
FOREWORD:
THE DEATH OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN AN ERA OF MULTICULTURAL CORPORATISM (“NEO-LIBERALISM”):
WITH EFFORTS AT RESUSCITATION

DAVID LEMPert, PH.D., J.D., M.B.A., E.D. (HON.)
Special Issue Editor

Abstract:

This foreword is in four separate parts:

Part I: Inspiration for the Special Issue: A Personal Story: *This section describes the inspiration for this issue, in a tale of the author’s experience with social science over the past 40 years. It offers some general observations and theories about what has happened to the social sciences from a personal perspective over time. (pages 2 to 19)*

Part II: The Concept for this Special Issue of Catalyst and the Reality of Critiquing and Restoring Social Science: *This section is what one generally finds in an introduction to a special issue, describing the specific concept and contents, with some additional information that itself is informative about social science today. It presents the goals for the issue and the process of putting this issue together. Most journal special issues offer an easy vehicle for an existing group of scholars to publish their work. In contrast, this issue, starting with a critical approach to social science, faced many of the challenges that exist today to those who seek to challenge the existing consensus in social science that is anti-science and that has politicized social science. This section provides a case study that offers insight into the controls and ideologies that restrict discussion of social sciences today. (pages 20 to 38)*

Part III: Introducing the Contents of the Special Issue: *This section introduces the pieces in this issue and how they fit together. (pages 39 to 46)*

Part IV: A Vision for Revitalizing Social Science and Inviting Continued Debates and Solutions: *This final section offers a short general “vision” for a revitalized social science, describing the kinds of actions that this issue of Catalyst seeks to catalyze, in revitalizing social science disciplines. (pages 47 to 52)*



The typical introduction to a special issue focuses on the pieces that appear and describes how they fit together with each other. What makes *Catalyst* a special journal is that in addition to linking articles on themes, it seeks to serve in the role of catalyzing deep reflection and social change. With those goals in mind, this foreword consists of four parts as described in the abstract above: a personal story of this editor’s experience (hopes and despair) with academic social sciences; the goals of this special issue and the process of bringing it to fruition; introduction to the pieces in the issue; and comments on the tasks ahead given the findings and proposals presented in this issue to re-catalyze social sciences.

Part I:
Inspiration for this Special Issue:
A Personal Story on the Promise of the Social Sciences for Human Betterment
and the Breaking of that Promise

I Am a Social Scientist

I am a social scientist. I am proud of it. What I do is considered to be impossible but I do it anyway.

I search for “natural laws” of behavior across societies that I use to predict future events. My guiding principle is a humanitarian one, to follow human goals and international law and to promote human survival and well-being. I generate hypotheses on major questions of human behavior like war, revolution, cultural survival, sustainability, social progress and human rights. I use comparative data. I am not bound by any specific methods or ideologies.

I follow in a proud tradition of scholars like Thomas Malthus, who offered one of the first laws of social science using natural variables of population and environment.

I also follow in the proud tradition of creating technologies to try to build a better world, like ideal laws and political, economic and social institutions that are responsive to human needs.

We live in an age of science and technology where we make constant predictions and develop technologies regarding both the physical and natural world including every other species and including ours when it comes to human biology and health. But, somehow, humans are treated in a different category where the same rules are not recognized, even though they also exist.

People like me are not supposed to exist. The mythology of our time is that there are no natural laws applying to human behavior, or that if there are, it is inappropriate to look for them. Since people like me are not supposed to be doing what we are doing, given the challenge to these beliefs, we are barely allowed to survive. Our works are not published because the questions we ask and the methods we used are simply not supposed to exist.

Of course this is not to say that there are no social scientists today. There are social scientists doing such work but many of them work on the dark side without the same standard that those of us in the light apply on satisfying international law, on working for the interests of humanity, and on making our work public. Those others work for militaries and police and security states and corporations on predicting and controlling human behaviors.

Here’s how this all happened and how we can try to return to civilization.

The Promise of Social Science: Growing Up in an Industrial Society

Like many others growing up in the “space age” and the “nuclear age”, that was back before the age of “full spectrum dominance” and drones, I came of age with a fascination of science and technology. I felt both the excitement of scientific discovery and expansion of human potential, combined with a nightmarish fear of its destructive power. Despite the haunting fears of those terrors introduced by technology in its destructive and invasive powers, I shared the belief that I lived in an era of human “progress” that was not only technological but that was also social and that would put technologies under human control for the fulfillment of human aspirations. If we could “put a (hu)man on the moon” and incinerate a city in a flash, then of course we could have the technology to put an end to poverty and to war and inequality and injustice. It seemed that achieving social progress was a simple application of social science to policy and just a matter of the will to “change our way of thinking”. The solutions seemed obvious and easy.

I believed that social science was just slower to develop but was in parallel to natural science, and would be the key to that better future. I saw the success of civil rights and women’s rights and peace

movements and the emergence of think tanks for “planning” and believed we were ready to advance to a new era. Devoting one’s life to this seemed to be the most noble of causes. Convincing people to follow long term human interests seemed like it would be harder than achieving some short-term technological and policy goals, but it seemed that there would be social science applications that would solve this dilemma, as well, so that we would be able to focus on our long-term survival.

Social sciences appeared to have the answers. They appeared to herald a scientific approach to social progress. Social science studies demonstrated the advantages of education over incarceration, for example. They measured the benefits of peace and tolerance. They pointed out new methods of education that engaged a wider range of human attributes. They showed how human fears and fallacies could be overcome with methods of child raising and parenting that taught logic and tolerance and respect. They showed how survival of different cultures, rather than homogenization into a single urban culture, offered the source of innovation and adaptation for long-term human survival and fulfillment.

Natural science was exploring space and the oceans as well as modeling the environment and health. Along with this came a belief that social science would be linked with it in the design of model communities in space as well as on earth. I saw social scientists focusing on human potential and how it could be freed and expanded. I saw them using principles and measures in seeking to predict and secure law as an instrument of justice and rights. What I saw in the 1960s and 1970s when I was growing up was a flurry of experimentation, of new think tanks, and of funding for research. There seemed to be a belief that continued scientific progress would provide the funds for an endless continuation of such funding and experimentation. With each new improvement would come the demand and the available funds for more, in a virtuous upward cycle of progress.

I had faith in this cycle of betterment. I was convinced that progress would feed on itself in this upward spiral and that all of this benefit would be shared. When I grew up, as a member of the growing “middle class” with that economic stability and educational opportunity, there was no reason to suspect that this basis of security and hope would disappear. Why would anyone want to give that away? Indeed, the logic of a long-term future was one in which we had the economic stability and confidence to focus our actions on the long-term, on working together for common ends as the only way to avoid going back to the horrors of World War II that were fresh in the minds of my parents and my teachers and some of our leaders.

Those who grew up in major cities and suburbs in the years before, during or after those when I was raised in the 1960s and 1970s, and had the advantage of a well-funded public high school education, would have also been exposed to the classics of social science that reinforced this belief in social science, among them:

- Malthus in economics, showing the mathematics of social stability;
- Madison, Hamilton, Jefferson and the Anti-Federalists, in studies of American history, the Magna Charta and its system of rights in studies of British history, and Rousseau and the idea of social contract in studies of French history. These classics of political science taught the axioms of political representation and balancing of power;
- Darwin’s theory of evolution, human adaptation, and the interactions with and balance with environment and nature that were the basis of a pluralistic model (rather than a single linear model) to explain differentiation and change.

Those who read science fiction literature for fun would have also read many of the many works describing the building of different kinds of utopias and the logics and lessons of trying to do so, with authors like H.G. Wells, himself, merging science and social science to lead the way.

In my college days in the late 1970s, the social sciences continued to advertise themselves as offering the keys to the betterment of society through predictions and application. The idea that attracted me was based on the notion that if we could understand human nature and behaviors at all levels, we could plan the perfect society. Along with the idea of science fiction was the belief that we could create human utopias through social scientific engineering to build progress.

In college, in the late 1970s, I found my calling in social science. My faith in social science, that I developed then and was able to follow in my first initial social science work (earning and award from my department and then published), remains to this day. In the nearly forty years since then, however, I have watched social science shattered, abandoned, maligned, distorted and all but abandoned today and replaced with something far from the methods and approaches that drew me to it.

What fascinated me as I began my own career as a social scientist, in prediction and applications were natural cycles and patterns in history and in individual human behavior that also had a relation to the environment which meant that there were things to measure and use in tests of measurable human behaviors. I was also drawn to the scientific basis of human behavior that could be studied in primates and in evolution. Some of this, I had to find on my own at that time, since much of social science in the areas that I was studying (political behaviors of collapse and violence and inequality) was still using fuzzy political terms of the Cold War or fleeing from reality to create mathematical models that had symbols but no basis in actual observations and measurements. In looking to build areas of the social sciences, there was not a lot of existing foundation but there was opportunity to bridge with some existing fields to conduct and read about experiments in behavioral sciences and biology. There were classic works to build on, even if I had to go outside of my classes to do it. There were social science questions and approaches to be found through a broad liberal arts education in natural science, theory of history, as well as literature. For example, I read

- the works on cycles of civilization, of Oswald Spengler and Pitirim Sorokin, in history and sociology;
- early social scientists like Tocqueville, to examine their field methods and approaches comparisons of societies. I liked how Tocqueville compared societies of similar origins but different environments (the U.S. and European countries) and made attempts to explain the differences using those kinds of variables;
- the early political economy like works of Karl Marx, and his study of cycles and development over time;
- Darwin and emerging sociobiology, including studies of animal and primate behaviors, to understand innate behaviors and adaptation and evolution;
- Tolstoy and his theories of historical change and movements. In reading classic authors like Tolstoy (and Orwell and Capek and Wells and Kafka), beyond the artistry I saw how these authors used the humanities to essentially pose thought experiments and to try to answer social science questions historical examples and close studies of human behaviors. I saw how the work fit together into a larger enterprise of predictions and applications and considered issues like determinism and feedback. In this way, I came to appreciate the humanities not as a competition with or replacement for science, but as a partner in scientific thinking that expanded the pathways of science. That also led me to start writing fiction alongside social science.
- books about science along with continuing studies of natural science, mostly to understand the methods and ways of thinking and measuring and analyzing, as a guide to also understanding human phenomena at various levels of study.
- the Bible and other classic religious texts as social data rather than as dogma, offering comparative guidelines on law and human action and social change and measures; and
- the philosophy of Ancient Greeks, to see how they began from scratch to create early science and social science by defining systems and parts of systems and ways of thinking, to establish the building blocks for measurements and comparisons.

In this way, I also realized that the modern segmentation of social sciences and placement of different methodologies in different fields was somewhat artificial. A real social scientist followed questions and drew on any methodology that could answer those questions, without the myopia of specific methods or boundaries. That was also something intellectually exciting and important for meeting the needs of others; minorities, children, the poor, and those who faced barriers.

I knew this wasn't just me, alone, running to the library and playing at social science so I felt that I was part of a community of people working together and across boundaries to build knowledge for human betterment. That was very different from just reporting on individual narrow interests and trying to secure or repeat dogmas, which was the critique of those who were afraid of experimentation and challenges and science. Things were also happening around me in a number of fields. Even though what I learned in many classes seemed just processed and dry, there also seemed to be new openings.

- New subfields were developing like ecology and sustainable development by scholars like Paul Ehrlich and Garret Hardin and Lester Brown. This was the time of some of the early literature on sustainability, following Rachel Carson's scientific ode to the natural world. At the time, of course I believed that these ecological works of the 1960s and 1970s would quickly be applied, in long term planning of consumption and the environment that would protect sustainability and natural beauty.
- In the 1960s, there were scholars in government who also looked at practical concerns and offered long term historical predictions and utopian suggestions. People like John Kenneth Galbraith were offering visions on the future of industrial societies and on moral choices. American Presidents had hired some of the best academic minds to work in government on building a "Great Society" including sociologists and psychologists and anthropologists who seemed free to ask large questions and to offer opinions based on professional judgment that would be backed by professional organizations and codes. Scholars seemed to be working in government for human betterment and not just for stable employment or for access to money and power. There was also space for the public intellectual, offering cross disciplinary essay and commentary. People like Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo and Irv Janus were asking basic questions about how to protect democratic decisions and to protect rational judgments. Think tanks and research institutes were developing alongside universities and they seemed to be motivated by social scientific questions in ways that represented independent thinking rather than funded research to promote self-interest.
- There were new techniques in mathematics and social science, like "Game Theory" and the prisoners' dilemma that seemed to offer ways for promoting peace and cooperation in ways that recognized diversity and listening and negotiating.
- Keynesian economics was demonstrating that the most productive society was one that had the greatest equality and that invested in people, in education, social welfare, rights protections, a diversity of ideas, and a strong infrastructure, and that worked to develop human capacity rather than to invest in prisons and war.
- Studies of political theory seemed to show that public participation, citizen oversight, and social contract democracy was the most stable and the most productive system and that there was no alternative to understanding all of its mechanisms and to making sure that they would work.
- Psychology seemed to focus on all of the aspects of human development and how human misperceptions could be overcome and how individualism could be promoted through new forms of education and awareness. This "new age" psychology was introducing a scientifically based understanding of human variety and needs that could then be linked to new approaches to education and to new legal protections.

At that time, it was unthinkable to me how these understandings for peace, for economic stability, for equity, for democracy, for sustainability, for more diversity in human development, that were, then, confirmed in social science, would not be treasured and fully applied. I believed that such information, once in human minds, would never disappear or be replaced by ideologies that would destroy this basis in reason. That such thing would happen (and it did, and continues today, often in ways that have been subtle and hidden under the banner of promoting diversity and research) seemed to me to be unthinkable. I thought that such a reversal would have required something monstrous and dislocating. How could human logic and betterment be overcome and subverted, replaced by ideas that were anti-science and

anti-reason, that would say that social science was “impossible” or that large questions and predictions and applications should be abandoned and replaced with only small, single issue reporting and advocacy and representation and endless philosophical questioning that would attack the basis of “discipline” and “applications”, themselves? It seemed unthinkable.

Rethinking my Faith in Society and Academic Institutions Regarding Social Science and Progress

In looking back at why I feel such disillusionment about what has happened (or how I view what has happened) in social sciences in the past forty years, I wonder if I was wrong to believe the things that I did. Some historians of social science argue that it always served elite interests and ideologies and was never really on the path to becoming a science (Price, 2003; Schrecker, 1986). In some ways, my faith in the idea of “progress” and in the U.S. may have itself been a fantasy that blinded me to some social science principles that I better understand now. It isn’t that I give up on social science. I believe in it more than ever. My experience with it, however, may have been the result of my own illusions. Part of the attack on social science today that I find being conducted by many people whose stated goals I share (for gender and racial and ethnic equality in industrial societies, for more economic equality, for tolerance, for democracy and rights and oversight, for environmental protection and survival) may be a result of their fears about science (that I also share) and about the reality of our institutions and system. I think that others made short-term compromises based on realities that I did not want to accept then and, in my belief that we must find a way to avoid social and environmental collapse and world war and totalitarianism, we cannot accept now.

I admit that I found much of formal schooling in the 1960s and 1970s confining and stultifying and wondered if it would or could change. I recognized it as being relatively uniform and mechanistic but I didn’t think that just changing the gender or backgrounds of the teachers or changing a few books or adding more mechanization was what was needed. That was just touching on the symptoms and outward view. I felt confined in book learning that seemed like church scholarship. I saw most academics as just bureaucratic clerks. But there were some that linked the classroom to social experiments and applications, including classes that used data collection exercises to model different phenomenon all around us. If they were the ones who would stay in universities and as educators, then things would change, but if people who loved the book learning, bureaucratic approaches and who just wanted to bring their own books and dogma were the ones to enter, the changes would only be skin deep and false. Even though social sciences today have more “representation” on faculties and more “area studies” and books from more countries and cultures, their anger at the previous system seems to be at the people in it but not the real failure in meeting human needs of students and society and of building social science.

The reason I had a hope for empirical social science and laboratory learning (not bureaucratic internships, but real field laboratory study and application) was because that was the way to make it exciting and linked to real and measurable impact on the world. In graduate school, I began inventing field courses that had social science “laboratories” and empowering applied policy work across disciplines.

What I saw was that there were niches to open up the university, to open up social sciences and to create applications. If that meant travelling half way around the world to advise a Prime Minister after analyzing all kinds of data, and then adding field data in-country, it was possible. After all, I just decided to do it. And I did it.

As a college senior, I found that I could model political, economic and social processes in a small country (Mauritius) as the basis for larger countries, and that I could use this as the basis for meetings on policy with the country’s Prime Minister and its newspapers and Ambassadors and that if I looked hard enough I could find the professors who would let me do that. Some of my interdisciplinary social science modeling and applications may have been flawed, but my faith in the results of modeling and in the ability to find a way to do that within existing institutions were not. I was predicting instability and elections and also designing solutions for ethnic co-existence and sustainability. I was 21 years old.

What I didn't really think about was that the reason they may have been letting me do that was not just to promote social science and human betterment but because it may have been creating a technology with military and control implications. Others in my situation simply decided that they would not engage in prediction and application at all because of their assumption that it would be used against humanitarian ends. They seemed to label anyone who wanted to use social science for prediction and application as someone who accepted militarism and control or were just naïve. Maybe that is the motive today, alongside those others who engage in social science research that is really the kind of reporting and work that does serve the interests of control, in area studies or in "criminology".

In the 1960s and 1970s, I was against colonial and resource driven wars and a believer in promoting autonomy and sustainability and a system based on rule of law. I believed that battles were worth fighting and that humans were finally starting to get civilization on the right path. Although I saw Cold War policies and its perpetual proxy wars throughout the globe as well as the fears and impact it had on politics in the U.S., I also believed that there was a post-World War II understanding that there was no alternative to an international system of peace and security that recognized differences and tolerance. I believed that the role of social science and intellectuals was to actively engage in building an international system based on law and universal values. In the U.S., we appeared to be advancing towards civil rights and social justice and building the "Great Society" and democracy, even if we couldn't quite get it right internationally.

Perhaps I was blinded to the parts of human behavior that social science was not yet really studying deeply, though it is there to see today in most post-World War II, "noire" films. The underbelly of fear and hate and self-destruction and violence and denial and self-deception that were also parts of human behavior were largely assumed away in my view of social science and applied policy studies of "solutions". The solutions avoided questions about the "deep structure" and how we would deal with it and overcome it, or whether that was even possible (Lempert, 2016). In my view, that didn't mean that social science is a failure here and that there is a reason to abandon it. It means that social science may have been too simplistic or perhaps still diverted from reality.

Today, I find that social science tools allow me to look at the "deep structure" of societies and to predict where we are collapsing and how things may change. But I also recognize that this deep structure is what may be preventing other colleagues from using these tools and engaging in these kinds of debates as well as applying the results of these studies, today.

