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Georg Lukács introduced the notion of reification in 1922 as the process by which living beings, relationships, and all subjective qualities come to acquire the characteristic of a thing. In contemporary feminist terms Rosi Braidotti (2013, p. 61) writes that ‘the opportunistic political economy of biogenetic capitalism turns Life/zoe—that is to say human and non-human intelligent matter—into a commodity for trade and profit’. In today’s late capitalism, not only our labour, but also each one of our nameable attributes can be placed for sale on the market. Donna Haraway (1991, pp. 161–162) states that we are changing from an industrial society ruled by white capitalistic patriarchy into an ‘informatics of domination’. The control of information is in high demand, as is the ability to market, modify, and consume every living and non-living thing.

The potential of late capitalism to commodify all and any potentialities is one that Lukács foresaw when he stated that commodity fetishism is the problem of the modern age of capitalism (Lukács, 1971, p. 84). His reflections on reification are foundational and vital for understanding how the political economy functions. In particular, I am interested in how capitalism normalizes the objectification of human subjects and interpersonal relationships and reduces human attributes to potential market value. ‘What is of central importance here is that [...] man’s own activity, his own labour becomes something objective and independent of him, something that controls him by virtue of an autonomy alien to man’ (pp. 86–87).

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the relationship between reification and sexual objectification in order to illuminate the effects that late capitalism has on women, and the potential for feminist activism within it. Although we may dream of a post-gender world, we are not there (yet) and late capitalism views women as having a privileged set of marketable attributes that are primarily connected to their reproductive functions. Sexual objectification acts to shape women as both consumers with buying power and as consumable objects. The hegemonic order is still racist, classist, and sexist, although it is finding new and creative pathways in which to discriminate.
In order to understand the challenges for women living in a posthuman age, social, technological, and biopolitical mediums of exploitation that are supported by capitalism, but also exceed it must be considered. In the following paragraphs I will examine the concepts of reification and sexual objectification and ask what spaces are available for women seeking agency within late capitalism. This examination will be pursued in three steps: in the first section I will explicate Lukács's notion of reification and question its relevance in light of societal changes. In the second section I will provide an account of objectification by engaging with Catharine MacKinnon, Elisabeth Anderson, and Martha Nussbaum in order to examine how women are shaped by male dominance. In the third section, I will explain what performative agency and cyborg feminism involve and consider the prospects for feminist activism in late capitalism with the assistance of Judith Butler, Haraway, and Braidotti.

1. **Lukács and Reification**

Lukács states that under capitalism one's qualities and abilities are no longer an organic part of his personality, they are things he can 'own' or 'dispose of' like the various objects of the external world. And there is no natural form in which human relations can be cast, no way in which man can bring his physical and psychic 'qualities' into play without their being subjected increasingly to this reifying process. (Lukács, 1971, p. 100)

For Lukács, commodity fetishism, and the practices associated with it, shift our perceptions and penetrate deeply into human life. The question that Lukács asks, namely how far commodity exchange and its structural consequences are able 'to influence the total outer and inner life of society' (p. 84), is one that will be pursed in this chapter. In capitalism, the human way of being in the world is fundamentally reconstructed at a social-ontological level to cohere with the production of value.

A contested point in the literature about Lukács's notion of reification is whether his critique is (and should be) a moral or a social-ontological one. For example, there is concern with Axel Honneth's claim that Lukács's notion of reification is to be read as inauthentic life-praxis instead of a moral error. In order to imply that reification has harmful consequences, the presumption is that one must rest this concern on a particular moral
framework, as is done in the works of contemporary authors such as Nussbaum and Anderson who turn to Kantian arguments.

My contention is that it is precisely the social-ontological reading of reification that is important for cyborg performativity and feminist activism in late capitalism. Reading Lukács’s notion of reification as social ontology instead of moral critique is salutary because it makes a truth claim instead of a merely polemical one.² It allows for a plurality of ethical motivations for problematizing reification and Lukács’s ideas to be workshopped for contemporary ethical and political critiques. Yet this reading is limited by Honneth’s notion there is a more ‘natural’ state to return to or remember that is somehow liberated from commodification. As such, the following questions must be asked: Is Lukács making an implicit normative claim that we should attempt to return to that ‘better’ place? If reification occurs as a pathological form of life-praxis rather than a moral error, what opportunities are there for agency and transformation to occur within reification that will not perpetuate self-alienation?

