *authority* over a person's activity after Spirit has emerged from it.⁵³ This is contrasted with a social-constructivist reading, in which the only authority is Spirit's self-legislation. In the context of ideology critique, this characterization also applies to Ng's approach. Ng argues that our nature is realized in the actualization of freedom through the dialectic of life and self-consciousness, and this is what gives authority to condemn distortions of the dialectic. Whereas the social-constructivist assumes that self-consciousness is a socio-historic achievement of Spirit, the naturalist reading claims that self-consciousness emerged from our specific embodiment. The aim is not to *overcome* nature, but to find freedom *in* our embodied and natural selves.⁵⁴ If social reality were a product solely of Spirit's self-legislation, but if we understand this self-legislative power as the top rung of the ladder, this power is merely formal and has no content. From the level of pure determinacy, life is what gives the expressions of Spirit actual content. Simultaneously, the top rung contains a transgressive potential from the pure determination of life, which ensures we are not kept hostage to some given (non-rational) nature that we simply cannot escape. According to the naturalist reading, nature is transformed in the process into a rational life form. The middle rung of the ladder explains how we go about our rational activity as a comprehensive whole of the three rungs, between pure self-legislation and pure natural determinism. This rung allows for the transformation of life through self-determination.

2.2 Reason in People: Habits and Practices

Whereas in the previous characterization of habits they play a positive role in the individual, habits are said to play a rather more negative role on the societal level. As ideology is not a 'personal' phenomenon but exists on a societal level, ingrained in *shared* practices and norms, the anthropology must be supplemented with the relationship of normativity between individuals, and within society at large. Simon Lumsden articulates the role shared habits play in Hegel's theory of historical transformation. The formation of habits involves the remolding of natural qualities and the naturalization of norms through education.⁵⁵ The products of one's culture, such as norms and values, are internalized and

⁵² Karen Ng, 'Life, Self-Consciousness, Negativity: Understanding Hegel's Speculative Identity Thesis,' in *The Freedom of Life*, ed. Thomas Khurana (Berlin: August Verlag, 2013), 35.

⁵³ Levine, *Hegel, Dewey and Habits*, 640.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 648-649.

⁵⁵ Simon Lumsden, 'Second Nature and Historical Change in Hegel's Philosophy of History,' *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 24:1 (2016): 77.

made one's own. This habitual conception of a person's relation to the culture they live in explains how people generally act in accordance with the norms of their culture without having to consciously reflect upon the act and legitimation of this act. As such, customs are habits that are shared on a cultural level. We are 'at home with ourselves' in our culture because the habits that govern our actions are experienced as 'material expressions of ourselves.'⁵⁶ This is how we may understand the authority of norms: they are 'embedded in and expressions of a form of life that is necessarily embodied and mediated through diverse elements in any culture.'⁵⁷ Again, this interpretation emphasizes the unreflective and necessary character of habits. On a societal level, precisely this character plays an explanatory role in historical transformation.

Lumsden reconstructs Hegel's theory of historical transformation as follows: it is the relationship to the universal that defines different stages of development. The first stage is one of refinement: people start acting towards a guiding universal, a shared and collective culture, instead of being guided by individual desires. In this stage, the particular is being overcome. The peak of a civilization is characterized by the state of 'being-at-home-with-oneself', where it conforms to its guiding universal, and knows itself to be thus conforming. Actions of individuals now align with the culture's constitutive principles, expressions of culture have itself as an object. This self-knowledge presupposes that the universal of the culture, its constitutive principles, finds a material existence through which it is realized. For norms to be binding on individuals, they require their material instantiation in the customs and habits shared by the people of that culture.⁵⁸ What follows the period of refinement, according to Hegel, is over-refinement. In this stage of, in abstract terms, the development of spirit from nature, habits form a force of destruction rather than being constructive.

When habits are realized in a society with nothing to oppose them, they develop into 'a superficial and sensuous kind of existence whose profounder significance has been forgotten.'⁵⁹ Without dissent and contestation habits and customs become stagnant. In the over-refinement of a society, the universal that animates a particular culture has been satisfied, and its expressions become routinized. As such, the society no longer strives for something new, which it did in the process of refinement: it strove to realize itself. In turn, within these routinized habits, which are particular and historical determinations of universal reason, the relationship to the universal is lost: the universal has been realized as a particular culture, yet the particulars do not share a universal. The routinized habits are practiced in repetition without a conscious relation to their animating principle. The 'blind' application of a universal, however, does not respond to particularities or the emerging needs of the present. What follows is that particularities start to clash, as there is no binding universal. The expressions of culture are not genuine expressions of the universal because the universal has shown itself to be limited by being realized. This causes a dissonance between people and their expressions of themselves in culture. Norms are no longer

⁵⁶ Lumsden, *Second Nature and Historical Change*, 81.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 75.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 77.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 83.

experienced as immediately binding, and at this point reason seems to fail to establish this connection, for reason cannot transcend historical reality to tell us where it is headed. People must break with this current form of life understood as a material existence and rationality by denying the necessity of the constitutive features of this form of life. According to Hegel, this can only be achieved through the establishment of a *new* form of life.⁶⁰ The reasons and norms that will resolve this discordance cannot be laid out in advance, yet, according to Lumsden, critical reflection is central to extracting from these particulars a new universal.⁶¹ As such, it seems that in the formation of habits explicit reflection does play a role.