In many cases, today, I am seeing that social scientists are free to mention and name all of the social problems that are worthy of study and applications, ranging from planetary and cultural survival to issues of equality and social justice. At the same time, they seem to be opposed to any real modeling, comparisons, predictions and technological applications to the root causes of the problems. The labeling and reporting seems to have replaced the actual discipline and work. It seems to be a self-parody and a self-fulfilling prophesy.

Just citing classics of social science or social science principles or seeking to use the scientific method is cause for immediate rejection in major journals today. The essence of science and discipline is building on earlier work and establishing foundations to move forward with better questions. Today, when I mention earlier, classic works, however, I face a wall of anger, throwing it out, as if "change" and reform in the university today means not only hating the prejudices and politics and discrimination of earlier "colonial era" academics, means also throwing out everything that was scientific and attempted to build reason and discipline. It is now throwing out the disabled grandparents with the bathwater. Social science today limits itself to what it calls "engaging in current debates", which are equally politicized and controlled. The very idea that social science is about "debates" that must be politically "current" is itself a fallacy that represents an underlying destruction of discipline and intellectual life. Social science is about solving fundamental questions and providing solutions to fundamental problems, not about personal academic "debates" narrowed and run by and for the careers of specific academics. The current "debate" in my field, is to critique and destroy social science and to replace it with dogma and psychobabble. That may be part of a process and design that continues what existed before without really changing it.

The vision I had of social science and its excitement and possibilities has seemed to go dark. I still have my hope, but I feel like I am living in darkness. Much of the social science that I studied seems as if it has been made to disappear and replaced with illogic and slogans and anti-science in an attack on reason.

In the late 1980s, after attending professional school and doing some social science teaching as well as creating the very popular field social science course and then NGO, “The Unseen America”, I entered a Ph.D. program and became an holistic social scientist. The story of my specific field and what happened in it over that time is the story of what has been happening in the U.S. and globally in academia and in social science.

The Attraction of My Field, the Holistic Social Science of Anthropology, when I Entered Graduate School

My first introduction to what was called “anthropology” was in high school, in a special course that my school offered. Instead of following a textbook, the course drew on a variety of theories and questions about human evolution and cultures in ways that were broad and exciting. It focused on every important question of the time (war and peace, rights and co-existence) and on questions of human nature, in ways that were rooted in science and in comparisons. It didn’t start with theory or methodology or case studies or jargons or definitions. It started with exciting questions.

In fact, “anthropology” had already been a part of our curriculum all through “social studies” courses in which we saw some of the early ethnographic films on polar peoples (“Nanook of the North”) and Southeast Asians (“Dead Birds”) and were exposed to questions about different environments and contacts between peoples. In fourth grade, I wrote a report about Egyptian hieroglyphics, so it wasn’t as if questions about human difference and relations and human systems was something that had to be narrowly packaged. I was already primed with the questions and the idea of looking comparatively and systematically, using all kinds of methods, to come up with answers.

An holistic like anthropology that combined natural science and social science along with questions from science fiction about the human future, studying human behavior at the level of culture and societies, offered the chance to focus on the most important human questions: cultural survival and culture change, the “perfection” of cultures to goals of social progress, understanding of the causes of wars between cultures and genocides and discrimination inside them. The benefit of a scientific and structured “disciplinary” approach was the systematic opportunity to both predict what would lead to such outcomes and then develop technologies to promote the best outcomes.

The field also had the advantage of examining human group behaviors in multiple time frames: over hundreds of thousands of years in the time of human evolution from other primates and examining processes of human differentiation (physical anthropology); over tens of thousands of years in the formation of different human cultures in the prehistoric and later historic records (archaeology); and in modern time, with contemporary cultures as they interact and change today and as they group into complex societies as well as disintegrate (social and cultural anthropology). There was also the fourth subfield, to study cultural cognition and ordering in the form of language and the changes in communications and explanations of the surrounding environment (linguistics).

In combining these four fields, anthropology was then, at its core, a social science drawing on natural science. It started with evolutionary biology and environmental variables, then added the element of human co-evolution with environments and development of technologies in the formation of cultures. Finally, it allowed for use of contemporary science of cognition, social modeling, comparisons and thought experiments.

What attracted me to anthropology was not just that it was a social science asking key questions. What was different about it was that it seemed to offer the freedom to break away from the ideologies that still directed other social science today and to replace those boundaries with fresh interpretations. Classic

anthropologists suggested that the very same tools used to study “primitive” or traditional societies could be used to study industrial societies and that these societies could be directly compared in order to understand common processes. The discipline suggested that countries like the U.S. could be directly compared to the Soviet Union and that all empires could be compared historically so as to reveal answers to questions of the factors that led them to arise and allowed them to be controlled. The promise of the field was to provide ways for comparisons of the U.S. with other historic empires, including Nazi Germany and the Roman Empire. This offered the freedom from the ideological straight jacket thinking of nonsensical Cold War labels like “capitalism” and “socialism” and from labels like “democracy” and “red” or “white” “fascism” that would allow for straightforward questions about “what is going on here?” It meant that work could cover the most relevant questions of our time and the solutions, rather than narrow and individualistic concerns.

When I read Horace Milner’s “Body Ritual Among the Nacirema”ⁱ in my high school anthropology course, I saw that one of the core goals of anthropology was to critique American society by comparing its practices directly to those of “primitive” societies in a scientific way. That kind of thinking offered a chance to pierce the mythologies, ideologies, and propagandistic blinders to see truth and to allow for looking for hard variables. It allowed for reversing “the common wisdom” in any and all of its aspects, from educational systems to ideas about politics and economics, by changing and testing all of the assumptions constantly drilled in as what was the “most advanced” or “the best” or “the only” choice. I realized at the time that this was an important and powerful tool for social change and one of the most important tools, along with skills in management and law, for addressing the key problems of our time.

For young people who were idealistic and humanitarian and bright, one of the best things that one could do seemed to be to train for leadership with the essential social science and practical skills and to open oneself to visionary thinking when doing so, in order to be able to create new institutions and to regulate and change those institutions that were failing or leading to failures, rather than simply fitting oneself into narrow slots in those same imperfect or failing or dangerous institutions. Disciplines like anthropology seem to offer the opportunity to be visionary: to see things exactly as they were and to understand what was humanly possible.

It seemed to me at the time that anthropologists were offered the opportunity to serve as visionaries and that in the post-World War II era where the world had seen so many horrors and in the Cold War era where we were in danger of unleashing new planetary horrors, that this was one of the most sensible and logical and “moral” (life preserving and civilization promoting) choice that a young and bright human being could make. I saw that anthropologists could be funded to go overseas, not to report on peoples to control them, which was something of the past colonial eras, but to bring back new ideas to apply as well as a clearer perception of industrial societies. Doing so would make me a part of the science and technology of social change. It was in that spirit and belief that I entered the profession of anthropology.

This was my idealized picture. I still believe in those goals and in the promise and I continue to do as much of it as I can in my own work that follows the calling of that profession. Within the profession, itself, however, I find very few colleagues left who share this vision of social science and the role of the profession. While anthropology still claims to offer “culture critique” it seems mostly in the form of well-worn ideological critiques that repeat the same kinds of slogans over and over to reinforce narrow political beliefs (that I mostly agree with as political beliefs) rather than to discover the mechanisms of how the world works or to offer new solutions to result in change. I find that most of those in the profession today do area studies and case reporting or philosophy (“anthroposophy”, though my colleagues hate this word because the inventor of the term, Rudolf Steiner, was Austrian and they do not want to be affiliated with his “school”) rather than social science or applications. Their work offers little real clarity about the reality of human systems in general or the mechanisms of change. The science of anthropology, to determine what could be changed and how, and to offer the technologies for real change, appears to have been gutted and reduced to the level of endless philosophical discussions over minutiae. In my view, it has been dismantled and fragmented. The study of current societies has been emptied of all of its sciences. It has returned to reporting promoting rather than challenging ideologies. That seems

to have been by design. When I look back and try to understand how and why this happened, whom it really benefits, and why, the picture that I come up with is not a happy one. My faith in my Ph.D. field of anthropology and in academia has been shattered over the past many years, though my belief in social science and in the disciplinary core of basic social sciences is unwavering. If only, I think to myself, ... if only others would return to it and build upon the foundations that great minds had created in the past, without desecrating and demeaning and denying it.

Experiencing the Decline and Dismantling of My Field of Holistic Anthropology over 40 Years

What happened in my field serves partly as a metaphor for what has happened in general. Indeed, the reason I entered the field of anthropology was because of the stagnation and myopia (in terms of questions and variables) that I found in the social sciences that I had focused on in college: economics and political science. I won awards at the university level in economics and political science, but I found these disciplines driven only by concerns of short-term material and political (power) gain relative to others, without a desire to focus on the real humanitarian questions relevant to human survival. Since then, however, I have seen anthropology (and sociology) also narrowed by similar pressures; adding some other competing interests within social science (important interests of minorities and gender) but similarly reducing the focus and methods to extremely narrow, short-term concerns at the expense of disciplinary principles and larger humanitarian questions and applications. I partly understand this because I was also partly shaped by these short-term pressures, though it was actually my attempt to overcome them that led me to become a social scientist, and particularly an anthropologist.

At the university level in the late 1970s, I admit that I avoided anthropology. Even though I saw the history and potential of the discipline, I didn't see any courses at my university, other than one I audited in archaeology (on the Ancient Near East and the rise of writing and trade and civilization), that were directly addressing the key issues that I knew were central to the discipline. The more "practical" social sciences that claimed to do that were Political Science and Economics, along with the skills in Psychology and some applied courses (like Administrative Science). They offered the prestige and the potential to at least work on important questions, though I actually found in studying them that the labels did not reflect the reality. That's what led me back to entering the (once, and partly still at that time) holistic discipline of anthropology.

Though I saw the promise of the disciplines of Economics and Political Science, and took several university courses in these departments and did some university teaching in these fields while in professional schools in law and business/ management I also felt that something seemed to be starting to hold these disciplines back and distorting them.

- Economics seemed to be focusing on production engineering and cultural extermination and assimilation for the purpose of exploitation and gain rather than promoting happiness, sustainability, quality, and fulfillment. Questions about equity and survival were silenced in favor of starting assumptions that were out of touch with reality and were mathematics rather than empiricism. It seemed that Economists were increasingly working for businesses and finance and mixing their own interests with the success of corporations, with globalization, and related harms, rather than as representatives of the public as they should have been.

- Political science, in whatever country, seemed to be serving mostly to convince people that their system was the "best" and "only" possible one. After studying definitions, the problems of political science seemed to be narrow attempts to win elections and hegemony and to explain away injustice rather than to try to create it. Most of the explanatory variables seemed to be ideological definitions. The more I studied Political Science, the emptier it seemed. Political scientists seemed to be interested in allying with powerful political figures and working to advise them, thus mixing their own careers with the interests of ruling classes, ruling interests, and the existing political system and its inequalities rather than concerned with oversight, law, and protection of rights and humanity.

- Sociology also seemed to be narrow, focusing only on urban societies and problems of specific groups as if to advocate their own causes and to offer statistics as to their own inequality, rather than to focus on achieving the overall “good” society, overall opportunity, equity and justice. Sociologists seemed to increasingly define themselves by methodology (survey) and their own group interests, rather than on comparative work and overall problems of social change, social violence, general political and social inequalities and abuses of power and how to predict them and effectively challenge them.
- By contrast, Anthropology seemed to be the overarching social science that took broad perspective and used natural variables. While it didn’t seem to be doing much of anything when I entered it as a graduate student, I thought that the energy that I would bring to it would be rewarded and welcomed. I was wrong. I did find a way to do my work on important questions, but I have increasingly had to publish my work in anthropology outside of the field of anthropology, given the disappearance of most of the areas that were part of a widely constituted social science field.

When my field work as a young anthropologist took me to study the urban Russians in the Soviet Union and to offer a comparison of the workings of the university, of law, of political economy, and of empire in Russia with the U.S., I may have been the first U.S. anthropologist in the urban Soviet Union. What I brought back was, indeed, a culture critique of the kind that fit the stated premise of anthropology along with a classic holistic model and several descriptions of general mechanisms of adaptation and control in modern societies that built on some of the classic founding works in the field. I travelled to a foreign, indeed hostile and uncomfortable, place and sought to live among the natives. I used a variety of scientific tools from across the social sciences to model how such systems worked. In writing up my research, then at Harvard, I offered an holistic (i.e., an “ethnographic”, anthropological) model both as a scientific description of how social processes worked, in general, as well as in the form of a vision of how U.S. institutions and the overall culture worked, behind the blinders of the Cold War that presumed incomparable differences. I travelled on government funds and came back with a university institute grant. Unfortunately, when I offered the culture critique, my career suddenly went dead.

I learned that culture critiques of the U.S. were not, in fact, allowed in U.S. social science when it came to comparisons with “enemy” industrial powers. Without using ideological terms like “socialist” to describe other major systems (today, the ideological term is “post-socialist”, whatever that is) in place of the social scientific terms and concepts of my discipline, academics would not even consider my work. Indeed, today, some 25 years after the end of the Cold War, anthropologists themselves are some of the strongest protectors of these ideological and mythological terms used to describe the Russians and the U.S. and to perpetuate blinders about how the U.S. system operates. The tool of ethnographic holism (the modeling of a culture/society to explain how it worked), the idea of comparisons, the making of predictions and the offering of applications using concepts from law and management have all been scrapped.

Since becoming a professional anthropologist, I have watched as my field of Anthropology, which I entered to do holistic social science, has turned to an “humanities” using the language and approaches of literary analysis and philosophy applied to culture itself. In the place of science and prediction, human relations are now turned into “discourses” and “texts”. In doing so, the discipline claims to be open to examination of cultural “deep structure” and to “deconstruction”, but that is only as a literary tool describing “consciousness” rather than either material or institutional realities. “Peer review”, which once existed to assure the professional application of disciplinary standards such as the scientific method, now works as contemporary political censorship to drive out scientific standards and to eliminate the asking of all of those questions that are not found in “current debates”. The claim is that the discipline is now more “inclusive” and pluralistic due to greater gender and ethnic representation. The reality is that one political standard and ideology has been replaced by another. Members of the discipline are now required to parrot the same slogans and ideological terms that are the new political litmus test, like “capitalism” and

“socialism” (and now, “post socialism”). Colleagues who use the scientific method rather than offer a literary critique, or who cite classic social scientists rather than the literary critics who now run the field, simply cannot publish work in the journals in the field or teach in the field. The discipline uses the fiction of “peer review” to promote a consensus that is in the self-interest of whomever sets the rules. Today, the rule they have decided to set is one that eliminates objective rules, all together. The rule today is that work must be only narrow case study reporting using a single method (that of “participant observation”) and must also mimic scholarship of the Middle Ages, with endless citations to the works of everyone else in this shared set of beliefs.

To me, the idea of a “discipline” and of the discipline of “anthropology” is something that is a bedrock foundation that can be built upon but can only be altered by replacement with better, more descriptive, more “valid”, more “predictive” theories. The test is not whether something is politically popular with colleagues but whether it provides answers to disciplinary questions and demonstrates success in solving the problems that are the basic questions in the discipline. By definition, a “discipline” follows rules. It starts with a set of fundamental questions within a sphere. It can add questions. It can add methods. It can replace what exists through demonstration of ability to solve problems. But it cannot simply wipe out questions and wipe out methods and eliminate scholarship simply on the basis of political preferences. The rules can be and are meant to be adapted where they build on past work. In social science, we start with the rule of scientific objectivity and measurement. We start with the definitions of “culture” and of “ethnicity” and of “society”. We ask question, discover certain truths or laws, and then build on this. In anthropology, we start with the assumption of human groups adapting to and shaping environments over time in various time periods. Over the long term, we evolve genetically as a species (over hundreds of thousands of years). Over the shorter term, we evolve “racial” characteristics (tens of thousands of years). Over the even shorter term, we evolve languages (roughly one thousand years). And over shorter terms, we evolve “cultures” (several generations). Anthropology works on the four levels to understand these changes. When we perform “ethnography”, our subject of study is the holistic “ethnic group” or “culture”, in the sub-field of “social and cultural anthropology”. This is what we mean by discipline. It is a shared enterprise with some core principles.

If researchers were to find that this discipline didn’t fit all of the problems they were studying, or if there were smaller units (larger than individuals, the subject of psychology; and larger or smaller than social or economic or political institutions which are the subjects of other social science disciplines), they could invent separate disciplines or sub-disciplines for greater focus. If they wanted to add some new measures and theories and wanted to offer “thought experiments” to enrich what existed, that would be welcome. What would not be welcome is the elimination of existing categories for pure political reasons.ⁱⁱ

Today, in my field of anthropology, however, the attack, particularly within social and cultural anthropology, has been an attack directly on both the unit of study to eliminate it (“culture”, and the physical anthropological concept of “race”) as well as on the questions of study (cultures and group interaction), as well as its structural goals as a discipline (objectivity, prediction, modeling) and its technical applications (promoting sustainable human cultures). All that is left is use of a methodology (“ethnography”, the “study of ethnic groups”) that is a contradiction in terms because the unit that “ethnography” was invented to study (“ethnic groups” at the holistic level, for modeling and comparisons) is no longer the unit of analysis.

In place of the “study of culture” is now the study of “food” (“food studies”) or of a single variable like gender (“gender studies”) or study of “organizations” (“organizational anthropology”) or “internet culture” or “technology”. The problems under study are no longer those relating to “cultures” and the level of cultures. They are now issues of personal adaptation, like “identity” and “migration”.

Scholars who wish to write about important topics in anthropology, in order to predict and model economic and political power or law at the level of cultures and societies, today, are unable to publish work or teach on the fundamental questions that were the basis for establishing the discipline and the

discipline has now established for two generations that scholars no longer ask these questions let alone have the chance to read or learn about them. Instead, anthropologists are limited to options like these.

- One is the celebrity worship approach. Anthropologists can write about people in power from the perspective of a celebrity magazine, commenting on their clothing selection, their office decorations, their posture and their oratory. One can describe their “rituals” of power and consumption in an innocuous and childlike way that offers no mechanisms for prediction or change, and can claim that this documentation is studying “culture”.
- Another approach is to make up a terminological (and unmeasurable, ideological) “variable” and new jargon to go along with it, that claims to “explain” (but not model) what is already obvious about an existing social problem (discrimination or inequality) in newly invented words, without any scientific predictions or tools for change. Scholars who wish to write about empires, can describe imperialism from the perspective of “debt” or “exchange relations” and invent new “theory” relating ideological jargon on topics like “debt in history”, but they cannot actually model empires and power balances and predict how empires collapse and change and whether and how they can be confronted or offer any applied technology to doing so.