In ‘Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat’ Lukács explains commodification: ‘a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a ‘phantom objectivity’, an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people’ (Lukács, 1971, p. 83). Reification in this respect affects intersubjective relations because it changes the way that people conceive of what they have to offer and receive from others. A process of ‘rationalization’ objectifies human attributes so that they are turned into things without human qualities. The consequence is that a mechanized life-praxis eclipses the world of emotions and empathetic values. Reification involves the social-ontological normalization of a hegemonic order in which production and profit are the highest values.

Lukács’s description of reification rests upon an account of the self-alienation of the worker and progressive rationalization. Rationalization involves a quantitative approach to work in which productivity is measured through mathematical formulas and workers are encouraged to limit their unique characteristics to achieve neutral functionality. As a result, individual attributes are conceived as ‘mere sources of error’ (p. 89). The worker is encouraged to conform to the systematization of work life and to perceive his labour as something that is independent of him. Through the process of rationalization, the worker learns to separate his physical and psychological selves and creates a wedge between the work process and the work results. The disconnection between work life and the needs and abilities of the worker has an adverse effect on self-consciousness: issues
are approached from a standardized, formal, and inhuman attitude and workers subsume their ethics to production. The object of labour becomes a carefully calculated result of a specialized system of operation instead of one crafted by people who perceive their labour to have a specific use value. A world of objects or commodities is created and their activities are governed by the laws of capitalism (p. 87).

Lukács states that rational mechanization extends beyond the worker and begins to transform all of society when the ‘free worker’ is freely able to take his labour-power to market and offer it for sale as a commodity ‘belonging’ to him, a thing that he ‘possesses” (p. 91). This is indeed the predicament of late capitalism. The problem is that objectification of one’s labour power and individual attributes result in self-alienation. When the commodity becomes the universal unit of measurement in society, one’s consciousness is subjugated to it and develops a ‘second nature’ (p. 86). The mode of being under advanced capitalism and reification is one of self-alienation for Lukács because the individual has become estranged from those characteristics that formerly shaped him as a human being—his personal significance is bound up in his value as a commodity. Although reification is the ‘immediate reality of every person living in capitalist society’ (p. 197), Lukács states that the classes experience this process much differently: whereas the bourgeoisie feel affirmed by self-alienation because it is a familiar product of their culture that they benefit from, the proletariat are devastated by it and face their ‘own impotence’ (p. 149) through its most dehumanizing features.

The process by which one is transformed from a world of human feelings and relationships into one in which labour power, human activities, and attributes are perceived as mere things to be bought and sold under capitalism is explained by Honneth as being a ‘distorted consciousness’ (Honneth, 2008, p. 25) that occurs through habituation and an amnesia or forgetting of precognitive recognition. Although this is an inaccurate reading of Lukács, it points to a pressing question. Namely, if under advanced capitalism, a second nature has become the new way of life, to which direction do we seek change? Are we to move to some formerly pure, first state, before ‘the fall’? Also, how do we come to have an awareness of this second nature; or how do we penetrate the web of self-alienation?

Lukács states that once the commodity has become universalized and reification becomes more pervasive, people do have the opportunity to pursue an understanding of this new structure or ‘to rebel against its disastrous effects and liberate themselves from servitude to this second nature so created’ (Lukács, 1971, p. 86). For Lukács, the pressure to conform to the
laws of commodification is inescapable, but one can obtain knowledge of them, and learn to use them for one’s advantage. However, using the known laws for personal advantage does not mean that one can individually change them, or how one is subjugated under them through reification. One of the problems that Lukács is concerned about is that capitalism has no moral compass: because reification is disconnected from its sources of labour and is driven by production each new transformation is embraced. The worker ‘has to conform to its laws whether he likes it or not’ (p. 89). In Lukács’s account, reification is an inflexible process that cannot be modified through the individual agent who embodies its effects (this differs from contemporary accounts of agency, such as Butler and Haraway). It is only as a collective member of a class, specifically the proletariat, that commodity fetishism can be overturned.