Whereas this scheme of historical transformation does not have direct bearing on an ideological society, it does illustrate which influence habits may have on a social level, instead of merely the individual level. Moreover, the relationship between habits and practices highlighted here illuminated the normativity of habits in society.

2.3 The Contradictory Character of Habits

There is considerable disagreement concerning the role of habits in Hegel's work.⁶² Some argue that habits are inherently a form of unfreedom, and as such are something to be overcome, while others argue that habits are a pivotal element to freedom. There is a pressing ambiguity in the role that second nature plays in Hegel's philosophy that needs to be addressed are we to understand habits properly. It is most simply expressed by the following contradiction: "... although, on the one hand, by habit a man becomes free, yet on the other hand, habit makes him its slave."⁶³ In the previous two parts, the positive and negative role of habits, respectively, have been highlighted. Can they be reconciled? If we follow Menke's interpretation of the contradictory character of Hegelian habits, we can start to understand how the opposing aspects necessarily follow from each other within the concept of second nature.

For habits to be instrumental in achieving liberation from oppression, it needs to be clear how liberation functions in habits. As it appears, liberation is one of the two horns that form the dialectic of the realization of second nature, the other being determination. Whereas, at first glance, the role of habits as 'habituating' one's first nature, and therefore positing a second nature, contains an element of liberation from one's bodily immediacy, this also implies a degree of 'mechanism' in one's activity: "Habit is spiritual or free insofar as it is the effect of willing (or positing) and it is mechanical or unfree insofar as, once posited, it becomes independent of the will and operates unconsciously."⁶⁴ This mechanical nature of habit is what constitutes Spirit's misapprehension of itself. Whereas Spirit's reality is freedom, Spirit becomes nature, which is initially Spirit's opposite, by positing itself as 'necessary'. On a societal

⁶⁰ Lumsden, *Second Nature and Historical Change*, 91.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 89.

⁶² See Forman, McCumber, Lewis, and Siep in Andreja Novakovic, *Hegel on Second Nature in Ethical Life*, 33; 37-38.

⁶³ Hegel, *Philosophy of Mind*, §410.

⁶⁴ Christoph Menke, 'Hegel's Theory of Second Nature: The "Lapse" of Spirit,' *Symposium* 17:1 (2013): 47.

level, this is analogous to the rigidity of habits that cause the contradictions driving historical transformation. Yet this misapprehension is in a way necessary: the only way Spirit *can be realized* is by being distinct from first nature, which is only possible through a second nature, which in itself *is* this necessary self-inversion. The foundation of second nature is at once its negation. Is the dissolution of freedom then ultimately to blame on the necessarily inversed realization of second nature?

In the emancipation of Spirit from nature, second nature plays a role in liberating consciousness from its bodily immediacy. By forming the background against which we are able to engage in reflection, habits open the way to non-habitual acts. In this moment, habitual beings seem to pay a heavy price for this subjective form of liberation: the mechanical, unconscious form of habits seems to preclude a more substantial freedom understood as autonomous action and reflection, and as such should be overcome. However, it is in the return to nature that the objectively liberating function of habit takes shape. The substantial freedom that second nature can realize resides in the *free* self-inversion into second nature. It is the *willing* of the positing of an immediacy which is to some extent no more willing. Contrast this with Spirit *succumbing* to its self-inversion: bowing to a law that is not one's own but external. In Menke's words: 'It is Spirit's own law of movement to lapse into finite Spirit. The second nature that it engenders is the point of inversion between them- the undecidable in-between of absolute and finite Spirit.'⁶⁵ This is 'being-together-with-oneself' realized, where Spirit is itself through nature. It 'returns to itself out of the otherness of nature.'⁶⁶ Objectively liberating habits allow for one to move freely and comfortably in a societal context by the identification of oneself with the context.

To summarize this highly abstract piece of theory, the unity and difference between the 'willing' and the 'unconscious' aspects of habits, or in Hegel's terms the infinite and the finite Spirit, constitute the dialectic that realizes freedom. Only because of their difference can the unity between first and second nature be formed, and can a person be a self-positing creature by nature. It is the same as the dialectic of consciousness and self-consciousness. Habits provide a deeper layer of looking for where freedom can be found, and it seems that willingly positing one's own second nature is how freedom as autonomy is realized. However, it is important to note that Spirit *can* be free in its embodiment through habits, not that it *is* per default thus free. The right kind of habits must be acquired and exercised.⁶⁷ Yet this seems to require a certain social context in which liberating habits can be formed. And this takes us right back to our central question: how can this be achieved in an ideological society?