In this way, the discipline creates the illusion of being “moral” and focusing on “contemporary issues” while it actually undermines the very science and technology that would explain and predict the phenomena it claims to study and that would allow for the creation of technologies to promote humanitarian and public interests (d’Andrade, 1982; Hymes, 1995). It also protects itself from criticism because those who promote this destructive anti-social science and anti-disciplinary and anti-applied approaches can claim to be representatives of the groups who were excluded by earlier scholars and victimized by society. They can also claim that any criticism is “racist” or “sexist” and an attempt to “return to the past” rather than be held accountable to demonstrate public benefit and results for the political interests they espouse or for the discipline. As someone who not only agrees with their stated political goals but who has sacrificed to try to achieve them, I find myself being oddly attached by the very people whose long-term interests I am actually sacrificing to protect. What has happened is something that I find both surreal and tragic.

Lest I be accused of making this up, I offer an example of a current advertisement for a teaching position in anthropology at a well-respected university that was placed on the website of the American Anthropological Associationⁱⁱⁱ.

*Open Rank Position on Emerging Worlds in Sociocultural Anthropology
The University of Texas at Austin*

The Department of Anthropology at the University of Texas at Austin invites applications for an open rank position to start in fall 2017, with preference for a hire at the Assistant Professor or early Associate Professor level.

We seek scholars whose work addresses emerging worlds and emerging theoretical approaches in sociocultural anthropology. Particular interests include non-representational theory, new materialism, sensory ethnography, multi-species ethnography, new ecologies and infrastructures, affect and performativity, racial assemblages, and circuits of violence. We also welcome methodological innovations and interventions. Geographical and theoretical areas are open.

In my view, most of these “new areas” of study appear to be an attempt to dismantle the discipline and to destroy any attempts to study behaviors at the level of culture/ethnic group or to use any kind of social scientific measurement. Here is why.

- “Multi-species ethnography” and “Sensory ethnography” are contradictions in terms. By definition, “ethnography” was the study of cultures within their environmental context (i.e., relationship to surrounding species, climate and geography) so the idea of “multi-species” here really means: “studies of humans and their pets”.

- “Sensory ethnography”, when translated in plain English, is really “journalism of sound”.
- The stated goal of the discipline of anthropology, though it may have not worked effectively to achieve it in its early years, was to model cultures and to describe them in relation to their material environments. “New materialism”, however, is not bringing materialism back in, to assure an anthropology that is protective of Indigenous peoples and all of us in relation to our environments and in opposition to colonialism. In fact, it is doing the opposite. It is defining the “non-material” and intangible as some kind of subject of study and reporting for anthropologists (but not an explanatory variable for predicting and improving processes of human cultures).
- “Non-representational theory” is partly the destruction of modeling.
- Since scientific concepts like “feedback interactions” have been eliminated from anthropology with science, that concept now apparently re-enters the field as something dumbed down like “circuits of violence”.
- I find it hard to believe that some of the other concepts being taught, like “performativity”, will last long in the English language.

Much of what I find in my field of anthropology today is not yet in any dictionary and my hope is that its lack of value in predicting or improving anything will assure that it disappears before it actually does enter the dictionary.

I wrote to the chair of the Department offering this ad and to the Dean of Arts and Sciences to ask for comment on what was happening to the discipline of Anthropology at the University of Texas, Austin, for inclusion in this issue. They chose not to respond. I do not believe they can respond in a coherent way, but of course that is only my “opinion”. Certainly everything they are doing can be backed up by “peer review”. Once they educate a group of students to use the new terminology they have created, these then become the “current debates” and questions in place of everything that came before.

This is not the only such ad and it is clear where anthropology is headed (and where it is returning). Here is another such ad from another well-known school^{iv}:

Associate Professor of Anthropology, Mount Holyoke College

We are looking for an ethnographer who specializes in media and visual anthropology, with attention to the politics of representation regarding cultural forms such as race, class, gender, religion, and ability. We welcome candidates who incorporate video, photography, and/or other innovative techniques into their ethnographic methodology. The successful candidate will have the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues in interdisciplinary fields such as Film Studies, Africana Studies, Latin American and Latinx Studies, and Journalism, as well as with community-based and global education programs.

What is clear from this advertisement is that the department is not even seeking someone who is trained in the discipline and its questions or can even teach the methodologies of the discipline. They are seeking someone to teach “politics of representation”. This is what much of Anthropology has become today; a place in universities for fulfilling the political goal of “representation” and where scholars can replace social science and applications with film journalism. Anthropology at major schools like this one, now sees itself as “cross cultural journalism” of different groups to be represented and reported on. If the natural sciences were to go this route, the approach would be one of cultural perspectives that would destroy natural science (feminist astronomy, Indigenous astronomy, African astronomy, Buddhist astronomy) and that would turn cell biology into animal representation (cat biology, dog biology, hamster biology).

The explanation in anthropology is that this is a “moral” (political) choice. What I fear is that social sciences seem to be taking the university back to the 19th century and earlier, to their roots in the church. In the past, the universities were founded by religious groups and incorporated religious teaching as part of their “ethics” obligations. These religious courses could not be challenged on the basis of whether they taught skills or addressed disciplinary problems. Their goal was to proselytize and they were funded

specifically to do so, with faculty, students and community all believing in the importance of this religious training in place of social science, with constant invocations but little in the way of actual enforcement of many of the ethical principles that they claimed to espouse. That appears to be the approach again, today. In my view, morality also requires principled commitment and courage with the focus on results, with engagement based on the realization of principles.

I am fearful when I see this trend in the discipline that the actual goal is to espouse beliefs as a form of public relations while assuring that none of the goals will actually be achieved. Transforming anthropology into a debating society for moral relativism and only journalistic recording and essay, without the development of science and technology for human betterment, means that those with power will win and that economic inequalities, loss of cultural diversity, environmental damage, and threats to human survival will only increase as they have over the same past forty years. As anthropologists give up science and application, those with power who needed to be educated and held accountable are continuing to use science and technology to increase their power and their unaccountability. Advocacy and self-affirmation have value in combination with science and tools, but alone they are the equivalent of entering into battle without technology, strategy or tactics.

It takes little more than a generation to destroy a discipline by cutting off all attachment to the past and that is what I see happening. My hope is that as long as the libraries are protected, scholars can ultimately find traditional work in their disciplines and articles like this one, though difficult to find, can serve as the threads to reconnect those thinking and rebellious scholars of the future with such work. I try to have faith that scholars will ultimately realize that the current approaches offer nothing of value and that no one is willing to fund this kind of fantasy forever. It will ultimately burn itself out. But, for now, it has emerged and is replicating itself in the selection of faculty members and their selection of students in a continuous process.

The Situation Today: University Social Sciences as Dead Zones and Academia as a Shell

I sympathize with students today who are entering the university with expectations that social science will open their eyes to natural laws of human behavior that they can use to make the world a better place and who then are immediately turned off by curricula that offers them endless definitions, jargon, and discussion that leaves them without anything of real value. I look at university curricula in the social sciences today and wonder what skills and perspectives students are learning and how and where they will apply it. "Where's the content?" I have no doubt that many students today privately worry to themselves (with no place to express their doubts) that what they are seeing in Anthropology and other social sciences is a fraud, backed up by mystique and slogans about "teaching people to think" without any content, promoted by a power structure designed to bully them into submission and in a way that perpetuates itself. What I see in universities today are dead zones where the skeletons of social science disciplines still exist but where the disciplines themselves are directionless echo chambers.

While teaching in secondary schools today is often sterile and numbing, with few direct visible practical applications in the teaching of social studies and literature, and often snuffing out curiosity, at least secondary school curricula offer some measures of skills that build in a sequence in use of language, mathematics, and natural sciences. Similarly, in the sciences at the university level, laboratory courses may still be cookbook projects, but there is a sequence of problem solving techniques and laboratory skills. Technical school vocations and professional schools at least partly also offer these steps. But following a century of modern social science, there is still very little in the sequential learning and application of theoretical skills other than perhaps in some cognitive psychology courses.

Most social science courses today, and particularly those in anthropology, sociology and political science, focus on definitions (the jargon of the field), on authors and theories (history, or what anthropologists call "ancestor worship", rather than prediction or models), and on some work with abstractions that claim to offer models of reality but offer compound assumptions. This same process is multiplied across dozens of "subjects" with huge packets of information that is of little real application, in

addition to the definitions, authors and theories and abstractions (such as the study of specific areas or histories or problem concerns). These courses mostly offer the same repetitive package promoting the recitation of facts and theories and the use of jargon but not the ability to predict or model much of anything or to change anything in ways that promote long-term human goals. In these fields, the definition of an expert seems to be someone who knows the history of all of the failures of the subject and pretends to offer value, but who at best knows some case studies that might or might not be analogies to something he or she meets in the real world. It is easy to understand why students today are bored and alienated and cynical and prefer to just memorize these packets of information electronically rather than to have to see other human beings. It is unfortunate that those who actually find this model appealing and who can best pretend that it is somehow dignified, of intellectual value, humane or even human, are the ones who are then selected to perpetuate it. The “seminars” and “discussion” sections in social science courses today seem to be little more than theater, allowing for venting, posturing, and social skills of watching the generation of dogma and figuring out one’s social position and status more than anything having to do with social science.

As one advances to the higher level courses, many of these are “discussion” courses are “response paper” or “review paper” or “research paper” courses where one learns how to cite the different theories. But there are no problem sets teaching methods of solving real problems, no proven laws or theories taught for applications, no laboratory work to demonstrate the theories, and no applied work to put the theories to use, other than the model of “internships” that place students as free labor in existing institutions that are largely failing their social missions and themselves unable to teach social science skills. One could rightly ask how it is that academics have been studying their “areas” and offering theory after theory but have yet to find any validity of any of their theories, or why they should continue to teach theories with the claim that social reality cannot be predicted by theory or natural laws. What is it that they are studying? How is it of any value? Why should time and resources be wasted on what is no different from philosophy, theology and church scholarship?

Not all of social science has been eliminated and this is where there is still hope. There are still methodological courses within and alongside the social sciences, starting with statistics and research methods. These are the remaining skeletons of social science. They do offer the range of potential quantitative and qualitative skills to be used even though each discipline seeks to limit the teaching of methodologies to only one or two techniques that may or may not be useful at all for solving the actual questions that are within the boundaries of that discipline. Students who are clever and who recognize the value of social science need to have the foresight to take as many of the skills courses that are offered, across as many fields as possible, while avoiding the rest beyond the basic vocabulary in each discipline that can be seen as useful simply for communications. These can be studied along with various communications skills and presentation technologies. Together, these are not the makings of a social scientist, but at least they maintain the potential for social science to develop again in the universities by those who can start again with important questions and start applying a variety of techniques to try to answer those questions and to develop applications.

If one were rebuilding social sciences, one would start by clarifying the fundamental questions and boundaries of each discipline (as I try to do in my piece in this issue on Economics), introducing students to the full range of social science methodologies that can be used within the context of the scientific method, and then try to build courses based on what fundamental laws of societies are known to exist. For social science courses to meet the definition of social science, similar to an introductory course in the natural sciences, they would have to link the definitions to specific demonstrated laws and then problem sets, with real data, to show how these the data is used to generate predicted outcomes. These laws would then be demonstrated in laboratory components of the course where students would learn the methodologies for testing and improving these basic building blocks.

Years ago, I tried just to reintroduce the scientific element of the methods, in hope that this would catalyze change. By trying to assure that there were “laboratory” courses in every field, and that students could have some control over them, I believed that this would unleash a series of new empirical models as

well as a questioning of the theologies that were perpetuated in their place (Lempert, 1995). I succeeded in showing that it could be done and in laying out steps to do it, though I was unable to fully establish this model within a singular department or university.

What happened to that effort was that it was co-opted. Instead of using the laboratory approach to invigorate social sciences, the universities have created approaches to “field work” that have either exploited students on international tourism (“study abroad”) or funneled them into low-level positions in existing institutions to work as exploited interns (in what is called “service learning”). Rather than allow students to model the world and to build and run solutions in their communities, many social sciences courses have emerged that are subsidized low level labor for existing institutions that were part of the problem. The “service” in non-governmental organizations or in university created “projects” works to treat symptoms and subsidize breakdown in government functions, rather than to explore how systems work and to create social experiments. Often this “field” approach is used to provide a pittance of services to the poor where government has refused to do so, and to simply train technical skills rather than to introduce new social science modeling in the form of real “laboratory” work.

Establishing measures of value and disciplinary standards would be one way to try to hold social science departments to their missions. I have also tried to do that in a series of articles, including one presented in this issue (for anthropology), but academics today ferociously resist discussion of any kind of measurements and call only for political review by their peers, with no guidelines. While universities claim to be “accountable” to accreditation committees (of like-minded people) and to students who pay tuition, it is hard to see any kind of actual measure of value of the social science disciplines at all of any kind other than peer “ratings” or measures of “starting salaries”.

The idea of “disciplines” is that they started with specific areas of study and with agendas of key problems that they would set out to solve, as the basis then for creating technologies to meet the needs. Social sciences, ideally, exist to answer social questions at different levels of inquiry and then to improve society at different levels, in everything from peace and sustainability to human fulfillment. In studying a social science discipline, one would expect to start with a list of the “problem areas” that the discipline addressed. Physics starts with the “nature of matter” and “energy” and its relationships and then establishes all of the areas and sub-areas where it applies questions (from the formation and future of the universe to the nature of elementary particles and fields). Biology starts with the nature of life, its evolution and function of its components at the level of eco-systems, species, organs, and organelles. The measure of progress is visible at each level of inquiry. The same should be said for the predictions of human systems and institutions and group behaviors. Yet, today, one finds it nearly impossible just to list the problems that individual social sciences claim they are trying to solve, the progress they have made, and the levels and areas of questions they are pursuing. It is as if there are no longer any lists of the mission or goals of social science disciplines, the problems they are trying to solve, the steps that are already solved and the steps ahead. With no purpose and no measure of value, the only measures they seem to offer now are political ones.

My discipline, anthropology, still claims to be unable to define even its essential terms like “culture” or “ethnicity”, let alone answer any questions or find any laws or principles. After trying for years to do it, starting with publishing an ethics code for practitioners, it has become clear to me that academics do not want any kind of standards. Anthropologists do not want to be a “discipline”. They do not want to have any rules or measures. They do not want to have to have a mission. They do not want to have to meet any standard of “value”. One can see it in the list of subject areas in the University of Texas ad. Anthropologists want to pontificate and “perform”, as if social science now is limited to being a kind of performance art.

Of course, they want the power to grade their students (something that I do not want with students; I want contracts with clear measures of objective learning). They want the power of blind peer review without accountability so that they can censor work they do not like. They want the power to choose colleagues without any transparency or accountability so that they can reinforce their political approaches in the use of university resources. They want the power to produce advertisements like those above, that

enable them to use resources to promote things that they cannot even define, let alone demonstrate has any kind of value to any of their constituencies.

Since what is being taught is a set of names and definitions, but not skills or solutions, the way once advances in these fields is not on the basis of ability to “prove” something true or false and to solve an existing disciplinary problem in a way that advances the discipline up a step. Advancement has returned to the approaches of a church hierarchy. That metaphorical description tells us where we are, today, in the social sciences. We are back in the 19th century, or perhaps in the Middle Ages, in the era of the church. Our social sciences are more like Church theologies in their quests to be “moral” and to focus on human thought rather than on measuring reality. The modern university has its roots in the church, in the pagoda, and in the yeshiva. It comes out of teaching religious doctrines. This is where it seems to have retreated, again, in the area of social sciences.

Contemporary Social Sciences as Theologies

The metaphor for describing social science today as a set of Churches may actually, subconsciously be the reality. One of the “laws” of anthropology is that cultures seek to replicate themselves and reassert their underlying structures. If the underlying structure of the university is really that of the church and of doctrine, the tendency of the newer fields like the social sciences would be to regress to that of church doctrines unless there were standards and oversight forcing accountability to standards of science and value.

Several years ago, Noam Chomsky, the linguist, described much of contemporary social sciences today as theologies that were little different from their antecedents in the church. As a linguistic, he drew the comparison to sciences. Though there is “Newtonian” physics, where laws operate in a context (motion less than the speed of light), there is no such thing as “Newtonism” or Newtonians” competing with “Einsteinians”. There are natural laws that have been validated and there are recent theories waiting additional testing. But, in “social sciences” by contrast, there is “Marxism-Leninism” and “capitalism” and “socialism” and “totalitarianism”. In anthropology, you may be a “Straussian” or a “structural functionalist” or a “post-modernist”. The reason for these characterizations is because they reflect factions with ideologies and the absence of scientific testing and laws. That means they are resistant to any kind of reform. When people follow and defend a “God”, there is no form of proof to convince them otherwise; other than perhaps defeating them with a bigger “God”.

As in the Church, scholars in social sciences today seem to take on the same role as church clerics. That would explain why courses focus on understanding of all the previous church scholars by naming and discussing them, rather than to problem sets and applications and laboratory field work. One shows obedience to doctrines by promoting and defending them in the church and in social science today by creating new hair splitting theories that maintain the religious doctrines (and “engage in the current debates”) and that do it by creating new jargon. Terminology is continually reinvented. Research may employ new technologies but it does no more than reports on what is already known and obvious.

With no ability to predict social realities and in apparent fear of confronting reality with empirical testing, social science generates into sound-bytes. In fear of new models and challenges to dogma, the way to prevent it is to assure that there is no way to do it. To assure adherence to dogma, they turn thinking into black and white sound-bytes or memes. The length of journal articles becomes shorter and shorter so that there is room only to cite what has already been vetted. Books are turned into shorter and shorter cookie cutter lengths and increasingly just edited volumes of short symposium, sound-byte articles.

The result appears to be disconnected from reality (and often from logic and language in their works). It appears to be a perverse self-destructive spiral to extinction of the disciplines. The work that is funded is either useless or directly serves specific elites interests. As it becomes more useless, the public also joins in on the attack and agrees to cuts in funding. So there is a downward spiral of lack of funding, insularity and self-censorship, and cuts in funding.

The justification that social sciences are “teaching people how to think” or “opening up perspectives on the world” is what churches do. The fear of challenge, change, and empirical study and modeling is characteristic of a church. Much of what is social science today is an exercise in poetry and philosophy in a way that reinforces (and grades) conformity to favored outcomes. Students are taught how to parrot, manipulate, and obfuscate. Unfortunately today, in an industrial society where technology has the power to destroy humanity, the death of social science and replacement with ideological invocation and philosophy can only have the result of undermining civilization and humanity rather than advancing it. This is a dismantling of civilization and an undermining of intellect, done in the name of “progress” and “intellectualism”. It is nearly impossible to challenge a Church because there are no standards other than solidarity of groups that form for self-protection.

Part II:
***The Concept for this Special Issue of Catalyst and
The Reality of Critiquing and Restoring Social Science***

I originally believed it would be relatively easy, particularly in the contemporary political environment today of dissatisfaction with most major institutions and with attacks on academia, to offer fundamental critiques and solutions. There seem to be plenty of academic journals and new ones, like *Catalyst*, on the Internet. One hears plenty of “critiques”.