Lukács believes that the proletariat has the unique ability to see inside the political economy because of its subjection to it: since the proletariat experience the most serious dehumanization from capitalism, it will be the class to desire change and have the insight to make it happen (p. 149). They differ from the bourgeoisie who feel themselves to benefit from it and thus do not question it (p. 156). Self-alienation is an inevitable predicament in capitalism, but it is more likely to be infiltrated by those who experience its greatest harms. Lukács critiques ‘bourgeois thought’ for having an impenetrable facticity that takes its economic and cultural norms as timeless and objective (p. 157). However, he also states that bourgeois culture is the point of departure from which proletariat self-consciousness must begin (p. 163).

Lukács, contrary to what Honneth claims, is not making an implicit normative claim that we should attempt to return to a ‘better’ place or some first nature. Lukács states that ‘proletarian thought does not require a tabula rasa, a new start to the task of comprehending reality and one without any preconceptions’ (p. 163). In fact, Lukács thinks that it is precisely the relationship of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie within capitalism that gives rise to its own ‘standpoint’, or class consciousness and the desire to overcome self-alienation. The path of the proletariat towards socialism is, as Andrew Feenberg states, ‘a reorganization of the society around a dialectical mediation of the capitalist inheritance’ (Feenberg, 2011, p. 110). For Lukács, activism occurs through the collective understanding of the current predicament; change cannot move backwards to a former state but only forwards through negotiation and re-appropriation. As we will see, this is precisely the approach that Haraway suggests cyborg feminists should take.
Still, Lukács’s account of reification has its limitations, as he admits in his ‘Preface to the New Edition’ (1967). Lukács attempts ‘to explain all ideological phenomena by reference to their basis in economics’ (Lukács, 1971, p. xvii). His concern with the petrifying qualities of bourgeois thought and the potential of the proletariat class to uniquely overcome it fails to consider how ideological indoctrination from other sources of power has resulted in exploitation and objectification of entire groups of people, such as women and minority groups. He gives what Fredric Jameson calls an ‘epistemological priority’ to the working class (Jameson, 2009, p. 214).

Feminist activism requires an understanding of reification under late capitalism that allows for transformation to occur and an individual agency that is not solely dependent upon class consciousness. Haraway claims that, ‘most Marxisms see domination best’ (Haraway, 1991, p. 172) but are not able to recognize changes that have and do occur under capitalism. For women, in particular, the nostalgia that Honneth portrays connected to going back to a more ‘natural’ or so-called ‘human’ time prior to capitalism seems ironic since oppression against women has become less severe over time (and under a capitalist society). Butler correctly argues that the structures of capitalism are not immune from social influences or the speech acts of individuals (Butler, 2010, pp. 148–149). Social-ontological indoctrination is pervasive through both economic and social structures that import normative equations into the minds of the populace, but this does not stifle the abilities of individuals to find performative agency within these systems.

Contemporary feminists such as Haraway, Butler, and Braidotti look for the opportunities to achieve change within an order that is dehumanizing but malleable. However, all three of these thinkers write with an aim to transcend the gender binary and are not specifically interested in how late capitalism affects women. In order to understand the particular set of challenges that women have, it is necessary to look to another group of feminist authors who analyse the consequences of female sexual objectification as a life-praxis.

2. Sexual Objectification and Reification: Feminist Problems

Lukács’s critique of capitalism explains how women, as do men, experience its dehumanizing effects; yet women are further constrained by the ideological structures of male domination that exploit female sexuality in order to remain in power. Catharine MacKinnon writes, ‘Sexuality is to feminism what work is to Marxism: that which is most one’s own, yet most
taken away’ (MacKinnon, 1982, p. 515). The challenges that women have differ from men because they are connected to and gravitate around the commodification of female sexuality. Although significant changes have occurred since MacKinnon wrote in 1982, late capitalism, which seeks to exploit the most marketable human characteristics, retains patriarchal interests in objectifying female sexuality and reproductive labour. In addition, the aesthetics of desirability supported through an increasingly medicalized cosmetic industry that generates vast amounts of capital rests on the assumption that female value is connected to being sexually attractive to men. The predominance of sexual inequality between men and women means that women have different opportunities for agency under capitalism and require a feminist understanding of reification that includes its sexually objectifying trajectories.