⁶⁵ Menke, *Hegel's Theory of Second Nature*, 43.

⁶⁶ Levine, *Hegel, Dewey and Habits*, 640.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 649.

3. Immanent Critique of Habits

To realize liberation from an ideological society with its problematic habits, one might ask why these habits are relevant to ideology critique in the first place. From the considerations presented above, it is clear that habit in fact has the potential to promote submission, mechanistic action and downright destruction. The crucial aspect of habit is its immediacy, which tends to render the current social structures as being necessary, without alternative. Habits can thus function as the greatest inhibitor of change.

Departing from Ng's dialectic as the basis and method of ideology critique, I would now like to argue that habits constitute the dialectic of life and self-consciousness, and that they are, as such, at once the location of ideology *and* the possibility for liberation from ideology. Habits share the dialectical form: they are at once consciousness and self-consciousness. Habits are the space through which self-determination may be realized, yet also may be impaired. The dialectic of life and self-consciousness takes place within habits, as habits form the in-between, which is the unity, of life and self-consciousness. To relate this even more explicitly to Ng's terminology, we may say that habits are the life that in its immediacy is present to itself, allowing for self-consciousness. Moreover, the determinate character of habits allows self-consciousness to take up life as its object to determine this life. The top-rung of reason is undetermined and as such provides no specificity for self-determination, while the bottom-rung is already determined and as such provides no freedom for self-determination. It is the in-between of determinacy that allows for self-determination. This is a reformulation of the thesis of double constitution. The next step to take is then to think about how habits could be related to ideology as we have come to understand it in this thesis. Looking back to Cooke's note about Marxist false consciousness, the important dimension that was included was embodied practices and habits. In which ways can the dialectic within these habits be distorted, and how do we find this distortion?

3.1 Ideological Habits

What we see in ideology is that the habits that are formed do not turn out to allow for self-realization, but rather develop into 'mechanical' or stagnant habits that constitute oppression. In an authoritarian state that does not strictly physically repress its people, the 'subjective' kind of freedom that is realized by habituating bodily sensations *can* be established, in the form of bodily integrity. Yet this is not the complete realization of habits as second nature, it is merely the first step. In the case of the true realization of freedom, ideology keeps second nature from being fully developed. Somehow, 'deformed' or bad habits are reproduced in such a social context. John Dewey calls bad habits 'routine habits', as they do not evolve and do not learn. 'What makes habit bad is enslavement to the old rut.'⁶⁸ But ideology has to be more than that - otherwise internal critique would do the job. Habits would simply not live up

⁶⁸ John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct: The Middle Works*, ed. J.A. Boydston. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983): 48.

to their own, internal standard, without there being any need to revise that standard. On the contrary, there has to be something *necessarily* wrong with ideological habits.

The necessary contradiction in these habits is caused by their particular self-relation. When the dialectic of life and self-consciousness is inhibited, their self-relation is inverted. Ideology causes the distortion of the dialectic in habits at two levels. At the first level, the distortion exists in the interrelation between particular actions and the habits they are expressions of. When these two are separated from each other, the habit is turned into a given universal. When habits cannot relate to the actions that express them, the dialectic is inhibited, and the habits do not develop. These habits stagnate with nothing to oppose them. This means that they are turned into universal givens, facts of life we simply are to deal with. 'Naturalization' of this kind is a well-known critique of capitalist ideology in contemporary western societies.⁶⁹ This stagnation prohibits genuine self-interpretation through one's actions, as the habits are not understood to be 'mine' anymore. This form of alienation allows only for internal critique: as the habits are immutable givens, we can only attempt to make our actions conform to these habits without finding self-expression through this activity, as the habits themselves are out of reach from critical consideration. This dissonance between actions and habits produces a form of anxiety in the person engaging in the practices and habits which they are not at home in.⁷⁰

On the second level, when habits as particulars are separated from their universal, the power of reason, reason is transformed into a transcendent standard. If one approaches habits and reason as separated entities, reason as a transcendent standard is objectified and turns immutable. Habits in this case are not self-conscious expressions of reason anymore, merely clashing particulars that are measured by an external standard of reason.⁷¹ This is the case in Lumsden's articulation of over-refinement: the universal is a non-contested standard of which the particulars are no longer true expressions. We can understand this as 'reality being in conflict with itself': self-contradiction occurs when the habits, that are the embodied expression of being-with-onself in culture, cannot be expressed according to themselves, as they cannot be expressed according to their universal. This only allows for the external critique of habits, from the transcendent position of universal reason. Moreover, the articulation of this second contradiction remains hidden by the limited self-understanding caused by the dissonance between actions and habits, the first level of distortion.