In fact, it took more than two years to produce this issue and much more time than that to find a venue for the central article in this issue, critiquing the legality of Economics as a discipline under recognized international law. All of the authors in this issue seem to have similar stories of difficulty in finding a forum for critiques and solutions. For starters, how do you get a critique and a solution for bringing disciplines back to their original precepts through “peer review” when such processes no longer even recognize the original goals and questions of the disciplines or even the basic procedural principles of objective reviews? The idea of getting through a “peer review” itself becomes paradoxical.

When one has a group of colleagues who fill an already established university niche with positions and funding to produce material, it is relatively easy to establish a journal and to fill it with a continuous stream of material. It is a bit like a continuous factory production. Offering fundamental critique and solutions, by contrast, has no constituency, no institutional structure, and no resources to offer other than ideas. Today, that makes it almost impossible to exist. That means that a critique of social science disciplines on their content and procedures must also include insight into their institutional structures that reinforce the existing mindsets and their failures.

This section in this introduction offers a description of the barriers to critique and describes the very infrastructure that this issue needed to establish simply to exist. It offers ideas for those who wish to continue and expand the critique and solutions offered in this issue. Before introducing the articles that now comprise the issue and how they fit together, below is an introduction to the process of this special issue. I offer data on how controls seem to work in social sciences that make it difficult even to create a debate or a forum that challenges the current dismantling of social science and that offers solutions.

This section is one two parts. The first begins with the advertisement for the special issue and then a discussion of the hypotheses of why the social sciences have been dismantled, that I hoped would be part of the discussion of the issue. The second part discusses the structural barriers to producing an issue like this one and some of the ways of overcoming those challenges for those who seek to do so in the future.

In offering this essay section here, that has also undergone peer review, I present my personal views as conclusive opinions based on more than 40 years of academic life. I have not footnoted or qualified every statement.

The Concept of the Special Issue

This issue came about as a matter of happenstance and then it almost did not happen. The difficulty of finding places to raise questions about social science and to try to improve them is itself evidence of how deeply rooted the problem of the disappearance of social science and its standards within the social sciences seems to be.

If there were channels today for reviewing social science works and for presenting new methodologies, one might expect to easily find the places to introduce critiques and to open discussion along with them. If these places existed, there would be multiple discussions of these issues that could perhaps be brought together. But that is not how the world of academia works and how “peer review” works today.

This author is not aware of any places to raise the issue of rebuilding social sciences.

Indeed, the only major criticism of social sciences over the past few years seems to have been the “Sokal Hoax” in which a physicist debunked the failures of social science by publishing a nonsense article and then describing the fraud he perpetrated (Sokal, 1996). That was more than twenty years ago and little seems to have changed.

There are plenty of journals that offer “critiques” and open the door to “critical works”. In anthropology, for example, there is the journal, *Critical Anthropology*, among others. But such journals do not offer their pages for constructive criticism in the form of accountability measures or solutions. They limit the debate to narrow, philosophical criticisms in ways that prevent any attempt to create accountability, standards or objectivity. The spaces they offer are short: long enough to allow for attacks but too short to present solutions. It seems that this is by design.

Assuming that most journals today in the fields that bear the labels of “social sciences” have become self-interested journals to promote work of specific groups in order to reinforce a track to tenure and some institutional power, where would one go to find the place for discussion of the discipline, itself?

Today, occasionally, for a short time, either a group of graduate students or maybe a renegade academic suddenly opens up a window of space. Such opportunities seem to only open for a year or two and then they seem to shut down. In other cases, journals seem to open for a short time for a purpose of a small group to publish a small amount of work. To keep it going, they no longer can find work to keep in their journal and suddenly open up space for outsiders. Finding them is sometimes like going on a treasure hunt.

This was one of those times. I found one of those open windows. I came to this journal, *Catalyst*, with my article that is in this issue, on economics. The piece is too interdisciplinary to fit most journals, since it combines law, economics and anthropology in one place. It is too long for any print journal. It is too short for a book and not fitting for a book since it does not have a ready market (the criteria for even academic publishers, today). It challenges the corporate ideologies of “law and economics” journals. It is too practical and applied for anthropology journals to even look at. The two leading (maybe the two only) practicing anthropology journals, accept only sound-bytes of some 3,000 to 5,000 words.

According to the editor of *Catalyst*, mine was the first article that had ever come to the journal that wasn't sought by a specific group for a specific purpose. I found the journal on the Internet in a search for an e-journal that might be open to something long and unusual. The editor let it sit for months. Then she agreed to publish it as the center of a “forum”, on condition that I also agree to produce an entire issue around it. That is how this special issue arose.

Putting together this issue met with a number of difficulties that demonstrate the barriers to rebuilding social science. Advertising the issue, receiving articles, and even completing the issue itself, faced all kinds of barriers that seem to work to reinforce what exists. I describe some of these below.

Purpose of issue and call for articles

With *Catalyst's* then editor, we agreed on the following call for articles for the special issue that we would start to advertise in early 2016. It appeared on the journal's webpage, hosted by the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and by those social science newsletters and listserves that agreed (often after considerable prodding) to disseminate the call.

Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum, will turn its attention in a forthcoming special issue to articles that offer critiques of any one of the five core social science disciplines combined with proposals for catalyzing reform of that discipline. The journal seeks articles offering specific measures and proposals for rebuilding each of the five core social science disciplines to focus on discovering the "scientific" theories and "laws" of human group and individual behaviors as a basis for designing technologies for social justice and social betterment.

The journal offers this special issue based on the debatable assumption, to be used as a starting point for argument sake, that the five core social science disciplines studying human behavior at the level of groups (anthropology, and the sub-sectoral disciplines of economics, political science and sociology) and of individuals (psychology) have been diverted from their missions as social science disciplines or have stagnated in paralyzing (co-dependent) critiques. The journal seeks articles on how to hold these specific disciplines accountable to the principles of social science objectivity for long-term, measurable human betterment.

The starting assumption is that three of the pure social sciences of human group behaviors (economics, political science, and, partly, sociology), while claiming to be "scientific" have actually worked as pseudo-sciences to promote political ideologies of industrialization, production, homogenization, and social control, while the fourth has been transformed to offer counter ideologies and "inclusiveness" (e.g., anthropology and many new spinoff "disciplines" associated with it) in ways that turn it into a "humanities" with no scientific method or thinking; as simply critique, philosophy, advocacy or journalism. Psychology may be the closest to a real science, but many of its applications do not meet universally established goals for social justice and have been used, instead, for social control (e.g., criminology, advertising). Several new disciplines have now emerged but without a clear link to a social science core (peace studies, human geography, sustainability studies, legal studies, development). Disciplines today claim to use scientific tools or specific methods, but few really meet the definition of "science" or "discipline" – hypothesis testing, real/non-ideological or culturally biased variables, results applicable outside of specific cases – or focus on larger human concerns – cultural survival, development of the full human potential, political equity, environmental protection, social equity, and peace, among them.

Seeking Hypotheses on How the Dismantling and Destruction of Social Science Happened

My hope for this special issue was that authors, singly, or as a group, would help to offer perspectives on the underlying root causes of the dismantling of the social sciences as part of the context for attempting to rebuild them that would be the "catalysis" process of the issue. My own hypothesis was that, behind the curtain of academia and intellectualism and their claims of promoting progress, there was one key factor influencing academia along with other institutions: money and power. I believed this was a result of the elimination of real public control and feedback with the university, with think tanks and with public debate. While others have written on how private universities have been corrupted by money and how a for-profit mentality has seemed to have taken over universities – some say by political design, both in public and private universities (Giroux, 2007; Ginsberg, 2011; Scott, 2012; Wittner, 2013) – there hasn't been much study of how (or whether) social sciences have been directly targeted in this way.

It is worth noting that some of the authors cited above, particularly Scott and Giroux, believe that the attack on the university and on the social sciences, was by design of several institutions and elites. They believe that these elites planned a backlash against universities and, one might extend the argument, against the specific disciplines (and perhaps the ethnic groups in them) that were promoting social science, law and some of the policy sciences as tools for democratization and citizen control of corporate and military institutions. They believe that these institutions and the elite families behind them organized to begin to fund think tanks and media to directly attack, disable, dismantle, and co-opt the universities.

The plan included changes in the political control over and the funding of education in ways that would achieve those ends.

Despite my hope that this issue would further examine how and why universities are failing in their social science mission, this special issue does not probe deeper into why industrial societies “allowed” this or other contributing factors to these failures to happen (or whether the process was a natural and predictable, deterministic one). At best, this special issue provides examples to suggest that what happened to social sciences was part of the process that seems to have happened with other institutions over the past 50 years: the dismantling of rule of law in many Western countries, the rise of oligarchy, the disappearance of the middle class, the continued rise of the national security state, and perhaps the attempt to “dumb down” the mass public, in a number of related phenomena.

While it is hard to determine the specific causes and effects of the dismantling of social sciences, the symptoms are certainly linked to a range of visible economic and political changes, even if the actual root causes may lie deeper in our cultures. What is visible today in the social sciences, all at once, seems to be a return to the forms of indoctrination and the methods of religious dogma, the mechanization of the classroom with new technologies that promote mechanical learning rather than empirical social science, and the addition of “field” work that is more like low-wage apprenticeship and technical skills application than it is empirical social science, that I have commented on in the first section of this introduction, above and address briefly and directly here, again, below. Financial and political controls could be the explanations.

What is it, specifically, that this special issue sought to explain, to confront, and to overcome with solutions? While technological advances (“e-learning” or “distance learning”), the introduction of “service learning” (internships), and the advent of “multi-culturalism” in the “social sciences” are all described as educational and human “progress”, I believe that they represent the opposite. In themselves, all of these could potentially be great advances, but the way they are used today seems to work to promote profit while creating the illusion of social benefit. These are the issues that I also hoped this special issue would address, directly or indirectly.

Electronic classrooms and programmed learning may be “efficient” in teaching definitions and dogma, but they do not address the underlying failures of disciplines, and that seems to be the purpose. Teaching and learning social science require laboratory methods working with communities. That takes resources. It has tremendous potential benefits but it also has all of the risks of travel and human interaction and spontaneity. With it come the risks (and long-term benefits for human survival and advancement) of empowerment and social change. The way technology is used today in social sciences, however, it is to dumb down social science to definitions and memorization with the occasional addition of new electronic measurements and presentations. This is not social science. It is university cost savings and social control. Packing people into classrooms and offering robotic electronic learning is an extension of mechanization and robotics to promote profits at the expense of quality. More rote learning, more robotic mass learning, and more packaged learning means that there is no need to invest in real education. It means there is no need for laboratories or equipment, no need for visits to the community to apply social science directly, and no need for two-way engagement with students that would allow students to invent new approaches and challenge existing models.

Multi-culturalism in the university also offered the hope and potential for transforming disciplines like social sciences into empowering community-based action. Instead, all it did was to take the church model for education and to replace the dictatorial role of the professor with a more diverse set of figures, while replacing one set of dogmas with multiple dogmas (Lempert, 1995). The diversification of faculty members has not made economics or political science more empirical or applied. It has not brought more answers and more useful tools to anthropology or sociology. Indeed, it has fragmented them into single variable studies and methodologically driven reporting with no real theory or application. The applications that have arisen are “criminology” and “security studies” that actually reinforce controls and inequalities. The rise of new sub-disciplines has come with lots of labeling but no real challenge to policies of cultural destruction and rise of corporate and financial power (Lempert, 2014). In many

respects, rather than train students to do better social science modeling and application, the effect of multiculturalism and diversity in the social sciences seems to have been to pander to students by offering them narcissism in the way that the mainstream media has become entertainment. Entertainment sells. Learning and standardization and application require work. In seeking to extract profits while diverting attention from skills and change, diversity actually also financially benefits university administration and short-term elite interests.

The choice of promoting “internships” for social science students (i.e., menial work for an established organization followed by writing a research or “response paper”) and “travel abroad” (educational tourism) programs rather than rigorous social science laboratory work and application in the form of community planning or running start-up institutions, fits the same paradigm. The internship and travel abroad programs offer lower level skills and entertainment with few demands, while providing free labor to existing organizations. They lure in students on the pretext of “job connections” and “lines on resumes” while actually disempowering students. The approach earns universities quick profits while exploiting students and making claims of “community relations” (Lempert, 2016).

It appears that universities are profiting from students rather than serving them and the public. They seem to be turning into profit centers on a commercial model rather than meeting students and public needs as public organizations. Indeed, both the current and a recent U.S. President of opposing political parties have made millions of dollars from “for profit” universities while advocating or supporting policies that have actually gutted funding for existing social science research^v.

While social sciences are rarely funded in developing countries and dictatorships because there is little concern for “solving” the social problems that are the result of inequalities and the corruption and abuses that reinforce them, in developed countries, the increasing concentrations of wealth and political power over the past few decades seem to also be correlated with the dismantling of social sciences or their transformation to serving elite interests even while claiming to represent “diversity”.

An Overview of the Era of Multi-Cultural Corporatism: The Social Context for this Special Issue

Social science is not offering much in the way of predictive models or technologies of change, but it does offer plenty of terms to “describe” it, often euphemistically. The clearest descriptive terms seem to be “multi-cultural” and “corporatism”. In my view as an anthropologist, “multi-culturalism” is also a deceptive term. Positions in universities and societies appear to be more “diverse” as a result of globalization and culture contacts, but cultural differences (as measured by language diversity and cultural integrity) are rapidly being destroyed. We are witnessing a homogenization and assimilation of peoples to fit a structure of corporate interests and economic and political inequalities.

Having a clear term to describe what is happening can help to make the goals of remaking the social sciences and the barriers clearer, but such a term must identify the specific institutions and behaviors that need to be changed since it is impossible just to blame and confront a terminology or an ideology or a set of institutions without understanding the behaviors and choices underlying them. In the United States, the term currently in vogue to describe the openness to visible diversity (what used to be called the “proletarianization” of the labor force or the “commodification” of individuals to serve in generic roles in corporate-institutional structures) is now generally called “neo-liberalism” to describe contemporary politics in the U.S. and Europe. Words like “neo-colonialism” and “globalization” are used to describe similar the impacts elsewhere. Some political scientists are now using terms like “oligarchy” (Gilens and Page, 2016) or “(inverted) totalitarianism” (Wolin, 2003), which are more descriptive.

The closest direct translation of “neo-liberalism” using corresponding terms that are easy to understand is probably “multi-cultural corporatism” or “multi-cultural corporate fascism”. What is “new” about it is its inclusive multi-cultural component, not that it has any impact on opportunity or social welfare. Its “liberalism” is not the “progressive liberalism” of the Welfare State or “democratic socialism”. It is the corporate liberalism of placing institutional power above regulation and allowing

“free” trade, controlled by multi-national corporate power (freeing up resources for exploitation and cultures for assimilation).

The arrangement has transformed the relationship between institutions and the governed and this is also what we are seeing with the dismantling of social sciences and their applications. Before, in my lifetime, corporations and state institutions were nominally subject to public regulation through democratic processes. In most “democracies”, these procedures were still controlled by an economic elite of a specific ethnic group and generally by a patriarchy, though females who enjoy the use of military force and police powers seem to be now joining it. This is what C. Wright Mills called the “power elite” (Mills, 1956).

While many scholars today like to label the system today as “capitalism”, since this also includes the commodification of people and the appearance of “diversity” and the rise of corporatist control, the term capitalism creates the assumption that the agency of this change is an abstract factor called “capital”. Blaming abstractions for human choices and actions covers them up and also pretends that certain political systems (that are “capitalist”) are the problem rather than those that might have different organizational forms (i.e., “socialist”). The problem is the rise (and/or entrenchment) of an economic elite controlling institutions and determining that they do not need to support the very disciplines that might predict their actions or that might generate technologies to challenge their power. Their exercise of power is through institutions, with the military and police also a form of corporate institutional structure.

As power has concentrated in institutions (military, banks, domestic and multi-national corporations), political control seems to have been placed directly in these institutions. Governments serve the institutional powers, directly, and manipulate political structures in ways that work to coordinate the institutions and the elites managing them. Today, in contrast to the past, those running the institutions are not necessarily from single ethnic groups or males. They are “multi-cultural” and “diverse”. Moreover, the institutions are not managed by a single set of families that has held power for several generations. They are a new oligarchy that has risen to fit the needs of the institutions. New families entering the oligarchy based on their ability to serve the interests of the existing corporate entities (rather than public interests) through technology.

How is this connected back to the problems of the universities and of academic disciplines and the goals of this issue for holding them again to their social science missions?

Rather than independently serving the interests of students who pay tuition (what economists would call “consumer sovereignty”) or communities through public regulation and public funding, universities, think tanks, and other places where social scientists work, now seem to serve financial and elite interests directly. Major funding seems to come from private sources and their endowments are then invested back in these enterprises. Both private and public university management appears to be unaccountable to the public, despite public chartering, and seems to serve the interests of a management class running the institutions as businesses interlocking with other institutions.

While think tanks are largely privately founded and serve as mouthpieces for ideological propaganda to serve donors, rather than for development of public social science and application, the universities now appear to be largely corporate institutions serving industry combined with the historic model of the church. If social sciences are dead, it seems to be a result of corporations acting as the tail wagging the dog (the public).

While some authors claim that faculty members and minorities were trying to protect their disciplines (Ginsberg, 2011), I believe that academics were among the first to surrender and to agree to be co-opted, while claiming to be doing the opposite. Rather than argue that here, I direct readers to the two personal essays by Brooks Duncan in this issue that I believe make a more eloquent argument for how this may have happened.

Duncan’s sharpest question that I would echo here is this one: If social sciences today are really more “representative” than before (with more women and more minorities and more courses on Women’s Studies and Ethnic Studies and Area Studies and Gender Studies) and if there are really more “political” and “moral” courses than before, why is it that the net impact of all of these changes on the inequalities in

society is less than zero and why is it that the impact on the structure of the university and on social science is also less than zero? In other words, how is it that with all of this supposed “progress”, we have more prisons (and also more courses on “terrorism” and “criminology”) and greater social inequality and a rise in corporate and military power and the national security state, and a weakening of democracy? Why is it that these “moral” courses are still top-down lectures and book learning and top-down grading without student empowerment, without community empowerment, without empirical learning and social science?

Indeed, all of this looks like co-optation of a small group of supposed “diverse” “representation” rather than real change at all. It looks like a suppression of change through the appearance of change rather than the reality of social progress. It looks like a new form of tokenism with an agreement to dismantle social sciences rather than to promote them as a means for applied social progress.