MacKinnon states that similar to workers who are defined as a class through their work being used for the benefit of others, women are defined as a sex through their sexuality being used for the benefit of others, namely men (p. 516). Women are dominated through the objectification of their sexuality, yet, ironically, they find a sense of personal significance through this experience. Sexual objectification naturalizes a ‘truth’ that the role of women is to be or become sexually desirable for men. ‘Objectification makes sexuality a material reality of women’s lives, not just a psychological, attitudinal, or ideological one’ (p. 539). Sexual objectification involves the social-ontological normalization of a patriarchal influence in which female desirability becomes the highest good for women. Like workers who function under a distorted life-praxis, women perceive their sexual attributes as constitutive of who they are and are alienated from a sense of being that values their other characteristics. This is a form of reification. At the same time, female sexual desirability is perceived as a way in which to access greater freedom: it is a bartering tool, a commodity accessible through products that women buy, or a quality that a woman has within her person to be sold on the market.7

Under a capitalistic political economy, work that involves the use of female sexuality and reproductive functions is likely to be most vulnerable to its reifying and exploitative tendencies (and a strong location for political change). Similar to Honneth’s reading of Lukács, Anderson argues that imposing market values onto female labour connected to sexuality and reproductive function assigns a price to that labour that detracts from its human value: these women are then assigned a worth that does not reflect their ‘real’ value. She claims that they are made into things, valued for their use instead of being respected and having the human dignity
that is accorded to them (Anderson, 1993, pp. 8–10). Anderson turns to a Kantian argument for the justification of the moral problems of use when she states that ‘use is a lower, impersonal, and exclusive mode of valuation. It is contrasted with higher modes of valuation, such as respect. To merely use something is to subordinate it to one’s own ends, without regard for its intrinsic value’ (p. 144).\(^8\)

Anderson argues against the legalization of sex work. She claims that when one makes sex for sale, it detracts from the ‘human good of sexual acts’ and its status as a gift to be shared through mutual recognition, attraction, and offering (p. 154). The sex worker’s autonomy is threatened because she ‘subjects herself to his commands’ (p. 156) and this devalues her as a property to be used without consideration for her ‘personal needs’ (p. 154). In other words, the sex worker’s sexuality is appropriated by the customer without thought of her humanity. Anderson claims that sex work threatens the dignity of all women through condoning disrespectful behaviour to women. For these reasons Anderson believes that the state is justified to prohibit sex work (p. 156).

There are a few striking problems with Anderson’s arguments against sex work. Like Honneth’s misreading of Lukács, she assumes that there is a more ‘natural’ place to return to and this imports a ‘pure’ status to women who are not sex workers as if sex work is a fall from a better place. She presumes that the ‘gift’ of sex is equally shared between men and women without consideration that the coercive factors active in sex work, facilitated by male domination, are also part of marriage and other legal sexual relationships. Anderson does not adequately consider that the problems with sex work are based on deeper institutional and social problems connected to sexual inequality. The dehumanizing roles that are prevalent in sexual relationships of all kinds between men and women (and same-sex relationships), and are exacerbated in sex work, are structured by patriarchal and puritanical values that must be considered in addition to the problems of capitalism. As the writings of sex worker feminists can attest, consensual contractual negotiations are part of sex worker relationships, but the legal prohibition of sex work and puritanical attitudes can inhibit the consensual quality of them. Disrespectful attitudes to sex workers are often a result of shameful attitudes towards sexuality and anger at women who are perceived to be controlling their sexuality on their own terms (see Queen, 1997, pp. 125–135).

I turn to sex work as an example because Anderson’s analysis exemplifies what is problematic about approaching a feminist problem related to sexual objectification from an institutional and theoretical framework that does not connect with or consider the women who are living within its effects. Whereas
Anderson thinks that problems must be tackled externally through changing the institutional order, other feminists realize that activism happens from within and without and involves consciousness raising (MacKinnon, 1982, p. 520). Like Lukács’s claims about the proletariat, I think that those who experience the most harmful consequences of the political economy that they live in (in this case sex workers within a patriarchal capitalistic world that promotes sexual objectification) have the most knowledge of it from which to generate change. Although female sexual objectification occurs through subjugation, this does not prevent women from achieving agency that extends beyond a false consciousness and allows for joy and change to occur. In the case of sex workers, paternalistic regulations are inefficient: concern for them means listening to their experiences and providing them with the support necessary to make their work safe and empowering and providing an exit strategy for those who want out. What is also important to consider is how politically aware women working in sex work have the power to change stigmatizing attitudes towards female sexuality.