Habits are the expression of the *unity* of the particular and the universal aspects of reason. A habit self-relates successfully if one is aware that the particular and the universal are *one*. Their separation inhibits their development, as demonstrated above. This oneness is also articulated by Ng's thesis of double constitution. Recognizing this is the key to the dialectics of immanence and transcendence: the

⁶⁹ Jaeggi, *Rethinking Ideology*, 65.

⁷⁰ Lumsden, *Second Nature and Historical Change*, 86.

⁷¹ Cf. G.W.F. Hegel, *The Encyclopaedia Logic*, trans. T.F. Geraets, W.A. Suchting and H.S. Harris (London: Hackett, 1991), §195. Hegel's description of the 'mechanism,' which is characterized by external determination rather than internal determination: 'Conduct, piety, etc., are in the same way mechanical, when a man's behaviour is settled for him by ceremonial laws, by a spiritual adviser, etc.; in short, when his own mind and will are not in his actions, which in this way are extraneous to himself.'

frustration of the dialectic in habits leads to the dichotomy between immanence and transcendence. Sticking with Ng's theory of ideology, what is needed for liberation then is for the dialectic to be able to unfold. Moreover, the specific structure of the dialectic of habits allows us to explain the peculiar falsity of ideology. Ideology is false but true through habits not according to themselves. In the same vein, ideology finds true expression in a false reality by means of habits' objectified status as givens. The habit is 'true' as it is elevated to a universal given, but false because it does not conform to its own norm: being self-conscious.

If 'solidified' habits are presented as reality, they are reproduced as such, creating more of the same facts of life. But, with our sights set on the possibility of liberation, this seems to lead to a paradoxical situation. There are certain objective social conditions needed to be able to develop habits and corresponding practices in the liberating sense.⁷² However, the habits one develops are expressions of one's culture, mainly acquired through education and influenced by the practices one engages in. Thus, these better conditions are necessary to be liberated from exactly those oppressive conditions one finds oneself in. Have we come to a dead end?

This paradox assumes that a person's reflexive capacities are somehow confined to the existing forms of habit. Fortunately, this is not the case. As Lumsden argues in his articulation of Hegel's theory of historical change, the *recognition* of dissonance in our habits is crucial for the development of new ones. For this reason, self-consciousness plays an important role in bringing about change. Developing habits of reason is a process of coming to understand oneself as a rational agent. Habits *can* be intervened on; they are not naturally given. But this requires critical reflection and time. Critical reflection is to some extent impeded by the habitual life activity that is distorted by ideology, but it can also be enabled by habits. Habits form the conceptual content of our ways of relating to the world and the normative framework through which we identify ourselves with the society we inhabit. Thus, we must learn to find those aspects of our 'spiritual immediacy' that need to be changed, which are impeding the interrelation between self-conscious activity and life-activity. This requires a degree of distance from oneself, but not a complete distance. In fact, it requires just the distance habits themselves involve by being specifications of universal reason. On the one hand, one needs to take a step away from the direct involvement in life-activity, but, on the other hand, one needs intimate familiarity with the contents of one's life. As such, this is where immanent critique must be applied. We must find within our habits the measure for the better ones, which is only possible by developing new habits from our current habits.⁷³ One cannot see beforehand what those better habits might exactly look like, for they do not exist yet. The process of developing new habits is the process of laying out better forms of life. However, ideology

⁷² Andreja Novakovic, 'Hegel's Real Habits,' *European Journal of Philosophy* (forthcoming): 6.

⁷³ For now, I will disregard the question whether this is only possible through the violent destruction of a society and consequent emergence of a new one. Satisfactorily answering this question would require a substantial sociological theory and theory of history, which this thesis could not incorporate by virtue of restrictions in scope and size.

is a societal phenomenon, it cannot be tackled merely by individual personal development. As such, our attention must turn to practices that constitute our habits, or our communal habits.

Education and the engagement in the practices of a society instill one with specific habits. The relationship of identification with practices as the material expressions of culture constitutes the normative authority of these habits. What we may take from this is that this interpretation of ideology calls for more than a 'correction' of consciousness: because habits are embodied, changes must take place in material expressions of culture, in social practices. This material change is not something that happens *after* the ideology has been dissipated. Changing practices *is* changing ideological habits. The distortion of the dialectic constituted by practices may be located by signs of suffering, which Ng locates in three spheres: the physical, the psychic and the social.⁷⁴ As the relationship to the external world is necessary for human activity in the realm of the psychic, the dialectic as the formal condition to this activity could provide the basis of evaluating, for example, the ecological damage done to the planet we inhabit in the name of profit. Analyzing habits related to this relation to the external world could provide a foothold in reshaping our practices with the aim of recovering this condition to our successful self-realization.