Some twenty years ago, Brooks Duncan argued that the elimination of science in my field of anthropology was actually a reaction by anthropologists to the attempt by elites to control the social sciences for destructive ends (Duncan, 1995). His argument was that social sciences were not really co-opted and that minorities were not agreeing to an elite agenda or being forced to follow it in fear for their jobs. He gave scholars the benefit of the doubt and said that they were purposefully choosing to destroy social sciences because they could not assure that their work as social scientists would be used for humanitarian purposes. In his view, they were choosing to destroy social sciences in the belief that it was better that no one do sciences at all. In a sense, the argument was that if humans now had the technology to create the atomic bomb, that they would ultimately use it to destroy civilization as we know it and that we would all be better off if we just tried to destroy science first, before we reached that point. He would probably see the movements today towards study of personal “identity” as a kind of “New Age” reaction to science and a turn inward to improve oneself, given the feelings of powerlessness to change society.

My view in this issue is that no matter how sciences are used, the moral choice is not to destroy science but to struggle to make it humanistic and to turn our attention to the study of the social scientific mechanisms to achieve positive social change. While I hoped to inspire more discussion and debate over this within this special issue, and hoped for more of a discussion on it than is presented in this introduction and in Duncan’s essays, this topic may be a kind of taboo. People may be afraid to confront it.

Psychological Symptoms of the Change in Social Science Disciplines that Create Barriers to Discussions like those Envisioned in this Issue

Whatever the causes of the disintegration of social science and whatever the appropriate response, I hoped that this issue would also touch on many of the visible signs of failure of academics and universities to defend social sciences. There seem to be underlying psychological barriers that may stem from political and economic pressures (or fears about them). Some of them deserve mention here along with the impacts on specific social science disciplines and disciplinary approaches.

It is generally considered “politically incorrect” and “reactionary” to critique the loss of standards in universities today. Indeed, many of those elites who seem to have promoted the dismantling of social sciences are also those who critique what has emerged in its place. In my view, both the critics and the defenders are half wrong in that neither support social science and its measures. They either support standards that are designed to dismantle social science or they do not want standards at all.

If one is idealistic and innovative and actually offers new approaches and implement them (Lempert, 1995) and tries to excite students and administrators and university academics to continue this marvelous invigorating mission and tradition of rational, scientific thinking applied to the great problems and questions of our day to open up discovery, the response today is resignation and rejection and scorn; nihilism and cynicism and attack. “Everything is relative”, “science does not have the answers”, “it is immoral to try to use technologies of social science to change anything”, “don’t ask big questions”, “what

you are attempting is impossible so don't bother trying". It is perverse and dark and stifling; a bastion of hopelessness and learned helplessness. It seems to be driven by fear, denial and anger.

Open up academic journals and one will find the self-promoting litanies, "No one has thought to test this before" (that in my view are tragic-comic given the usual lack of justification for what is tested as having any connection to any real human benefit or needs), followed by closing paragraphs of, "It needs more research". Yet most of these research publications no longer apply the methodologies of scientific testing to important comparative questions. Instead, they have retreated to Church scholarship, on the one hand, requiring endless citations, or simple case studies and mathematics to prove the obvious (or irrelevant), on the other.

Along with the dismantling of social science has also come a duality in the idea of "discipline" and "standards". On the one hand, in the parts of social science that have become rigid political dogma and that prevent any real inquiry or science, the idea of "discipline" and "standards" is used as a sword to drive out any questions, variables, and methods that do not repeat what already exists. On the other hand, among those who claim to be representing the new "morality", there are no standards and there is no discipline at all other than direct politicization. The real standards that have disappeared are the standards of science, allowing challenges and new variables and hypothesis testing without constraining the questions and variables and conclusions, and the standards of professional ethics. There are no enforceable ethics codes in any of the social sciences that can be used to hold anyone accountable for conflicts of interest or corruption of processes because no one in these "professions" wants any such "discipline" or protection at all. If ethics codes could be enforced, it would be much harder to break them.

Indeed, the ethical obligations of social science disciplines have also now become twisted beyond recognition, apparently allowing for academics to use their authority and to follow any sources of funding as well as to avoid any actual social obligations in their work. What Laura Nader called "studying up" in anthropology – the study of power and how it works in attempts to hold it accountable – has now been defined by many anthropologists as "unethical" because it might lead to accountability and change of those who have power. Written law claims that this is a human right and a basic right in democratic societies, but I have found in my direct experience academics are now defining these basic rights as "unethical".

In many ways, what exists today in the place of social science is a set of "feel good" courses that do appear to pander to constituencies to reinforce political beliefs and identity (which in themselves are not "bad"). The problem is that in pandering, they offer these perspectives in place of social science rather than in improvements and applications to it. Meanwhile, they are not confronting many of those aspects of social science that they opposed; they are simply disengaging from it. By doing so, much of what continues as social science has gotten worse give the lack of engagement and confrontation.

In universities today there appear to be two parallel extremes within "social science" disciplines. The disciplines are in many ways more authoritarian (and, in my view, racist and genocidal) than they were in the colonial past, which is what my central article in this issue, on economics and its violations of international law, critiques, while trying to protect minority cultures, diversity and rights. Alongside this is a new set of representational "diversity" courses on "identity" that appear in social science in place of social science. In comparing the social sciences that I studied in the university some 20+ years ago with those taught today, I find that both extremes are much more pronounced and anti-science (anti-social science) while the "middle" between the extremes, that allowed me to study and ask social science questions and taught some social science methodologies, has largely disappeared. What we appear to have are more doctrinal and mathematical courses in economics and political science in support of globalization, industrialization, militarism, the national security state (courses in "terrorism and security studies" and "criminology and prison studies) with the destruction of minority cultures and eco-systems that it supports, on the one hand, with courses on "women's studies" and "ethnic studies" and "globalization" (and the evils of "capitalism") and "post-socialism" on the other. It is a full politicization in which students are subject to or allowed to choose their form of indoctrination, but without any actual

measurement, modeling, hypothesis testing, or application. The picture is not entirely bleak. Some of the gaps are being filled by departments like Environmental Biology and subjects like environmental economics, but that just reinforces the disarray.

My undergraduate major (at Yale) of “Economics and Political Science” that promised a return to social science questions and modeling has all but disappeared while the leading intellectuals in the field (Charles Lindblom and John Kenneth Galbraith among them) are no longer read and are immediately attacked when they are cited in current work, as part of an effort to make them disappear. That interdisciplinary approach of the past allowed for comparison of political-economic systems and for modeling them as “industrial states” and “mixed systems” while identifying variables to describe how they became what they were. It also allowed for applied courses within them on understanding the variables influencing policy processes (individual and institutional behaviors) as well as on the full array of policy choices and social contract/system design choices. These are now disappeared. Many of the majors that were interdisciplinary and applied social sciences like that one, “Economics and Political Science” (“Political Economy”), as well as the traditional “Legal Studies”/“Law and Society” that taught the building of legal institutions, constitutions, and the writing of progressive legislation and policies, no longer seems to exist or continue as something else (courses in identity for specific groups or dead end repetitions of ideology of “globalization” and “capitalism”). Yale’s “School of Organization and Management” that combined public policy schools, management and behavioral science also no longer exists in that form and has been replaced by a standard Business School.

In Political Science, instead of predictive models and tools for building participatory democracy and for improving society, most departments today list a range of new courses in “Terrorism Studies” and “Security Studies” and “Criminology”. Instead of social justice and social contract modeling, there is now “Criminal Justice”. The modeling has also become mathematical based on the assumption of “rational actors” despite the fact that political behaviors seem to be increasingly irrational (if not socially suicidal, and insane). One cannot model the behaviors of social suicide today in political science and have it reviewed. Neither those assumptions nor entire sets of variables can be studied or reviewed in political science journals. Political Science has also moved towards mathematics and towards area reporting rather than predictive modeling. An article in this issue by Polly Sly describes what is missing today in the discipline of Political Science and how the discipline seems to serve only elite interests.

What seems to have invaded Economics (and detached it from all of the variables of politics and culture) was a reinforcement of ideology and productivity and affirmation of greed in the “new” theories of “Trickle Down Economics” and the “Laffer Curve” that were promoted by corporate elites during the Reagan-Thatcher era of the 1980s. The models of public economics were replaced with “supply side” subsidies of the rich with the myth that it would help the poor. Instead of humanistic models and studies of reality and comparisons and predictions and alternative, utopian economies, economics became both a study of dogmas and a retreat to mathematics and engineering of questions of short-term productivity. “Society” in the study have economics has been reduced to a “constraint” or an abstraction that is commoditized as “social capital”.

In many disciplines, instead of getting better models and tools, what we have developed alongside the mathematics and the theologies and the narcissism is endless critique; first of the existing tools, then of the existence of tools themselves, then attacks on science, attacks on standards, attacks on measurement, attacks on law, attacks on anything constructive. There was “Critical Legal Studies” that attacked the idea of law as a tool for social change (one of the beliefs in the 1960s) and that offered the promise of some real world predictions of legal decisions and legal systems in continuing the social science of law established by the “legal realists” in the 1930s. Instead, however, it degenerated into story-telling and discourse analysis and deconstruction, coming from literary studies and turning the real world of law into literary studies of “narratives”. Similarly, there was “Critical Development Studies” that criticized all of the neo-colonial globalist “development” models and then made sure that there was nothing to replace it other than cynicism and “helping the poor” in ways that essentially colonized them and promoted exactly what was criticized. In offering “critique”, its goal was not to rebuild and offer a “constructive critique”

with predictions and models and understanding of deeper structures, but seems instead to have been to paralyze everything in endless debate and abstraction. There was “Critical Anthropology” and then “Critical Medical Anthropology”. The new “tools” were not to reconstruct what might have been wrong but only to “deconstruct” and destroy and expose and deride. By definition, a “critic” is someone who does not offer anything constructive. He/she simply acts to destroy others who do. These movements do not present “alternative theories”. They have been followed by “Feminist Critiques” (and “Feminist Economics”) and “Queer Studies Critiques” that are an endless stream of single variable, self-promoting approaches for “inclusion” such as “feminist economics”.

If one asks academics today what it is that they do and how they actually add value to their disciplines (or how they can even call what they do, “disciplines”) the answer is that they teach “critical thinking” and offer “explanations”. Social science attempted to explain human phenomenon by showing how variables could predict outcomes and then how understanding of such “laws” could promote progress and the human tradition. Today, social scientists no longer believe in natural “laws” of social behavior and they no longer seek to provide models that can offer predictions for anything beyond what is already known and common sense. What they do is “explain”, which means creating endless definitions that explain nothing. They see themselves as poets. They believe there is brilliance in their turning of phrases and perversion of languages but there is nothing behind it. They build their careers on creating new words. They are creating protective mystiques and walls to hide the emptiness of their work and their inability and unwillingness to predict or improve anything.

Theories offered in social science today are no longer hypotheses that can be tested. Instead, they are descriptive terms that can never be tested or applied (let alone understood), with endless case studies proving over and over again what is already known.

Rather than look for causes and structures, my colleagues use labels that have no measurable content and that cannot be used in any way as variables (“capitalism” and “imperialism” and “patriarchy”), on the one hand, and contemporary establishment political ideologies on the other (“post-socialism”). Rather than recognize and protect actual cultures and historic cultural identities of language and environments, they actually work to promote assimilation and the creation of preference identities that promote rootlessness (e.g., sexual identities, Internet identities, and other social groupings and identifications).

My colleagues’ “theories” are themselves largely attacks on science and reason, reinforcing the idea of great singularities of today that prevent any kind of scientific comparisons (“modernity” and “globalization”) that describe all contemporary events as impossible to compare to any other time because they are so “unique” that social science becomes irrelevant, or how (in citing authors like Foucault), everything is so interconnected including our consciousness, that no change is possible, and that everything is in the mind and “socially constructed” and that we can simply will anything we want to happen, or we can create “social movements” and “new consciousness”, such that social science and study of actual human behaviors are irrelevant.

My colleagues talk about social change and social movements in the social sciences but actually trying to apply academic teachings to human social progress, as defined under international law and agreed to in most countries, is also something that these academics religiously seem to avoid. When I ask them, why, they say that this is “social engineering” and that is for people (and militaries, and corporations, and criminal syndicates, and national security organizations, that are mostly beyond public control and that do such social engineering every day) to do “themselves” without any scientific work from scholars to use as guidance.

The social science and application that my colleagues now religiously oppose are not only stated goals of national and international laws. Such work is also part of the publicly chartered legal mission of universities and often in the stated missions of universities themselves. If social scientists do not seek to enact these obligations and serve as models of them and teach them and organize them, then who will and who does? Where is the morality? Where is the commitment to law? Where is the commitment to science? The answer is that today, all of these, including science, is just one of many “points of view” to be “critiqued”.

It seems that academics today, as a group, have built up defensive mechanisms and systems to eliminate discussions of their role and how they act in contradiction of their stated missions and stated political goals. My colleagues point to courses on single issues like “Human Rights” (but generally without teaching social contract drafting and enforcement) and “Peace Studies” (without much in the way of prediction or applications), and “Global Studies” (but not comparative empires and predictions and mechanisms), and all of the representational identity courses as the basis for any questioning of the actual academic quality, disciplinary basis, and real-world impact of these courses, claiming that any questioning of their approach is an assault on “progress” and “turn back the clock” even when the purpose is to actually promote the goals they claim.

The lesson of this special issue is that to stay within an academic environment today and to do any social science, one essentially has to publish it oneself and create the infrastructure for doing it oneself. The mainstream of university disciplines of “social science” today allows only the anti-science “critical debates”, the invention of jargon and case studies of the obvious, joining the circus of endless, useless noise, while producing “empirical work” as a form of journalistic reporting or bean counting using any new media and measurement technology that one chooses.

Mechanisms of Political (Political Economic) Influence over Academia, Impacting the Social Sciences

Although none of the articles in this special issue focuses directly on the mechanisms of the changes that have occurred in society to dismantle social science, there is a good question that needs to be raised in this issue of why even public universities, with both public funding and student tuition payments do not demand social sciences that promote the long-term public good and are content with just symbolism that lacks contact. I raise this question here for a brief discussion since it is this kind of public pressure that is needed to help rebuild social science.

Private universities increasingly rely on corporate donations and alumni donations and they are responsive to businesses and elites so they do not have the necessary incentives to promote public social science that serves long-term public interests, even though they are public chartered. It seems clear that they would favor corporate benefitting scientific research and the arts while stifling those disciplines that might lead to social progress. But what has cut the link within public universities?

The answer may be in the overall corporatization of the political process and the disempowerment of citizens as consumers, but other control mechanisms seem to be at work over faculty advancement and research. Public oversight over most forms of government spending also seems to have been weakened and the university may be just another example.

In the 1960s and 1970s, in the U.S., there was a feedback on private funding between the new middle class minorities who rose on the basis of their own businesses (medical clinics, law firms, small businesses) and whose taxes and contributions also filled government treasuries for building a new and more open society. The Cold War largely channeled funds in the U.S. for military competition and imperialism, but there was also an element of national development through social welfare and solidarity as well as the goal of winning hearts and minds globally with the example of more inclusive and beneficial policies. The better-off the population, the more funds they could offer. This set of incentives, however, seems to now be broken, with the goal of continued transfers to the elite and social control rather than public investment. Without the incentives for public benefit and with the direct linkages, the result is to destroy the institutions that had promoted such benefit. The incentive system in place today seems perverse and self-destructive.

In general, tuition payments are partly a direct market control of consumer sovereignty over the university and what it teaches, but these mechanisms today seem to work only for specific technical skill training (and increasingly in “private business model” colleges and universities), with student demand working only to promote courses as entertainment rather than long-term public benefit. The cost of libraries, laboratories, and quality teaching with close student contact is too high for “the market” to work on its own without public oversight. Education must be public subsidized and overseen as a transfer to

future generations, and this is where the link is broken. Government funding to meet public needs for solutions to social problems and future needs has been cut. Research has been moved to think tanks or it is subservient only to specific state and non-state powers: the military, the national security state, and corporations. Public oversight has become that of corporate boards that eliminate long-term measures and direct public concerns.

If private universities can now be bought by commercial interests and have an incentive to destroy social science and social progress, it may be that public universities are unable to fill the gap. Their mission appears to be increasingly limited to teaching and to government supported research for the benefit of the same corporate industries that influence state governments and the concerns that influence national government (military research, information collection rather than social benefit applications, national security and prisons.)

In the global economy today, tax laws have allowed for accumulation of vast amounts of wealth for specific industries in a concentrated “winner-take-all” economy of large financial institutions, military technology companies, the prison state, non-renewable energy sources that are subsidized by specific policies and military and police spending (on behalf of oil and coal companies), the pharmaceutical industry, and entertainment industry. The funds that are available to go back into universities are largely serving these interests rather than any public interests. Since the funding is largely for short-term destructive or exploitative industries rather than for products of immediate public benefit, and the policies that promote the funding are global rather than community or nationally based, university funding also reflects these priorities. Much of it seems to also promote narcissism of specific groups that have benefitted from entering this elite power structure (co-opted minorities and women) or who can be co-opted into believing that their interests are being met through this “representation” that replaces social science.

Only a few weeks ago, in my field of anthropology, I saw an advertisement for a newly created position in anthropology in a nonsense subfield that undermines the discipline but that was seriously being promoted by the University of Copenhagen. The subfield is called “corporate anthropology”. This is an example of what is happening and how businesses are not only introducing their concerns but how they have fundamentally distorted social science disciplines into nonsense that undermines the very definitions and subject of study of disciplines. Indeed, there is already a field of business management. Anthropology studies culture and human adaptations, not product markets. But anthropologists do study people, so a Danish business has found that it was able to co-opt the discipline and fund a position for someone who would study markets to strengthen Denmark’s corporate business interests. The university agreed. Indeed, “Anthropology of Bureaucracy” and “Corporate Anthropology” is now an emerging field in the corporate dominated university in the corporate state. The discipline of anthropology is stripped of its questions but its methodologies are co-opted for use by elites. This is the new business of social science.

Similarly, it is not unusual today to see advertisements for social scientists that require scholars to bring research projects and funding with them and to see anthropologists working for assimilation of peoples rather than for cultural protection, and for studies of specific needs that should be work done by public agencies outside the university. The result is now replacing science and social science technology development inside the public university.

At the upper levels of the university, the concept of University President as statesman or stateswoman and spokesperson for humanity has similarly been replaced with the concept of University President as fundraiser and business manager and this is what is visible in advertisements for these positions. Although the top research universities opened positions of President and Provost to women, and minorities, the background is increasingly that of economist fundraiser. The role of the President has increasingly been one of sycophant to donors and cost-cutter for the new corporate university.

The university that became the leader in building its endowment in the U.S. was Stanford and the way it did it was in fact by creating a linkage to death, though it is usually not described so openly and directly with those words. The recent history of Stanford is that University Provost and Political Science

Professor Condoleezza Rice solicited funds from military companies and alumni working in war industries. Then, as National Security Advisor and Secretary of State under President Bush, her decisions provided those companies with the benefits: tax money for an illegal war in Iraq, money for prisons and new forms of torture, and policies sending Americans to their death to support the interests of oil companies. The U.S. did not prosecute her under international law. Nor did anyone in the state of California seek to use the RICO (the racketeering statute) designed for prosecuting such financial coordination. Nor did the university challenge her return to teach others how to do the same. Though Stanford University is a publicly chartered institution and keeping a professor like Rice on its staff is likely in violation of its charter, there has been no effort to revoke Stanford's charter (Bugliosi, 2008).