There is a spectrum of female sexual objectification that finds its most explicit representations in the sex industry. What I am attempting to get at with the rather difficult example of sex work is that even when female sexual objectification appears to have taken over the lifeworld of an individual, this does not foreclose the opportunity for agency, nor does it necessarily result in the woman being denied her humanity. There are both harmful and liberating aspects of female sexual objectification and an accurate account of it must consider both. Although women are limited by sexual objectification because it shapes their values and aspirations towards becoming desirable under a male gaze, not all forms of objectification are harmful or wrong: it is important to consider the context because sometimes the experience of objectification is an enjoyable aspect of sexual life (Nussbaum, 1995, p. 251), a chosen form of income, or a location for political change. Nussbaum argues that although it is morally impermissible to instrumentalize another person, she qualifies this statement, stating that if it occurs in a context that is affirmative of one’s humanity it is acceptable (p. 289). From a sex worker feminist perspective, one which exceeds Nussbaum and the other authors mentioned above, recognizing the predominance of sexual objectification and learning how to perform that objectification with irony, self-empowerment, or a sex-positive approach that de-stigmatizes female sexuality can be a path towards greater agency for some women. In order to explain what performative agency looks like and how it repeats, mimics, and challenges the normative orders of late capitalism, I turn to Butler, Haraway, and Braidotti.
3. **Performative Agency and Posthuman Feminism**

Haraway claims that feminists and Marxists err in their attempts to create a revolutionary subject from a perspective of hierarchical dualisms, moral superiority, nature, or innocence (Haraway, 1991, p. 176). Yet, Lukács's account of the activist potential of the proletariat is closer to her notion of cyborg feminist than might be supposed. They share the notion that late capitalism must be the point of departure for those most dehumanized by it so that they can move forwards through experimentation and re-appropriation. Haraway's cyborg feminist rejects the notion of salvation and views herself as embedded in the world. The term ‘cyborg’ is an ironic one meant to explain subjects who are ‘the illegitimate offspring of militarism and patriarchal capitalism’ (p. 151).

The pursuit of individual agency and progressive political action involve learning to employ the languages and methods of the hegemonic order, but with a satirical performance that upsets its foundations. ‘Posthuman feminists look for subversion not in counter-identity formations, but rather in pure dislocations of identities via the perversion of standardized patterns of sexualized, racialized, and naturalized interaction’ (Braidotti, 2013, p. 99). In this section, I will explore what feminist activism might look like in late capitalism by way of Butler's performative agency and Haraway's cyborg feminism.

Butler's analysis disputes Lukács's notion that the individual cannot effect significant change from within the political economy. She argues that the market is open to being shaped by many different factors including social institutions and structures of meaning, individual speech acts, and technological networks (Butler, 2010, pp. 148–150). The social-ontological naturalization of particular ways of being in this world, as a woman or a worker, for example, are themselves effects of a performatively produced market, that is so continuous in its reiterations that it appears to allow for little variation (p. 149). However, performatives as reiterations inevitably involve failure since they are not exact copies (p. 153). The failing yet polyvalent character of late capitalism ‘that actively produces differences for the sake of commodification’ (Braidotti, 2013, p. 58) means that it is open to manipulation and change. Butler's notion of performative agency suggests that women (and men) can find malleability within the hegemonic order that is sexist, racist, and homophobic to exert an agency that both recalls and transgresses its reifying practices. Butler states that ‘performativity seeks to counter a certain kind of positivism according to which we might
begin with already delimited understandings of what gender, the state, and
the economy are’ (Butler, 2010, p. 147).

It is vital, however, not to forget that the reifying effects of late capital-
ism are prolific, and in many instances without a moral compass. It is
a multiplier of deterritorialized differences, which are packaged and
marketed under the labels of ‘new, dynamic and negotiable identities’ and
an endless choice of consumer goods. This logic triggers a proliferation
and a vampiric consumption of quantitative options (Braidotti, 2013,
p. 58).

In other words, the current society will not only allow for performative
agency and cyborg personalities to emerge, it will also learn how to com-
modify them. The question that re-emerges is whether what is experienced
as empowerment is not merely another form of commodity fetishism that
perpetuates self-alienation.