3.2 Transformative Power: Changing Habits for the Better

There are two significant transformative elements in ideology critique: in the immanent critique the norms that are discovered in a practice must be transformed through the critique, and consequently the practice must change in itself. The first aspect is theoretical, the second practical.

Concerning the theoretical change, replacing the negative anthropology with a formal one allows for substantive transformation of the norms that are found. Immanent critique must explain how the new norm is somehow immanent to a practice. In case of Ng's anthropology, she is merely able to locate instances of unfreedom, without providing any direction to improve the practice. But when you engage with habits, supplemented with the threefold structure, one can point to the potential redetermination of habits in how they relate to universal. The formal norm of reason is always the standard, yet this does not yet yield any specific measure for change. However, in accepting this formal norm of reason, the conceptual content of practices as an internal justificatory order is grounded. As such, the specificity of the formal is provided by the existing norms and to some degree by the conditions of life. Even though in the naturalist reading of habits, they are determined by life, it is never by *mere* life.

The conceptual content of habits, understood as an internal justificatory order, allows for the *determinate* development of our habits. This is self-determination not from nowhere, but from the particular reality we find ourselves in. Development is not an unguided growth but, in maintaining the naturalist reading of the development of spirit, always to some extent determined. In a societal context it is determined by its own exigencies, and on a more fundamental level by life itself. With the

⁷⁴ Ng, *Ideology Critique*, 401.

introduction of the threefold structure of habits, we have found a dimension which itself lies in-between the domains of pure immanence and transcendence. The transformative power lies not in the top rung: mere formal reason cannot tell us what is right in a given situation. Contrast this with actions: they are individual instances of acting on intentions. While actions are *ours*, they do not define us to such an extent to determine our self-understanding. Reason, on the other hand, defines us completely, but tells us nothing about who we are. Habits are defining to us, because we can determine them and *we are self-determining beings*, they are the expression of us as we are. They, by their determinate character, give content to our specific self-understanding. Given this partially determined character of habits, the immanent norms to our self-expression and our identification with society could guide the development of the better kind of habits and practices.

In this framework, liberation takes the shape of one's identification with the material expressions of society and self-expression through one's habits. Our aim is to develop better habits, but in every new determination of the power of reason, some contradiction will come to light. This is why a good habit is self-conscious: it is able to recognize its own faults, and allows for development. This is what is meant with 'critical habits'. Ideological habits restrict this self-consciousness. However, developing the right kind of habits does not mean there will never again be contradictions. It means that the development from a specific socio-historical context can result in developing habits that enable freedom to a greater extent. In other words, they are better habits than the ones they developed from, allowing for some measure of historical progress. Therefore, the situation we imagine when we picture an ideology-free society is one not devoid of contradiction *per se*, but one of free development and self-realization through our habits.

The practical aspect of transformation is explained by the transformation of practices. What structures practices are norms, and these are the final object of immanent critique. Yet, an important question a model of critique must answer is how norms exactly are immanently *within* practices, and especially in this 'hidden' way which cannot be reduced to internal critique. Then, to begin the path to change, one must look towards the societal structures that constitute the distortion. The norms of the practices that are relevant must be criticized, i.e. they must be shown to be detrimental to the dialectic. The development will then have to aim for the direction of solving that distortion, given the specific contents of the habits in question.

Ideology critique understood in this sense involves a form of alienation, for, when stepping away from habits, one will encounter a form of not-being-with-one-self. This also serves to explain why it can appear so difficult to get rid of ideology: as to some extent we identify with our habits, however alienating they in the end might be, changing them may feel like changing ourselves. It takes time to change habits. The habits that underwrite these practices are constitutive of our self-understanding. This explains in part why ideology is such a difficult problem: apart from the epistemic dimension in localizing the problem, practices can be 'extraordinarily hard to change even when the normativity of

the practice has been made explicit.⁷⁵ This is because they form a part of our cultural self-understanding, a part of our identity. Lumsden gives the example of eating meat. Even though many people are confronted with the reasons opposing the current manner of production and consumption of meat, it is a very difficult aspect to eradicate from our eating habits. In broader terms, this pertains to beliefs concerning our optimal diet, the meaning of the physical bodies of animals, and in practical terms to the manner and amount of meat consumption, which are social habits, or customs.

Finally, on the subject of transformative power and immanent critique, Jaeggi's project in *Critique of Forms of Life* is an example of a theory of critique which, by incorporating immanent critique, does seem to be able to provide a formal ground for change. Through the idea of a learning process, forms of life learn to overcome their own contradictions. As such, they are measured in their ability of overcoming problems. To some extent, this is analogous to habits' role of constituting freedom in overcoming their self-contradiction. However, Jaeggi does not explicitly connect forms of life and the critique thereof to ideology critique in her book. By supplementing Ng's theory with a substantive theory of anthropology, I've attempted to provide it with this transformative power that Jaeggi enjoys, while retaining the narrative of ideology which remains a helpful and important aspect of social critique in contemporary times.