In addition to the direct financial and political influences over the university, the control of research agendas seems to be working through other mechanisms. The corporatization of publishing, including the university presses, has also been part of the use of the "market", both overtly and covertly, to transform social science into reporting and entertainment. As the major corporate presses began to merge and consolidate the industry and as book sales also became controlled through vertically integrated channels (book store shelf space sold directly to corporate publishers, assuring no space for new entrants), this pressure has fed back directly on academia.

In order to commercially "compete", university presses have changed their publishing strategy from one of offering new works in small niches that would open the door for progress, to seeking only books that already had a "mass market" appeal. The vetting process on academic books began to include new criteria that were commercial rather than actual quality "peer review". Presses now ask whether proposed books already have markets of captive students (whether the professor could ensure purchase by extorting students of a large lecture course) or whether there are enough colleagues who would go along with assigning or promoting the book. While, theoretically, the public should be able to influence study of social science through the market (and there are examples of this in studies of sustainability and collapse by authors like the human geographer, Jared Diamond, whom the public, including this author, seems to love but many academics refuse to acknowledge), many of these "market" decisions actually fail to test public interest and value at all. The criteria are generally whether there is a mass market or whether the majority of scholars might use the book as a text, thus shutting out much new work of merit.

The impacts are obvious. More books became group written, as those of multiple authors or textbooks, like those in the Soviet Union were, to ensure a single line and multiple stake in the book. To compete in the "mass market", more academic books became entertainment. Titles and topics are increasingly sexualized and sensationalized. Without new ideas, the focus on the books became one of presenting "new" facts, to compete against journalistic and area reporting accounts. This has begun to turn books into journalism, entertainment, advocacy and narcissism. Cost cutting measures have also turned books into cookie cutter lengths and formats to assure that they fit a common mold that would "sell" without raising the costs of publication.

The vetting process also appears to work to ensure a prior censorship. Publishers now refuse to ensure authors against the new approach by corporations to censor criticism. In the U.S., the courts are now open to "strike suits" and "SLAPP" suits (strategic lawsuits against prior publication) designed to threaten authors and publishers simply by creating nuisance and costs. The result has been to prevent publishers from critiquing business or government support for an emerging corporate oligarchy.

What happened at the level of book publishing appears to have been pushed down to the level of academic journals, as well. Behind claims of "space limitations", the length of articles in academic journals has been constantly reduced, with editors always claiming that the fault is with publishers. In applied anthropology, in the two major journals of the field (*Practicing Anthropology* and *Anthropology in Action*), the situation has reached such an extreme that articles are in fact no more than sound-bytes of 3,000 words and there is no room for letters to the editor or debates, and little even for book reviews. The standard length in most other journals is now only 8,000 to 10,000 words.

Although some authors in areas of fiction have now used self-publishing and the Internet to promote new works through clever marketing schemes that could occasionally break through the barriers,

academic publishing is limited because academic authors are seeking “legitimacy” for their work and careers through the publishing process, rather than seek a market. This legitimacy has tended to enforce political and ideological controls. Of course, it was possible to try to create an “Authors’ Collective” as a publisher and to open up space on the Internet. (In the 1990s, I tried with some colleagues to start a cooperative academic press.) It would have been easy to undersell the commercial presses. But academics are not entrepreneurial. My experience is that they are afraid to take this risk. The reason may also be the way that career advancement is still controlled.

Most advancement in research universities today is subject to a measurement process that has little or nothing to do with actual contribution to social science or to public value of work. Although there are no standards used today for measuring social science breakthroughs or values to the public, there are measures of prestige that academics establish for themselves. What the social science associations do is arbitrarily establish rankings of certain “prestige” journals. They also establish ranks on the basis of “citations” of work. They call these rankings “impact factors”.

Journals that have “high impact” values are those that are run by corporate publishers, sold at high prices, and unavailable to those without major resources. Internet journals, even at universities, like this one, that are open access and available to practitioners and readers throughout the world, for free, have zero impact. Journals that have space constraints, favor short articles, have academics at the corporate funded private universities and that offer little diversity or application, have high value in these ratings. Journals that are open to new ideas and applications and that have no restrictions, and where you can potentially do actual social science have no value in these ratings.

Many universities internationally now openly use these ranking systems in hiring (particularly the United Kingdom but some other countries that seek scholars and wish to rise in the “rankings”). Most others seem to do so on an informal basis. This is how they exert social control over scholars and the disciplines. In order to remain in the field, academics must publish in certain identified journals and in order to publish in those journals academics must agree to their ideologies, their decisions on methodologies, on variables, and on length. In my field of anthropology, it may be impossible today to publish social science in any of these major journals. The length requirements alone make it impossible to establish and test an hypothesis and offer comparative data. The requirements for citations to the literature also make it impossible to offer anything new since all of the space is taken up simply discussing theory and defending the right to simply offer a new idea, let alone present it.

Almost certainly, this special issue was unable to attract the articles it sought because academics knew that by publishing in *Catalyst*, they would not get the “credit” needed to advance their careers, let alone jeopardize them by offering a constructive critique and challenges. The same pressures also made it difficult to find reviewers of pieces to sure academic peer review, as I describe below in the next section.

Prospects for Change and the Role this Issue Can Play as a Catalyst

I have hope that public/market pressures and the new technology of electronic open-access publishing like this journal, will ultimately lead to a return to public benefit social science.

Social science has been in a downward spiral for a long time but I believe that economic and social realities will ultimately force it to wake up. For a long time, students have flocked to courses and work that pander to identities and that offer them something easy and fun. They believed that they could simply enter the job market with a degree but without real skills other than a few journalistic skills, without social science and that companies will invest in training programs while selecting them on their ideologies and contacts, alone. As they find themselves entering the labor market without real skills or perspectives that the social sciences could provide, and as current companies are unable to provide them with work, students will continue to abandon the current approaches and demand more.

The rise of fields like environmental studies and geography is already partly a recognition that social sciences today are bankrupt and that other departments must start to fill the gap. Increasingly, not only students but the public in its funding will start to demand results again from social science on problems of

human concern: accountability of public and private institutions to citizens, social equity, safeguarding of rule of law, demilitarization, planning for sustainability, demilitarization, and other issues of human concern. We will need real social science to achieve it, not just ideologies and definitions and slogans.

It is the goal of this special issue to partly serve as that catalyst.

The Difficulty of Trying to Challenge the System and Rebuild: The Process of Putting Together this Special Issue

Putting together this issue required more work than I had imagined or was led to believe when I agreed to take it on. That also led me to a deeper understanding of how academic publishing and review processes operate today to vet ideas on the basis of ideology in a way that undermines science and scholarship.

In an open and free society and one that claims to follow principles of scientific procedures of open scientific debate, there would not only be open forums for substantive critical work and essays, but disciplines would be open to such constructive criticism and change. They would openly inform colleagues of the existence of such discussions and would assist in welcoming such articles as well as fulfilling the needs of the profession for free. Scholars would feel free to critique their professions as a way to improve them as well as to meet professional and public obligations. Scholars would offer time for reviews and would follow guidelines for review procedures.

In practice, none of that seems to hold true. The pecking order of professional associations in the social sciences and of their journals appears to serve to reinforce common beliefs, to promote conflicts of interest with benefits for the public and students, and to prevent any real discussion and debate. Even where a journal like this one, at a recognized public university, offers the forum for such discussion, there are already numerous obstacles.

Below, I discuss four of the areas in which this special issue faced barriers of:

- *Outreach*: Informing colleagues that this journal even exists and that submissions and other forms of participation were welcome was itself an obstacle.
- *Finding Submissions from Authors able to Offer Critiques and Solutions*: Finding colleagues willing and able to offer critiques and solutions seems to go completely against the training and incentives of scholars today whose thinking is within “the box” and engaged in ritual advocacy of “argument” rather than modeling and real solutions. There seems to be plenty of “wash” (“green wash”, “rights wash”) that mentions public problems and measures them, but little of the actual critical thinking and constructive solutions that the disciplines all claim is their reason for being.
- *Finding Colleagues Willing to Perform the Expected Professional Service of Peer Review for a Journal that Offers No Pay and No Status to Advance their Personal Interests*: In a society where valuation is based on status and wealth, scholars themselves seem to be driven only by those incentives rather than by any sense of duty or mission or love for scholarship and the profession. Finding reviewers who can apply standards rather than use peer review as a political tool against colleagues and who are trained to promote ideas rather than just enforce self-interested consensus, seems almost impossible.
- *Protecting Academic Freedom*:

Difficulties of Outreach

Most journals already have a steady stream of articles from a group of colleagues. Special issues often are the result of publishing conference papers and serving a group of colleagues who promote their work together. That was far from the case for this special issue that started from scratch. To seek authors and reviewers, I personally sent a call for outreach to 15 professional associations including those in the U.S. and Europe, across the five social science disciplines and general social science associations, as well as relevant sub-disciplines. Several of these were eager to publicize the call for articles on their listserves. Others agreed to post on web pages to members. There was no way to check whether all of these actually

went out. All of these were new contacts. *Catalyst* did not have any such existing infrastructure for contact and outreach. I had to construct it. I thought it would be easy and that promoting disciplines and creating opportunities for scholars to publish and debate would be welcome. It partly was, but there was also a strong block of opposition that shocked me and that I view as a professional ethical responsibility to report here.

Overall, only two thirds of the associations agreed to publicize this outreach (10 of 15)^{vi}. The fact that there were refusals at all astonished me. What, after all, is the function of disciplinary membership societies if not to promote academic exchange and inform members of professional opportunities including publication? The answer is that for many of these associations of scholars, the mission appears to be something else: to promote the perspectives of a small group of scholars within each association to set the (religious) canon of the association.

I asked the head of the Association for Psychological Sciences if he could explain his “psychology” in refusing outreach to members of the association and I have his permission to use his response here:

Dear Dr. Lempert,

[I]t is settled APS policy. The reasons for it appear to me obvious. Every day, I get calls for submissions, offers to edit special issues, etc, from new journals I never heard of. If APS were to accept calls for papers from non-APS journals, they would likely become very numerous and vetting them very tedious.

Sincerely,

Randy Gallistel^{vii}

I offered the following rebuttal to the APS Board and received no response, though I requested one and offered to publish it.

Dear Dr. Gallistel:

Your critique of open information and of vetting is, in my view, a condemnation of the scientific method itself which relies at its core on debating new ideas that have "never [been] heard of" and "vetting them" according to some standard other than simply being known to a small group. That "very tedious" process is the essence of science and the core of the idea of discipline and objective review. The idea of a policy being set by administrators and being "settled" without the possibility of review is the very definition of a religious belief that cannot change, rather than science, which is always open to being improved. Certainly you could task your administrators to screen legitimate calls for submissions from journals from those that are not (in our case it is easily done since we are based at the University of Tennessee and are open access without any fees of any kind to authors, unlike many long-standing journals backed by commercial publishers).

Best,

David

Difficulties of Appropriate Submissions from Authors Willing to Engage in Debate

Though I am proud and happy of the articles that are presented in this issue, the small number of submissions, the lack of submissions in certain disciplines, and the lack of topicality of some of the submissions that were received also shocked me. I thought that opening the door to a healthy debate that I know members of the public and undergraduates agree with, would result in a large number of pieces. My conclusion from the response that included some not published pieces (that I found narrow and somewhat narcissistic) is that academics today are simply not rewarded for and not trained for any real critical thinking or for actual solutions. The structure of academia today also seems to create a situation where academics do not have the inclination or time to do any deep thinking and where work is reduced to journalistic blog and repetition that gets dashed off.

Catalyst received draft articles from only five authors and discussion of article ideas from three other authors. Aside from articles published here from Brooks Duncan and Polly Sly, that were sent in draft and that covered two of the social sciences beyond my piece on Economics, the other draft articles were mostly evidence of what is wrong in social science.

- One of the articles was from an undergraduate, attacking social science rather than supporting it. In other words, the piece was exactly the opposite of the purpose of the special issue. Apparently, the author was in a class where the professor was promoting attacks on social science and encouraging authors to join in the attacks.
- Another article was from a graduate student, writing in the area of Queer Studies and calling for a new social science that would serve the agenda of gay rights. We discussed the article and the fit with the theme. The author withdrew the piece in recognition that promoting an interest group agenda was not correcting the problem he identified in social science but was just offering a different way of politicizing disciplines.
- A third author, also an early career scholar, sent a paper about two political philosophers in the early 20th century. The piece had no linkages to contemporary issues of social science and no ideas for remaking social science.

Three other pieces potentially fit the theme but needed work and only one of the three, the piece on Kathleen Levinstein on applied behavioral analysis, is published here, after joint work to produce it in publishable form. It seemed that this was the first time that the authors were able to freely address such themes.

- One piece focused on “Critical Medical Anthropology” as an example of “Critical Studies” approaches that have come to paralyze and politicize social sciences. What happened is described below.
- A Political Scientist was eager to write about the detachment of his discipline from environmental variables that led to an inability to predict or offer value in areas of sustainability and environment. After months of waiting and nearly a dozen letters, suggestions and offers of help from my end with promises from the author, the piece simply never materialized.
- Dr. Levinstein, a practitioner in social work sought to address the entrance of religious and ideological based treatments for genetic conditions like Autism in ways that abandoned science and caused harm. You can read that piece in the issue.

Writing these pieces did not come naturally to the authors. Even with considerable guidance, the author of the piece on Critical Medical Anthropology (CMA) was unable (or unwilling) to focus on how this approach had been able to enter her discipline, what systems or procedures had failed, and how they could be improved. Rather than follow direction, she produced what was, itself, in my view, a “theoretical critique” of “theoretical critique” (CMA). In my view, as an outsider, she was indoctrinated into approaches of abstract theory without science only felt comfortable producing the very thing she was criticizing. It seemed that the “theology” of disciplines had so penetrated them that perhaps academics could not even realize it. Another potential explanation is that the author did realize the contradiction but did not submit a critique for reasons of professional advancement. If academic advancement today is dependent on publishing (nonsensical) theory in specific journals and the ability of young scholars to keep their jobs depends on doing so, there is reason why scholars would not want to publish “essays” in this journal; particularly ones that criticize people in their field who could influence their ability to earn their livelihoods. In fact, I sought the author’s help in finding graduate students who could take her idea and turn it into a piece that would fit this journal, with whatever credit she would have liked for offering the idea. She declined. I then began a search for graduate students, again through outreach to professional associations, who would be guaranteed publication of an article in this journal that was being “commissioned” to provide material on this topic, with the suggested title, “Social Scientists as Modern Witch Doctors: Fighting ‘Evil Spirits’ of ‘Structural Violence’ and ‘Capitalism’ in Medical Anthropology instead of the Causes of Disease”. In looking for graduate students, the only two potential takers were two students who actually wanted to write on the opposite position, in which they had been trained; attacking social science.

There were no suggestions of any other pieces such as book reviews or essays.

Finding academics who would agree to provide “response articles” to my piece on “Is Economics in Violation of International Law?” also proved to be nearly impossible. This was despite the promise to authors of a light peer review that would mostly be a copy edit, with guaranteed publication and protection of whatever approach the authors wished to take. Two pieces that were offered, by Ugo Mattei and Peter Söderbaum appear in this issue but the process of finding authors took months and left a track of numerous broken promises from scholars.

Overall, I approached more than 20 scholars and practitioners to contribute to this issue, believing that they would welcome the invitation and would all have a professional interest in the topic and conclusions of my article. Of these, six never even responded^{viii}. Two scholars offered what I understood were clear promises to write pieces but then never produced them after months of correspondence^{ix}. Two other scholars seemed by their responses to be interested in producing pieces but then simply “disappeared” and did not continue correspondence^x. I received polite refusals from several^{xi}. I also approached a number of faculty members within the University of Tennessee, itself, where this journal is based, but found no one with both expertise and interest in the topic.

Difficulties in Peer Review Processes

Every article in this issue, including this Introduction, has undergone two academic peer reviews in fulfillment of *Catalyst’s* policies of constructive peer review, and every article has been reworked by its authors following receipt of review comments but finding reviewers for a publication that most never heard of proved to be almost impossible. *Catalyst* has no current list of reviewers who were able or committed to review the material in this special issue, which meant searching and outreach again through professional associations.

Review processes don’t work easily. Few scholars today feel committed to do them. And when they do, they often seek to push self-interest, rather than to actually review the work. Several academics approached for reviews reported the conflict of interest that they faced in reviewing articles for this issue in a simple omission: “funding for my profession would be endangered”. Few scholars jumped at the chance out of expression of concern was for society and for the advancement of knowledge and that their interest was in doing things better and considering criticisms as the basis for improvement, though a very small number, whom I was thankful to find, did.

As Robert Keohane, a renowned emeritus Political Scientist wrote, candidly, “The scholars I know publish well-known journals and would not see the refereeing task ... as priorities for them”^{xii}. Typically, academics responded to my request by noting that there were “working on a book” (what academic isn’t?, and many of these were retirees who were free of teaching responsibilities) or, for those better known, “on a book tour”. There is no professional “pro bono” obligation for academics beyond the line that it offers academics on their c.v.

Protecting the Academic Freedom of the Issue against Outside Interference

In establishing the groundwork for this special issue, I took great pains to protect authors and academic freedom, well beyond the usual claimed protections (that I believe do not work today). I went so far as to establish a contract with the editor of *Catalyst* to ensure that I would be able to protect opinions as I saw fit. The stipulation was that anything the (outgoing) editor of *Catalyst* disagreed with or others disagreed with, they would have the opportunity to debate in the following issue to this one. The only protection that I sought for this was “discussion” with me and the authors of articles criticized in order to assure fairness (with an implied opportunity to respond) and no personal or libelous attacks.

Unlike almost all professional journals, *Catalyst* was also particularly well suited for protecting free speech since its host (up to and including this issue) was the University of Tennessee’s “Research and Creative Exchange” unit (TRACE). Rather than being a for-profit commercial publisher or an academic publisher subject to financial concerns and pressures, *Catalyst* was operating essentially as a library archive, but an electronic one. As an archive, it offered the same kind of free speech as a book-shelf.

Authors are simply placing their books on the shelf. *Catalyst* acts just to highlight particular works on the shelf by organizing them by themes and offering some kind of “review” to suggest a higher quality. This approach is relatively free of any direct pressures.

The contract that I prepared for this special issue sought to assure these protections would remain for the production of the issue and through any transitions of *Catalyst* in the future.