Haraway thinks that the world is shifting dramatically from an industrial
and organic one into a polymorphous world dominated by the control of
information; there is no going back, at an ideological or a material level
(pp. 161–162). Humans are increasingly systematized through statistics
and forecast; they are no longer ‘sacred in themselves’ (p. 163). The capital
today includes data storages of human information ranging from genetic
to consumer tendencies, as Facebook can attest to11 and profit is built upon
owning what was previously considered to be private information. Whereas
Haraway considers the current political economy to be an informatics of
domination, Braidotti calls it bio-genetic capitalism because it ‘invests and
profits from the scientific and economic control and the commodification
of all that lives’ (p. 59). It exploits the generative capacities of ‘women,
animals, plans, genes, and cells’ (p. 95) and it is without limits as to what
can be bought and sold. One of the challenges that activism currently faces
is that there is not one source of domination from which to push against,
as earlier feminists and Marxists believed in, there are multiple (Haraway,
1991, p. 160). This means that activism cannot work in the same ways as
previously supposed and must learn how to approach change from multiple
perspectives even if they are incomplete and imperfect.

Haraway conceives of the cyborg as a new ‘self’, a model for activism of
a social-feminist politics that looks to biotechnologies and communica-
tion technologies to redesign bodies and social relationships through the
shaping of information (p. 164). She states that the notion of the cyborg
has transformative and political potential because modern machines
challenge the ubiquity and spirituality of the Father through their mobility, fluidity, and their omnipresence (p. 153). ‘Cyborg unities are monstrous and illegitimate; in our present political circumstances, we could hardly hope for more potent myths for resistance and recoupling’ (p. 154). The political potential of activism is not about ‘the fall’, the presumption that there was some prior wholeness or natural state, but instead it happens through ‘seizing the tools to mark the world that marked them as other’: such tools are the re-telling of stories to displace naturalized identities and hierarchical dualisms (p. 175). Haraway believes that technological culture helps to open up the hierarchies of formerly privileged dualisms because boundaries have become more fluid between the organic and the mechanical. Borders between the human and the animal, man and woman, the real and the virtual, and the ‘self-developing and externally designed’ (p. 152) are starting to overlap.

Haraway critiques the notion that women as a category can be mobilized, stating that there is no such thing as being definitely ‘female’. Instead of looking to some kind of ‘natural’ identification between people such as gender, class, or race, Haraway argues that we need coalitions, political kinships, and affinities—otherwise ‘taxonomies of feminism produce epistemologies to police deviations from official women’s experience’ (p. 156), as was exemplified above during Anderson’s assessment of sex work. The problem with the positing of women as a political group is that it necessarily seeks to subsume the diverse experiences of women under one banner and in doing so fails to acknowledge the variant and irreducible interests of that broad category. It ends up assimilating the ‘polyvocal’ into one feminist voice without admitting to it.12 What Haraway points to is a significant problem with feminist discourse that continues: women associate with their class and cultural background more than they do with other women. For example, white feminists, socialist and liberal, have failed to consider the concerns of women of colour, transgender people, and sex workers, among others. Haraway thinks that feminists have erred (as Lukács also erred with his concentration solely on the bourgeoisie) ‘through searching for a single ground of domination to secure our revolutionary voice’ (p. 160). In fact, the presumption that domination comes from one primary source is, again, another form of reification.

I agree with Haraway that supporting an essentialist theory of ‘woman’ disavows the polyvalent character of women’s voices, both individual and dissenting, to be heard (p. 160). What, however, can be achieved through asking how late capitalism affects women is not a move towards entrenching a limited conception of what a ‘woman’ is. Instead, it helps us to understand
how the confluence of the market commodification of human life and the sexually objectifying drive of male dominance shape those people that the state recognizes as female. Polarized forms of sexual difference are still active and strong. This is not to presume there is a common life-praxis that all women share or one female language that can be spoken, however, once we understand how ideological systems of meaning work to shape our consciousness as women, we can learn how to break down these influences and employ them for what Haraway calls new ‘fusions’ (p. 173) or new performative options in late capitalism. Machines, animals, the gender roles and sexualities of all people, provide sources of innovation for feminist cyborgs. As Haraway states, the point now is not to figure out what is false consciousness and what is a clear consciousness. Yet we must still ask how to reduce self-alienation in late capitalism with a combined interest in learning how the new ‘pleasures, experiences, and powers’ (p. 173) can be employed to shift the hegemonic order of things.
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