3.3 The Practice of Immanent Critique

In staying true to theme of reflexivity and self-consciousness of this thesis, I will conclude with some final remarks on the general theorizing of ideology critique. Academic research concerning ideology critique is itself, surely, a practice. As such, we can understand the development of this field, especially in the actual exercise of the critique, in terms of habits. Every academic field or tradition carries with it certain presuppositions and frameworks. As an example, one could say that orthodox Marxists are in the habit of analyzing social conflict as class struggle, and critical theorists are in the habit of taking their position as the theorist to be part of their theory. In the context of immanent critique, this means that the critique as a practice must reflect upon itself. We would like a self-conscious habit that avoids 'falling into a rut' and that does not reproduce itself no matter the circumstances. We want the right kind of habits that enable autonomy and as such promote critical reflection on our habits.

Ng responds to the question of the position of the theorist with her starting point of reflexive immanence, but how her method of internal immanence is supported by this, is not completely clear. They share the same reflexive form, but to what extent is her naturalist anthropology immanently theorized? There appears to be a form of foundationalism in this argument, in the form of her anthropology. But in Ng's case the anthropology is negativist, which seemingly relieves her of foundationalist accusations but puts her in the scope of Stahl's convincing argument against negativist approaches to immanent critique. As such, it appears to me that the only way to proceed with immanent critique, is with a set of presuppositions. In this case, they take the form of an anthropology based on Hegel's concept of second

⁷⁵ Lumsden, *Habits, Reason and the Limits of Normativity*, 196.

nature. Although I agree that the dialectics of immanence and transcendence are the key to ideology critique, I think it is inevitable to get one's hands dirty in transcendental claims, lest risking your analysis to have a strongly relativist character. However, these transcendental and formal claims need not be a problem in themselves. If Ng's method of the dialectic of life and self-consciousness is not to have an authoritarian character, there must be some form of *corrigibilism* that is involved in the *practice* of critique. In some way, this is included in the basis of immanent critique itself: it acknowledges that the object of critique transforms, and with that the critique. What is needed for any theory of immanent critique is the possible re-articulation of any norm or ground that is held. If critique turns on itself, there is room for changing the model one has been adhering to. This is especially important for this kind of theory because it deals with 'ideology'. If it does not take a corrigible stance, it runs the risk of becoming authoritarian, by applying norms in a mechanical manner. This is explicitly not to say that all substantive theories are fundamentally un-useful and should not be theorized, but contrarily, it is the acknowledgment that in the face of uncertainty, of incomplete knowledge, of changing experience, critique can be practiced and is important. This is the only response to the challenge of the theorist's position relative the subjects of the theory, when taking any form of an anthropology aboard in one's theory. Any critical naturalism must acknowledge this: one is dealing with a slippery object. Awareness of the possible distortions of one's own theory is crucial when dealing with social-historical reality. This might prove to be a good example of a critical habit.

Conclusion: Critical Habits

In summary, this thesis started out with the reconstruction of neo-Hegelian theories of ideology and immanent critique. There are many questions that can be asked about the method of immanent critique, but, nevertheless, it is crucial that we find ways to criticize forms of life that are unsustainable in social, economic or ecological terms. This is the first, and necessary, step towards realizing the transformation of these conditions. The practice of critique demands a founded position from which to criticize, a demand that is rather challenging in the case of ideology. Ideology critique should heed itself for both absolute paternalist claims and arbitrary relativism. In this thesis, I have argued a critical naturalist anthropology to be a fruitful ground for critique. In developing such an anthropology, however, a negative conception of anthropology appeared to be insufficient to provide the theory with a positive transformative power. As such, I have defined an anthropology based on habits, focusing on the constitutive feature of habits in autonomy and self-consciousness.

With the Rödlian conception of habits, we were able to define a threefold structure of habits that provided us with the positive side of habits in their constitutive role in self-consciousness. With the role of habits in the Hegelian conception of historical change, we found at once how habits exist on a societal level and how habits may become stagnant and oppose change. Furthermore, the constitution of freedom through second nature by the contradictory character of habits helped us understand how habits could form both an oppressive and a liberating force. The understanding of habits as the realization of our second nature, too, provides additional founding of the claim that the distortion of the dialectic of life and self-consciousness is critically detrimental to the actualization of free human activity. Habits form the fundamental dialectic but simultaneously limit the dialectic. As such, we come to a theory of ideology critique with habits as its object and its ground, with the aim of developing critical habits.