The review process that I established for articles was to put them on different tracks with different review obligations. Prior to my doing so, *Catalyst* had no specific review standards. The editor agreed that my piece on Economics would not undergo a “blind” peer review since it would serve as the basis of the issue’s “forum”. Instead, the editor would offer suggestions for improving it and reviewers, whom I would select, would offer suggestions for improvement while also having the option to present publishable “Commentaries”.

For any pieces that were “scientific”, I would seek an expert review process to assure the accurate use of methodologies and factual accuracy of the piece, including knowledge of the field. There are no such pieces in this issue.

For all other pieces that are “essays”, the process was to fully protect the opinions of the author. Some pieces, like this introduction, would not need to merit review. Others, that are considered thematic essays that offer critiques and proposals, would only be subject to reviews of statements for factual accuracy and accuracy of any use of methodologies. All of the conclusions and proposals would be the free speech of the authors. The only role that I took was that of a copy editor. I made sure that all articles addressed the theme, that they had a context to make them intelligible to readers of several disciplines, and that they offered logical arguments. I offered some troubleshooting and recommendations for improving the presentations and arguments.

Despite this process and the protections, there were still attempts to stop this issue that I mention here only to note this as a factual matter. The result of that was to eliminate a category of essays that I had originally hoped would appear in this issue as simple opinion pieces, written in plain English, without extensive footnotes. As editor, I would have been happy with three of the articles that now appear in this issue, in their original forms in styles that were less academic and shorter. The articles by Kelly Levinstein, by Brooks Duncan (on “The Quiet Purge of Jews in Social Science”) and by Polly Sly, are now longer, heavily footnoted academic essays. In my view, critical essays in academia are subject to a double standard that requires much heavier footnoting than pieces that represent a “common wisdom” and protect existing practices and ideologies. Ultimately, these three articles are now much “stronger” than their original form. The authors and I are happy with the current form that bolsters and solidly grounds their views. On the other hand, it came at the expense of additional uncompensated time and effort.

Of course, all respectful debates and disagreements are welcomed in future issues, with the hope that I and other authors in this issue will also be welcome to respond.

Protecting free speech is costly and rule of law in the United States today is, apparently, not very strong.

Part III:
Introducing the Contents of this Special Issue

The normal role of an introduction is to ground the format of the issue in an overall context and to introduce the history and content of the issue in a way that shows the links between the pieces on a common theme. In doing so here, I offer a slightly annotated version of the Table of Contents that shows where this issue fits in the enterprise of critiquing and rebuilding the social sciences as a whole and individually (the core social sciences) followed by some highlighting of the importance and history of particular articles that I am proud to publish as part of this special issue.

What This Special Issue Does to Advance the Agenda of “Rebuilding Social Science”:

The Table of Contents of this Issue is produced here, for reference, in the body of this article, as a prelude to discussion of the content.

This issue is organized into three different sections.

- The goal of the first section, The General Problems of Social Science Today, is to present some systemic problems in social sciences and the universities today in a general way. The first parts of this introduction partly create that context as do two pieces by Brooks Duncan; one that is a bit of a satirical look on changes in the social sciences and the second that focuses on the transformation of social sciences into repositories for “representation” quota filling in the universities in place of the problem-solving mission of social science. Kathleen Levinstein’s essay offers a case study of the corruption of social science for specific profit ends. In this way, the section highlights some of the influences from outside social science disciplines that have distorted their missions.

- The second section, Failures of the Core Social Sciences, moves to specific critiques of the content and teachings of the main social sciences at different levels: Sociology (at the societal level), Anthropology (at the cultural level), and the three “functional” categories within cultures and societies of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology (at the level of socialization), and then Psychology (individual level). Note that for this issue, there are only critiques of two of the disciplines: Economics (my piece, that also touches on the field of Economic Anthropology, with two response articles) and Political Science, by Polly Sly. The articles here offer critiques as well as alternatives to describe the appropriate questions (content) and methods (scientific method and then specific methodologies) and applications, as well as the appropriate relations of these disciplines to humanities.

- A third section, Structural Solutions to the Rebuilding of Social Sciences, focuses on the kinds of procedural and institutional mechanisms that are needed to rebuild disciplines to hold them to their missions as disciplines. This section offers one of my pieces on safeguarding objectivity in academic review processes. In this section, I also call for the promotion of missing academic debate through the revival of forums like “Letters to the Editor” and offer a sample such letter that currently disappears from debate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS, ANNOTATED

INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE: FROM THE EDITOR

Foreword: The Death of Social Sciences in an Era of Multicultural Corporatism
(‘Neo-Liberalism’): With Efforts at Resuscitation [This article]
David Lempert

THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF SOCIAL SCIENCES TODAY

Short Statements of the Problem in the Social Sciences:

1. Professor Rip Van Winklestein Applies for a Teaching Job
... to Find His Discipline has Disappeared
Brooks Duncan
2. The Quiet Purge of Jews in Social Science
Brooks Duncan

Short Essay on Problems in Social Sciences:

3. *Psychology*: Distorting Psychology and Science at the Expense of Joy
Human Rights Violations against Human Beings with Autism by Applied Behavioral
Analysis
Kathleen Levinstein

FAILURES OF THE CORE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Major Articles on the Core Social Sciences:

- ?. *Sociology (Mass Society)*: [Welcome for Future Issues]
- ?. *Anthropology* [Welcome for Future Issues]
4. *Economics*: Is Economics in Violation of International Law
Remaking Economics as a Social Science
 - a) Introduction: The Inspiration and Need for this Piece
 - b) Part I: Is Economics in Violation of International Law?
 - c) Part II: Is there a Current Social Science of Economics in Economics or Elsewhere?
 - d) Part III: The Rebuilding Process for the Discipline: Where Economics Fits
 - e) Part IV: The Challenge of Institutional and Cultural Change in Academia*David Lempert*
5. Response: An Ecological Economist’s View: *Peter Söderbaum*
6. Response: An International Legal Scholar’s View: *Ugo Mattei*
7. *Political Science*: The Nonsense and Non-Science of Political Science
A Politically Incorrect View of ‘Poly-T(r)icks’
Polly Sly

?. *Sociology (Socialization Process)*: [Welcome for Future Issues]

?. *Psychology*: [Welcome for Future Issues]

STRUCTURAL SOLUTIONS FOR REBUILDING SOCIAL SCIENCES

Tools: Return to Objective Standards in place of Political Ones

8. Returning Discipline to the Discipline
A Model Procedure for Reviews in Anthropology, Social Sciences, and other Related
Disciplines
David Lempert
9. *Letters to the Editor: Resurrecting this Historic Section*
Redefining Anthropology? *David Lempert*

Introduction to Articles in This issue and History of Each Article:

I take a special pride in this issue for the courage of its authors, for the careful and insightful critiques and for focusing on mechanisms and solutions. In my view, these characteristics are all too rare in academic work today. Were it not for this journal, many of the perspectives presented here on modern societies including the U.S., would simply disappear altogether.

Below are some ideas that I wish to highlight about the different articles that appear in this issue, in their order of appearance.

THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF SOCIAL SCIENCES TODAY

Short Statements of the Problem in the Social Sciences:

1. Professor Rip Van Winklestein Applies for a Teaching Job
... to Find His Discipline has Disappeared
Brooks Duncan

Maybe not everyone remembers, or young people no longer read Washington Irving's story of "Rip Van Winkle" that is part of the early Dutch-American folk lore of "New Amsterdam" (New York) and the Hudson River. Duncan has taken this charming tale and transformed it into modern day, with the difference being that Duncan did not simply take too much to drink and head off to snooze for two decades. In Duncan's view, it is the opposite. The academics he satirizes apparently went into a snooze, or a long, generational denial for two decades, while Duncan was forced to abandon his professional love and calling and to go into a kind of professional and international exile. He apparently made good use of his twenty years and did not give up.

What Duncan is revealing is not really the bankruptcy of contemporary disciplines, but how they both champion their anti-intellectualism and use it as a means of exploiting the very groups they claim to serve by training generations of students who are sensitive to problems of discrimination and inequality, but who learn little in the way of substantive skills to do anything about them in the courses on these topics. Students and communities are paying for expensive book-learning and are receiving degrees leaving them in debt and unable to make much headway on social problems at all.

In the past, when social science began to focus on solutions to social problems on both a global and local scale, social science disciplines partly demonstrated value to the public as a basis for funding. Social scientists were involved in community affairs and the university was beginning to integrate itself with community needs. Today, with social sciences serving as "representation" and diversion from focusing on social needs and directly addressing them, the funding is in a downward spiral with the only community return being the free labor of students as "interns" and "clinical practitioners" to replace services that are no longer funded at professional levels (legal services, education, and social welfare rather than prisons). Moreover, forces seem to act to ensure that disciplines remain cut off from reality and from the direct constituents of funding: community and students seeking specific skills. Instead, the university is increasingly linked to corporations, government and wealthy private donors who have little interest in either social change or community needs and do not wish for the universities to challenge their structures of authority. Faculty, like Duncan, who try to break this link and re-establish accountability to communities are apparently censured and purged from the ranks.

To keep themselves afloat in this pernicious distortion of funding and incentives, social science disciplines have often turned into pyramid schemes. To justify salaries, they need to attract paying students and graduate students. But since they cannot attract students by demonstrating real benefits in the community or real skills, they need to attract students on another basis. To do that, Duncan suggests that they are pandering to interest groups with courses on identity politics that are forms of narcissism without skills and practical application, and they transform their courses into entertainment in ways that offer public relations and savings to university managers without any quality. In Duncan's view, they

offer vague promises of future benefits and employment without any real measures and with no accountability. This is a downward spiral as the quality of teaching and research continues to fall to new lows and, in fact, to absurdity that Duncan satirizes.

Dr. Duncan's bittersweet satire on what has happened had, he reports, no place in any existing academic journals or in political essay publications that have mostly disappeared. I am happy to offer a platform for that voice here in this issue.

2. The Quiet Purge of Jews in Social Science *Brooks Duncan*

Duncan's piece on "The Quiet Purge of Jews" is highly controversial both, he reports, in the Jewish community and among academics. If Duncan is correct, the quota filling goals of universities in some of the social sciences have replaced Jews, this one minority that had a history of working for humanitarian concerns in the social sciences and that fought prejudices with structural solutions to benefit all groups, with academics today who are chosen on the basis of "representation" and simply promote discussions of their own groups at the expense of the disciplines and their ability to have real impact on social issues. These implications of this article are fascinating and terrifying at the same time.

Duncan omits in his article any discussion of a key legal case on discrimination that was raised to the U.S. Supreme Court nearly fifty years ago, that is known by most rights lawyers in the U.S. It is almost as if Duncan is proving predictions made by that case. The case was brought in 1971 to challenge affirmative action policies of admissions at the law school of the University of Washington, in Seattle. Law school applicant Marco De Funis, who was Jewish, sued the University for discrimination and his lawyers warned that the U.S. was entering a new era of discrimination that would work directly against Jews. The case was *DeFunis v. Odegaard*, that reached the Supreme Court in 1974, around the era of a similar case of *Bakke v. University of California*. The Supreme Court did not decide it, avoiding the issue on the pretext that DeFunis had used the three years that the courts let go by, to get into another law school. What is important about the DeFunis case is that DeFunis, despite the sound of his name was not a "white" man challenging a "minority" hire. DeFunis was Jewish, but affirmative action meant that Jews were to face a new kind of discrimination that would classify them as "white" or "overrepresented" in much the same way that Eastern Europeans had purged Jews in the 20th century to reduce them in professions like law down to 1 or 2% to reflect their percentage in the population. De Funis' lawyers said it would only be a matter of time before affirmative action would be used to eliminate Jews from certain professions that they excelled in, on the grounds of "correcting" discrimination. DeFunis is now dead and his case is forgotten. This issue is now swept under the rug. Duncan lifts up that rug.

Duncan's article is important because it gets beyond knee-jerk "political correctness" in regards to affirmative action and examines the actual social goals of "representation" to try to promote those goals effectively, in solidarity with them, rather than attack. The claim for affirmative action was that the entrance of minorities (and women) into certain professions would not only create greater opportunity overall in society, but that it would also bring new perspectives that would revitalize the professions at all levels. For example, "Eco-feminism" offered a challenge to the patriarchy and the ushering in of a society that would be more peaceful, more equitable, and more in tune with nature. The idea of multiculturalism was that it would foster social science that focused on solutions to public problems, greater accountability, transparency, and experimentation. But what if the opposite occurred? What if the newly entered minorities and women, instead, just copied the abuses of authority that they had criticized and merely became "tokens" or figureheads who were co-opted by that system and were in line with all of its negative features and were simply a new part of authority protecting their own power? What if the goal of allowing greater diversity in those disciplines and professions that could actually change society and change the structures of power was actually to co-opt or neutralize it? What if the process of "inclusion" was also a process of destruction and oppression in which minorities were now part of these goals? These are the questions that Duncan has dared to ask.

Duncan is suggesting that the introduction of “diversity” in hiring in the social sciences has been used to hide and insulate or at least has worked hand-in-hand with an agenda for destroying the social sciences. In overseeing the review process for Duncan’s articles, I was frightened to see Duncan’s attempts to critique changes in social science in an attempt to make them more socially responsible, repelled in ways that attacked Duncan as being racist and sexist and wanting to “return to the past” (!). Duncan’s argument is clearly not that the introduction of women and minorities has dumbed down the university because women and minorities are somehow inferior. It is that in using some of the social sciences as places to achieve diversity AND as places to promote ideologies to protect power, selection processes have worked to eliminate social scientists of all backgrounds, including those males and non-minorities in political science, economics and psychology, and women and minorities in all fields. Duncan’s argument is that the result has been to assure a politicization and a dumbing down in all of these fields (or at least a neutralization at any attempts to improve these fields and to allow them to teach real skills in empowering ways that could lead to real social improvement and social change).

It is important to remember the history of discrimination and purges in social sciences, particularly during the McCarthy era in the U.S., that forced Jews in many disciplines to take ideological positions to fit those of the establishment (Price, 2003; Duncan, 1995) and it is also important to allow for full examination of how processes work today. This is what Duncan tries to do. I am happy to protect the right to do that in this issue.

Short Essay on Problems in Social Sciences:

3. *Psychology: Distorting Psychology and Science at the Expense of Joy*
Human Rights Violations against Human Beings with Autism by Applied Behavioral Analysis
Kathleen Levinstein

Dr. Levinstein’s piece is an important look at how science and social science too easily go awry as the result of economic self-interest and her case study of Applied Behavioral Analysis considers the economic incentives that lead psychology and its applications to go wrong while also detailing the failures of appropriate public oversight. While there are cries today from academia for self-regulation and for increased distance from political oversight, largely due to mistrust in political institutions and political processes without real attempts at seeking to challenge and fix them, the insulation of disciplines from scrutiny, which academics instinctively demand, is not the solution when academics themselves have conflicts of interest. The question is what kind of oversight will best protect the public and how we can achieve it.

Levinstein’s article is courageous because she is both practitioner and potentially a direct beneficiary of science and its applications as the parent of an autistic son and as an autistic. She tells a chilling story of science and application gone wrong in ways that stigmatize, victimize and do harm to individuals and society under the pretext of intellectual advance and “help”.

FAILURES OF THE CORE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Major Articles on the Core Social Sciences:

In a time in which there do not seem to be any public or internal standards of measure for social science discipline that subjects these activities to measures of progress in answering important human questions for meeting human needs, this section provides two articles that apply such standards. Disciplines today do have review procedures but they are, again, those “peer review” procedures that are too easily political standards of adherence to an internal dogma defining “current debates” and/or use of a specific methodology or to financial controls.

4. *Economics: Is Economics in Violation of International Law*
Remaking Economics as a Social Science
 - a) Introduction: The Inspiration and Need for this Piece
 - b) Part I: Is Economics in Violation of International Law?
 - c) Part II: Is there a Current Social Science of Economics in Economics or Elsewhere?
 - d) Part III: The Rebuilding Process for the Discipline: Where Economics Fits
 - e) Part IV: The Challenge of Institutional and Cultural Change in Academia.*David Lempert*
5. Response: An Ecological Economist's View: *Peter Söderbaum*
6. Response: An International Legal Scholar's View: *Ugo Mattei*

My long piece is one in which I started, as a lawyer, with the standards of international law for protecting cultures (a human rights measure), for protecting sustainability and the planet/environment, and for human rights and aspirations as expressed in international law. There are plenty of critiques of social sciences (and of science) as representing the interests of colonial powers and ideologies, but we do have measures and tools for assuring that accountability rather than throwing out social science. That measure is international law. I decided to apply it to Economics and then to use international law to offer guide for how to restructure a discipline where it went afoul of international law in a way that would still protect science. In addition to holding Economics to the test, I also decided to hold the sub-discipline in my field, Economic Anthropology, that claims to be the antithesis of (neo-classical) Economics to the test, as well, to see if it actually offered the solution. That made for a long but interesting piece and also provoked an interesting discussion among international legal scholar Ugo Mattei and environmental economist Peter Söderbaum.

The problems inherent in Economics are different from those of other social science disciplines that have become humanities, such as contemporary anthropology as “Anthroposophistry”. Economics claims to be a science, uses mathematics, and teaches skills. The question is whether it is actually a “social science” or just theoretical mathematics and techniques, as well as whether the mathematics and techniques are objective and humanitarian or not. My piece deepens previous critiques using the analysis of law and of requirements of “science”, revealing neo-classical Economics as a pseudo-science of “hard” techniques and soft thinking; using sophisticated technical tools that have replaced the important questions of the discipline as well as its public and legal purpose.

This article presents a detailed analysis of an entire discipline as opposed to what is the typical bounded approach today of either a micro-analysis or an “argument”. Today, that makes it impossible to publish anywhere other than in an e-journal like this that does not have length requirements. The piece is essentially the size of 10 standard articles today but well short of the length of a book (that would be twice that size). That means that today it does not “fit”.

The one economics journal that critiques the profession, the *Real World Economic Review*, wanted to publish this piece and said it would go “viral” but they required as a condition of publication that it be only a sound-byte summary, 10% of the whole, with no place to post the rest. After I explained how lawyers need to back up claims for credibility, as do scholars, and that I did not just seek to grandstand and invite attacks, I never heard from the editor, Edward Fullbrook, or the assistant editor again.

This is representative of the publications problem in social science. If you have the equivalent of a long mathematical proof or a model, you cannot “summarize” it and that means you cannot publish it. Law reviews accept long pieces but generally only of discourses where the footnotes can be longer than the text, with the standard length of 30,000 words but not more.

7. *Political Science: The Nonsense and Non-Science of Political Science.....*
A Politically Incorrect View of ‘Poly-T(r)icks’
Polly Sly

Rather than use a legal or public standard, Sly’s piece is straightforward in examining Political Science today. Sly simply holds Political Science to its own standards as a discipline claiming to be a “science” and addressing questions of political systems following the requirements of objectivity and the scientific method. Sly looks at the structure of the discipline and existing work to paint a picture of a discipline manipulated by financial interests and existing political power, distorted by ideology and filled with internal contradictions. Sly offers a vision for the discipline and some solutions for reorienting it to assure a humanitarian and scientific purpose.