I have attempted to articulate the normative grounds for an immanent critique of ideology, and this certainly leaves many fundamental questions to be asked. Besides interpretational questions about habits and second nature, the development of history, and immanence in Hegel's work, also about the formal conditions for human activity as such. In the framework of Ng's formal conditions, nonetheless, engaging with a more substantial anthropology seems to be a promising direction to inquire in. With the threefold structure, I have attempted to provide an alternative to the dichotomy between absolutism and relativism, or more specifically between essentialist naturalism and social constructivism. Such alternatives, hopefully, inspire the belief that the possibility for critique is worth inquiring into.

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 'Cultural Criticism and Society.' In *Prisms*, translated by Samuel and Shierry Weber, 17-34. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1967.
- Becker, Michael A. 'On Immanent Critique in Hegel's *Phenomenology*.' *Hegel Bulletin* (forthcoming): 1-23.
- Buchwalter, Andrew. 'Hegel, Marx, and the Concept of Immanent Critique.' *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 29:2 (1991): 253-279.
- Celikates, Robin. 'From Critical Social Theory to a Social Theory of Critique: On the Critique of Ideology After the Pragmatic Turn.' *Constellations* 13:1 (2006): 21-40.
- Chiapello, Eve. 'Capitalism and Its Criticisms.' In *New Spirits of Capitalism: Crises, Justifications, and Dynamics*. Edited by Paul du Gay and Glenn Morgan, 60-81. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Cooke, Maeve. 'Redeeming Redemption: The Utopian Dimension of Critical Social Theory.' *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 30:4 (2004): 413-429.
- . 'Resurrecting the Rationality of Ideology Critique: Reflections on Laclau on Ideology.' *Constellations* 13:1 (2006): 4-20.
- Dewey, John. *Human Nature and Conduct: The Middle Works*. Edited by J.A. Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- Geuss, Raymond. *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Haase, Matthias. 'The Social Nature of Thinking.' Unpublished manuscript, 2012.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 'Philosophy as Stand-In and Interpreter,' in *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, translated by C. Lenhardt and S.W. Nicholsen, 1-20. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *The Encyclopaedia Logic: Part I of the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences with the Zusätze*. Translated by T.F. Geraets, W.A. Suchting and H.S. Harris. London: Hackett, 1991.
- . *Philosophy of Mind*. Translated by W. Wallace and A.V. Miller, introduction by Michael Inwood. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . *Lectures on the Philosophy of Spirit 1827-8*. Translated and introduction by Robert R. Williams. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Honneth, Axel. 'Recognition as Ideology.' In *Recognition and Power: Axel Honneth and the Tradition of Critical Social Theory*, edited by Bert van den Brink and David Owen, 323-347. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Jaeggi, Rahel. 'Rethinking Ideology Critique.' In *New Waves in Political Philosophy*, edited by Boudewijn Paul de Bruin and Christopher F. Zurn, 63-86. London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009.
- . *Critique of Forms of Life*. Translated by Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2018.
- Levine, Steven. 'Hegel, Dewey and Habits.' *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 23:4 (2015): 632-656.
- Lumsden, Simon. 'Habit, Reason and the Limits of Normativity.' *SubStance* 37:3 (2008): 186-206.
- . 'Second Nature and Historical Change in Hegel's Philosophy of History.' *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 24:1 (2016): 74-94.
- Marx, Karl. 'For a Ruthless Criticism of Everything Existing.' In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 12-15. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978.
- Menke, Christoph. 'Hegel's Theory of Second Nature: The "Lapse" of Spirit.' Translated by Gerrit Jackson. *Symposium* 17:1 (2013): 31-49.
- Ng, Karen. 'Life, Self-Consciousness, Negativity: Understanding Hegel's Speculative Identity Thesis.' In *The Freedom of Life*, edited by Thomas Khurana, 33-68. Berlin: August Verlag, 2013.
- . 'Ideology Critique: From Hegel and Marx to Critical Theory.' *Constellations* 223 (2015): 393-404.
- Novakovic, Andreja. *Hegel on Second Nature in Ethical Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- . 'Hegel's Real Habits.' *European Journal of Philosophy* (forthcoming): 1-16.
- Roderick, Rick. *Habermas and the Foundations of Critical Theory*. London: Macmillan, 1986.
- Rödl, Sebastian. *Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . 'Education and Autonomy.' *Journal of Philosophy Education* 50:1 (2016): 84-97.
- . 'The Science of Logic as the Self-Constitution of the Power of Knowledge.' In *German Idealism Today*, edited by Anders Moe Rasmussen and Markus Gabriel, 151-158. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017.
- . *Self-Consciousness and Objectivity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Stahl, Titus. 'What is Immanent Critique?' *SSRN Working Papers* (2013): 1-20.

---. 'Georg [György] Lukács.' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Spring 2018 Edition. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/lukacs/>, accessed on 11-6-19.

Taylor, Charles. *De Malaise van de Moderniteit*. Kampen: Ten Have/Pelckmans, 2007.

VERKLARING KENNISNEMING REGELS M.B.T. PLAGIAAT

Fraude en plagiaat

Wetenschappelijke integriteit vormt de basis van het academisch bedrijf. De Universiteit Utrecht vat iedere vorm van wetenschappelijke misleiding daarom op als een zeer ernstig vergrijp. De Universiteit Utrecht verwacht dat elke student de normen en waarden inzake wetenschappelijke integriteit kent en in acht neemt.

De belangrijkste vormen van misleiding die deze integriteit aantasten zijn fraude en plagiaat. Plagiaat is het overnemen van andermans werk zonder behoorlijke verwijzing en is een vorm van fraude. Hieronder volgt nadere uitleg wat er onder fraude en plagiaat wordt verstaan en een aantal concrete voorbeelden daarvan. Let wel: dit is geen uitputtende lijst!

Bij constatering van fraude of plagiaat kan de examencommissie van de opleiding sancties opleggen. De sterkste sanctie die de examencommissie kan opleggen is het indienen van een verzoek aan het College van Bestuur om een student van de opleiding te laten verwijderen.

Plagiaat

Plagiaat is het overnemen van stukken, gedachten, redeneringen van anderen en deze laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Je moet altijd nauwkeurig aangeven aan wie ideeën en inzichten zijn ontleend, en voortdurend bedacht zijn op het verschil tussen citeren, parafraseren en plagiëren. Niet alleen bij het gebruik van gedrukte bronnen, maar zeker ook bij het gebruik van informatie die van het internet wordt gehaald, dien je zorgvuldig te werk te gaan bij het vermelden van de informatiebronnen.

De volgende zaken worden in elk geval als plagiaat aangemerkt:

- het knippen en plakken van tekst van digitale bronnen zoals encyclopedieën of digitale tijdschriften zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het knippen en plakken van teksten van het internet zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het overnemen van gedrukt materiaal zoals boeken, tijdschriften of encyclopedieën zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het opnemen van een vertaling van bovengenoemde teksten zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het parafraseren van bovengenoemde teksten zonder (deugdelijke) verwijzing: parafrasen moeten als zodanig gemarkeerd zijn (door de tekst uitdrukkelijk te verbinden met de oorspronkelijke auteur in tekst of noot), zodat niet de indruk wordt gewekt dat het gaat om eigen gedachtengoed van de student;
- het overnemen van beeld-, geluids- of testmateriaal van anderen zonder verwijzing en zodoende laten doorgaan voor eigen werk;
- het zonder bronvermelding opnieuw inleveren van eerder door de student gemaakt eigen werk en dit laten doorgaan voor in het kader van de cursus vervaardigd oorspronkelijk werk, tenzij dit in de cursus of door de docent uitdrukkelijk is toegestaan;
- het overnemen van werk van andere studenten en dit laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Indien dit gebeurt met toestemming van de andere student is de laatste medeplichtig aan plagiaat;
- ook wanneer in een gezamenlijk werkstuk door een van de auteurs plagiaat wordt gepleegd, zijn de andere auteurs medeplichtig aan plagiaat, indien zij hadden kunnen of moeten weten dat de ander plagiaat pleegde;
- het indienen van werkstukken die verworven zijn van een commerciële instelling (zoals een internetsite met uittreksels of papers) of die al dan niet tegen betaling door iemand anders zijn geschreven.

De plagiaatregels gelden ook voor concepten van papers of (hoofdstukken van) scripties die voor feedback aan een docent worden toegezonden, voorzover de mogelijkheid voor het insturen van concepten en het krijgen van feedback in de cursushandleiding of scriptieregeling is vermeld.

In de Onderwijs- en Examenregeling (artikel 5.15) is vastgelegd wat de formele gang van zaken is als er een vermoeden van fraude/plagiaat is, en welke sancties er opgelegd kunnen worden.

Onwetendheid is geen excuus. Je bent verantwoordelijk voor je eigen gedrag. De Universiteit Utrecht gaat ervan uit dat je weet wat fraude en plagiaat zijn. Van haar kant zorgt de Universiteit Utrecht ervoor dat je zo vroeg mogelijk in je opleiding de principes van wetenschapsbeoefening bijgebracht krijgt en op de hoogte wordt gebracht van wat de instelling als fraude en plagiaat beschouwt, zodat je weet aan welke normen je je moeten houden.

Hierbij verklaar ik bovenstaande tekst gelezen en begrepen te hebben.

Naam: Emma Young

Studentnummer: 5630681

Datum en handtekening:
14-06-2019

Young

Dit formulier lever je bij je begeleider in als je start met je bacheloreindwerkstuk of je master scriptie.

Het niet indienen of ondertekenen van het formulier betekent overigens niet dat er geen sancties kunnen worden genomen als blijkt dat er sprake is van plagiaat in het werkstuk.