STRUCTURAL SOLUTIONS FOR REBUILDING SOCIAL SCIENCES

Tools: Return to Objective Standards in place of Political Ones

In addition to reorienting social science disciplines on the basis of public purpose/ law and scientific questions and methods, part of the challenge of rebuilding social science is to create the institutional and procedural mechanisms that assure accountability, healthy internal debate, and that oppose financial and political manipulation. Doing this is tricky and it is an area that academics fear for good reason. “Public purpose” and scrutiny have too often been used historically to impose agendas on scholarship that serve elite interests under the cover of promoting public or “majority” goals. Processes and standards can offer protections but they can also be used, as they have often been used, to purge specific approaches.

The goal of this section of the issue is to open the debate on how to establish standards that are fully protective of diversity and humanitarian objectives while also assuring adherence to disciplinary objectives and standards.

8. Returning Discipline to the Discipline
A Model Procedure for Reviews in Anthropology, Social Sciences, and other Related
Disciplines
David Lempert

I present this piece here for discussion on how to assure the depoliticization of professional review processes, with some very clear guidelines that combine concepts from law (and human rights protection) with concepts of social scientific method and interdisciplinary consensus on answering questions and offering results. The piece I am presenting here is one of three that I have written in this area. What I have found is that there does not seem to be any place in social science where this discussion can be held, since no publications exist to openly present and debate procedural codes and issues in specific disciplines.

The piece that I am presenting here is an excellent one for discussion. It was peer reviewed and readied for publication in the one anthropology e-journal that had the ability to print such a piece; *Anthropology Matters*. Yet, despite fully undergoing a blind peer review at that journal and also undergoing final copy edits as a last step to publication, editors intervened with no explanation to pull the piece from publication. After multiple letters to the editors to find out what the basis was for the decision and what changes they would require, I still have no idea what the basis was. I can only conclude that there was no disciplinary or professional basis at all. The editors are, of course, welcome to participate in that debate openly in future issues of this journal, with my responses, assuming the openness of future editors of issues of *Catalyst* to this debate.

9. *Letters to the Editor: Resurrecting this Historic Section
Redefining Anthropology? David Lempert*

This final piece is a short example of something that is now missing from much of social science today; open, collegial debate. Social science proceeds on the basis of debate. Without debate, disciplines are left with dogma. There are rules of debate, including reference to and grounding in the questions and definitions of a discipline and scientific methods of determining truth. What is also needed for such debate is that it have forum.

Today, there is some debate among colleagues on electronic websites and even on Facebook, but it is becoming unfocused, with quick reactions. In my view, we need to safeguard the space of “Letters to the Editor” to assure for responses and discussions that do not simply promote groups of colleagues (or attack) but that have a disciplinary basis.

Here is an example of such a short letter that I sent to the editor of a journal after reading a book review of a book that in my view had no link at all to social science or to the terms or boundaries of the field. This piece was reviewed by the editor and welcomed for publication. Shortly, thereafter, however, the editor announced that the publication would no longer have “Letters to the Editor” or interactive discussions. In hope of restoring this disappearing institution and procedure while also assuring the existence of a “Letter to the Editor” page in *Catalyst*, I create that space here.

Part IV:
A Vision for Revitalizing Social Science
and Inviting Continued Debates and Solutions:
Challenging Readers to Promote the Process of Change

No issue of *Catalyst* could be complete without some challenge to colleagues to the processes for catalyzing change. This section offers a short general “vision” for a revitalized social science, describing the kinds of actions that this issue of *Catalyst* seeks to catalyze, in revitalizing social science disciplines.

It is one thing to offer articles that critique social science and point to the root causes of the problems as well as to offer specific measurement tools and alternatives. But using these tools and advocating for this kind of vision requires more than blueprints and law. It requires cultural change. How do we do that?

Universities today are filled with people trained not to believe in social science, not to do it and to suppress any attempts to do it. Journals are locked against discussion. The few places on the periphery where these ideas can be presented are never read (and probably very little of what is produced in the major journals is read either). Funding for critique does not exist and only a few authors with missionary zeal who can make great sacrifices can do anything.

I have started to do it with the idea of a legal challenge to Economics, review processes, and introducing laboratory courses (Lempert, 1996). It does not seem to be enough.

In my view there is an opportunity today to do so if colleagues would realize it. Funding in universities today and for research has become a vicious cycle in a competitive downward spiral. I believe that it can be reversed. Doing so requires focusing on positive community benefits for students and community and reaching out to students and community rather than to just politicized funding. The current social science disciplines are unable to make their case for benefit because the lack of science and application undermine the potential for benefit while real science and application lead to real and measurable results.

Where are such changes occurring or could they occur and how can it be accelerated?

A Short Vision for Revitalized Social Sciences

There is a special niche for revitalized social sciences as objective “sciences” discovering “natural laws of human activities” with direct policy applications for specific social benefits in line with global humanitarian goals, particularly in communities that are recognizing that they need to focus on their community needs and on practical tools if they are to survive. A place this transformation could start is in small universities that value scientific principles and seek to serve community needs.

A social science department in a technical university, for example, offers an opportunity for scientific based approaches with applications in a way that differs from the current adaptations of social sciences in non-STEM universities. State universities that are responsive to local needs and recognize the need today for change also offer opportunities for a restart of social sciences.

The components of this idealized vision with a way to promote and sell it, are presented below.

Mission of the Disciplines: Social Science as a Science with Linked Technologies, in Parallel to Natural Sciences

Like the natural sciences, the role of the social sciences is to uncover “objective” natural laws of human behavior using the scientific method. Ideally, in promoting this vision, the purpose of these disciplines is to use data, experiments, and thought experiments to predict human phenomenon in the areas of human behavior, discovering the relations between measurable variables and phenomenon that are not culturally specific but that work across cultures and times. It is not to “explain” (to just offer stories) or to just document or to name and label phenomena but to measure and predict.

A vision for the social sciences as social sciences starts with affirmation of this mission and the idea of *discipline* in the disciplines: a commitment to discovering laws in ways that are neutral to the observer and that can be repeated in multiple places and times rather than for single events. Each discipline has a series of questions that it seeks to answer in a division of labor, with cross-disciplinary work and theoretical and philosophical questions to follow later but not to replace the concept of discipline in defining an area and set of questions with specific boundaries.

Relation of Social Sciences to Humanities

A vision of social science requires an humanities that is linked to social science in a constructive way that understands science. In coordination with the advance of social science disciplines, humanities, ideally, play an important complementary role. If the goal of academic work is to advance human knowledge for the betterment of humanity, the role of “humanities” in relation to both the natural and social sciences is to provide the imagined thought experiments and provocative questions that can advance the science and imagine new technology, while also raising questions about its ethical implications and the need for public oversight and controls as well as assuring that specific human needs are not overlooked. The role of the humanities is also to raise questions about causality and about what is possible and not possible in predictions about how the universe works. Humanities offer this in the form of fiction and philosophy. Social sciences need to maintain links with these approaches and those disciplines need to also recognize a role in helping to advance the social sciences and to make them responsive and accountable, but not to replace or undermine them.

Institutional Organization of the Social Sciences and Required Breadth in the University

Ideally, in fulfilling the mission of academic research and teaching, university departments will be increasingly held and should be held to offer clear statements of the focus of their departments in the context of the advance of human knowledge. Social science departments in general and specifically, ideally must offer statements of the large intellectual questions that they are pursuing, their fit within the overall search for human knowledge, the relation to question they do not ask and the gaps they leave, in order to demonstrate where they fit with the overall goals and progress of social science. Doing so can increasingly be the path towards support from students and community, including local funding.

In their search for funding, departments will also have an advantage in student and community support if they establish such measures and statements for the specific courses taught and research projects pursued under their aegis. They will be rewarded for clear statements of measures of disciplinary success. Each course should also offer statements on its objectives in teaching skills, problem solving and advance of discipline, and applications, rather than just covering subject areas and theories, and should explain where it fits in specific relation to other offerings and research.

Mission of Teaching of the Disciplines: Steps for Project Based Higher Education: The Teaching of Social Sciences

Today, most of the entrance and exposure to social sciences is through ad hoc appeals to self-interest (identity) or commercial interests (specific careers but not to the ability to solve particular kinds of problems for particular groups at particular levels). Today, the social sciences compete against each other for students, funds and attention, leading to a diversion from their actual mission and potential benefits and an inability to actually train future social scientists or to promote to the public the value of social science in the way that natural sciences sometimes effectively present their work. More practical and accountable introduction to the fields is also a way to promote funding.

Ideally, students entering study of social science should have an introduction to the organization of the social sciences, the division of research questions, and the existing methodologies in order to understand the overall goals of these disciplines, their context and the progress that has been made to date

in these fields. (It may be that this is currently not being done anywhere and that materials do not even exist for this.)

Ideally, every social scientist should have some basic introduction to each of the six basic social sciences (anthropology, sociology (at its two levels), economics, political science, and psychology) in the same way that scientists have a basis in chemistry, physics and biology, as a basis for cross-disciplinary work, boundaries, and for exposure to a larger set of methodological and analytical approaches. There should also be some exposure to all of the disciplines that seek to fit into social sciences today so that students and the public can understand where they fit (and whether they do).

Training offered in social sciences should have two objectives for providing benefits to students and communities, in parallel to that of the natural sciences.

- Training should provide the methodologies for solving specific problems using understandings of natural laws that have been uncovered, in the form of problem sets.
- Training should also provide the methodologies for laboratory work (in the social sciences, field research and quantitative methods) for problem solving.

The sequence of teaching should be in these building blocks for problem solving along with skills courses. As in the natural sciences, the place for teaching theory is at the high levels where more complex problems call for new models and new methods of data collection and where there are challenges to existing knowledge.

While project oriented (applied) teaching of science and technology is generally taught at the higher levels, the ideal approach to teaching science is not through just textbook problem sets and cookbook laboratory exercises but through integration of these with creative applications where students use problem solving methods and research methods on a variety of local problems. This is the appropriate model for social science as well.

In my book, *Escape from the Ivory Tower: Student Adventures in Democratic Experiential Education* (Jossey Bass, 1996) and in its sequel, *Escape from Professional Schools* (not yet published), I present a set of course curricula at several levels in the social sciences where students learn modeling, research skills, and applications at all levels, in the community and in the university. These courses offer the step-by-step approaches to learning the skills and applications of the social sciences. This is only a first step to restarting social science by promoting doing it. As we return to social science, curricula will then have the basis for problem set courses applying models for results, and for applications.

Protections: Constituents, Ethics, and Funding Firewalls

For social science to advance as a social science, its mission and connection to international law, humanitarian values, and advance of the disciplines must not only be clear and transparent, but there must be real accountability and enforcement. This is also in line with public benefit and support, as well as a key to overcoming the political antagonism today among those scholars who could do social science but who fear the abuse of the results.

One of the dangers of social science that is visible today is that research and university funding may not serve the ethical, legal, public and professional interests for advancing disciplines but may distort agendas in order to serve specific economic interests (businesses), political or military interests (government agency funding), or ideological interests (foundations and donors).

Statements of universities and departments cannot be based only on goals of “growth” of funding or sources of funding or prestige. They must be rooted in actual measures of disciplinary advance and measurable public benefit with mechanisms of direct public accountability and legal accountability.

Ideally, departments must have mission statements that start with the research questions they seek to answer and the public benefits and establish processes to assure that they are community and public centered and driven and not opportunistically driven by funding opportunities and specific political pressures. Funding strategies need to follow overall professional strategies and not distort or reorient them. There need to be mechanisms for rejecting funding that does not meet strategic objectives.

The distortion of social science has been partly a direct response to politicized elite funding (in the U.S. it is the “war on terrorism”, the growth of the prison sector and “criminology”, the control of foreign peoples, the manufacturing of political consent, and promoting productivity rather than sustainability, social progress and quality) and partly a reaction against the uses of science and technology (a growth in anti-science attitudes within some social sciences and anti-technology that have led to an overall rejection of social science itself given its recent historic abuses). The way to reform is to break this pernicious source of funding and oversight and to link work directly to the public stakeholders; students and communities.

The teaching mission also includes a mission of civic training for students as active citizens. In my book, *Escape from the Ivory Tower*, I describe a vision of “democratic experiential education” in the social sciences that assures that social sciences are also empowering and protective of individuals and society.

Beyond this Issue: Invitations to Readers

While *Catalyst* now reverts back to a new editor, it is my hope in offering this special issue that the debate on social sciences will continue in future issues in ways that catalyze the social science disciplines and apply them in ways that achieve real social justice.

Constructive letters to the editor are welcome and it is my hope that the pages of *Catalyst* will be open to them and to responses.

I hope that the space of *Catalyst* will be open for other special issues editors on these and similar topics and that future issues will also be open to articles on these themes without having to “fit” theme issues.

For readers interested in this special issue, I note that I have already written pieces on similar topics, for which there are no journals where such debate can be held. Perhaps they will appear in future issues of *Catalyst*:

- “What’s Missing in Anthropology and Applied Anthropology?: A Practitioner’s Vision for Applied Anthropology Programs”
- “Where’s the Discipline in the Discipline?: Ethics Principles for Book Reviews and General Standards of Review in Anthropology, Other Social Sciences and Related Disciplines”
- “On Renaming Social and Cultural Anthropology”

Colleagues may also write to me directly with constructive critiques, proposals and invitations.

Selective References

- Bugliosi, Vincent 2008. *The Prosecution of George Bush for Murder*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Vanguard Press.
- D'Andrade, Roy. 1995. "Moral Models in Anthropology." *Current Anthropology*, 36:3: 399.
- Duncan, Brooks. 1995. "Anthropological Perils in the Cold War's Wake," *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, Vol. 18, No. 2, Fall.
- Duncan, Brooks. 2013. "Post-Cold War Anthropology as Ideological Blog: Purging Klukhohn and Mead for a Diary Read" (Essay and Book Review of Melissa Caldwell's "Not by Bread Alone: Social Support in the New Russia"), *Journal of Developing Societies*, Spring, Volume 29, No. 1, 61-87.
- Ginsberg, Benjamin, 2011. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All Administrative University and Why It Matters*, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2007. *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*, Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.
- Hymes, Dell H. ed., 1982. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lempert, David. 2013. "Taking History Back to the People: An Approach to Making History Popular, Relevant and Intellectual," *Democracy and Education*, Volume 21, Issue 2, Article 1, Fall. <http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol21/iss2/1>
- Lempert, David. 2014. "Feminism and Development Studies: Building the Discipline or Politicizing It?" *Anthropology in Action*, Summer, Volume 21, No. 2, pages 43-48.
- Lempert, David. 2012. "The Social Science of Empire," (Review Essay using four books of "The American Empire Project" as a take-off point), *Journal of Developing Societies*, Fall, Volume 28, No. 4; 441-68.
- Lempert, David. 1995. *Escape from the Ivory Tower: Student Adventures in Democratic Experiential Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lempert, David. 2015. "Measuring Human Progress in the New Millennium and The Jewish Question as the U.S. Empire Collapses," *Miscelanea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos*, Volume 64. <http://www.meahhebreo.com/index.php/meahhebreo/article/view/690/916>
- Lempert, David. 2016. "The Myth of Social Progress, Revisited", *Human Figurations: Long Term Perspectives*, Volume 5, No. 1, March. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/11217607.0005.107/--myth-of-social-progress-revisited?rgn=main;view=fulltext>
- Mills, C. Wright (1956). *The Power Elite*, London, Oxford University Press.
- Price, David H. 2003. 'Subtle Means and Enticing Carrots: The Impact of Funding on American Cold War Anthropology,' *Critique of Anthropology*, 23: 373.
- Schrecker, Ellen. 1986. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, Deborah Leigh, 2012. "How the American University was Killed, in Five Easy Steps," Op Ed News, August 8. On the web at: <http://www.opednews.com/articles/How-The-American-University-by-Debra-Leigh-Scott-120819-373.html>
- Sokal, Alan. 1996. 'Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity', *Social Text* (Spring/Summer) 46/47, 217-252.
- Wedel, Janine. 2011. *Shadow Elite: How the World's New Power Brokers Undermine Democracy, Government and the Free Market*, New York: Basic Books.
- Wittner, Lawrence, 2013. *What's Going on at UAardvark*, Boston: Solidarity Press.

ⁱ *American Anthropologist*, 1956, Vol. 58, No. 3, 503-507.

ⁱⁱ In this issue, I offer a critique of and proposal for rebuilding “Economics” as a social science, but I don’t call for eliminating the definition of “Economics” or breaking up the field. I call for more empiricism for predictive modeling, to eliminate the assumptions and abstractions of the discipline, today. I also bring in more predictive questions with applications, beyond the current focus on “productivity” and towards issues of consumption and sustainability. A reader of my piece, Peter Söderbaum, also echoes the call for more pluralism in Economics in this issue. What we do not do is call for the replacement of the field with philosophy or political advocacy or area studies.

ⁱⁱⁱ Internet Source: AAA Career Net, accessed in July, 2016.

<https://usmg6.mail.yahoo.com/neo/launch?.rand=1shqm3fp5qb97#>

^{iv} Internet Source, AAA Career Net: <http://careercenter.aaanet.org/jobs/10070325/assistant-professor-of-anthropology> accessed on July 16, 2017.

^v U.S. President Donald Trump established the Trump University to teach real estate skills and faced civil lawsuits from students who claim they were defrauded. Former President Bill Clinton earned millions of dollars for unclear activities at the international for profit chain, Laureate University.

^{vi} Those not agreeing were: the American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences (AABSS), the European Economic Association, the American Psychological Association, and the Association for Psychological Sciences, and the International Political Science Association. These included three of the five social sciences and one general social science.

^{vii} E-mail communication to author, February 8, 2016, with copies to the APS Board, Nancy Eisenberg, Susan Goldin-Meadow, and Sarah Brookheart.

^{viii} These include Edward Fullbrook, who originally wanted to publish a very short version of my piece in his own journal, the *Real World Economic Review* (“Post-Autistic Economics”) but then went silent, Ralph Nader, Mark Weisbrot, Law Professor Jonathan Turley,

^{ix} Economist James Galbraith and Historian Ellen Schrecker.

^x Harvard Economics Professor Steve Marglin, Economist / Lawyer Bill Black, and Economist Herman Daly.

^{xi} Among these were Noam Chomsky, Law Professor Marjorie Cohen, Economist Kshama Sawant, Social historians Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz and Angela Davis, Law Professor Robert F. Kennedy Jr., Lawyer and Sociologist William Domhoff, and Sociologist Frances Fox Piven. Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark’s office would not communicate directly with him. My former professor Charles Lindblom was happy to reconnect (and I followed with birthday greetings for his 100th) but his eyesight prevents him now from scholarly work.

^{xii} E-mail to author, May 26, 2017.