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**The final elimination of objectivity from scientific thinking in spatializing social science theorizing**

1. **The contradictory concept of social science theorizing**
* common practice: creating knowledge through the models of meta theories – arriving at relative objective theories
* (the mind set of the citizen society: scientific knowledge, interest and the monopole for decision making)
* (disciplinary knowledge variations of interpreting the citizenship society from the (conflicting) economic, political and individual interest of the wholeness of the citizenship, the nation state)
* disciplinary thinking providing the models for theorizing
* the paradoxies of the relativism of scientific knowledge
* interpreted by the epistemological social science departments as the nature of scientific thought

- Hegel and Kant, differences to think about scientific thought

- the paradoxies of a relativisms of objective social science knowledge

* the paradoxes of relative objective knowledge reproduced in the social science concept of objectivity: the modelled reality (empiricism) proving the modelled thought

- despite all these contradictions and paradoxies of objective relative knowledge and what objectivity means: Social sciences - so far - insist on the objectivity of scientific knowledge as the distinctive nature of scientific knowledge

1. **Spatial and global “turns”: Space as the new epistemic dimension of “globalizing” social sciences**

Intro: The mystery of “globalising” social sciences

* no buzzword social sciences would not welcome as a new model for framing theorizing
* have the social sciences not always been very global? How about the colonialisation of the whole world with the theories and the science model of the European social sciences?
	1. **Space and thought**

* Modelled social science theorizing detects the where: Spatial attributes dominate the discourses about what makes social thought “globalizing” social thought: “Eurocentrism”, “Southern theories”, “Western sciences”, “Chinese perspectives”, global, local, glocal, universal (newly read), etc
* … globalizing thinking as opposed to which kind of thinking? Thinking without a where? The headaches of thinking through models….From where to where does global thinking shift towards thinking that implies space
* Space as a dimension of scientific knowledge (rationally). The case of a spatially diverse object of thought
* Space in spatiological thinking: Logically a contradiction in adjecto, an incommensurable attribute of knowledge; Like: Yellow speed. Or: Quick colours. Local knowledge. Southern theories – no contradiction in adjecto? - Not for spatiological thinking: Thinking through space is the epistemic must for therefore called *globalising*/*localizing* thinking
* Paper objective: critiquing the introduction of space as an epistemic dimension for theorizing - and its manifold tragic implications for social science theorizing, namely the elimination of what constitutes scientific knowledge.

**2.2 Space as a cognitive dimension of theorizing in spatiological theorizing - The nature of knowledge spaciological thinking creates**

 *“..the proposition that thought is related to places is central to my project provincializing Europe” [[1]](#footnote-1)*

 *“To ‘provincialize’ Europe was precisely to find out how and in what sense European ideas that were universal were also, at one and the same time, drawn from very particular intellectual and historical traditions* ***that could not claim any universal validity.******It was to ask the question about how thought was related to place.*** *Can thought transcend places of their origin? Or* ***do places leave their imprint on thought in such ways a****s to call into question the idea of* ***purely abstract categories****?” [[2]](#footnote-2)*

* Space is not a dimension of the object of thinking but a cognitive agent creating thought, “imprinting” thought into theories

*“Until I arrived in Australia, I had never seriously entertained the implications of the fact that* ***an abstract and universal idea characteristic of political modernity everywhere*** *–* ***the idea of equality, say, or of democracy or even of the dignity of human being – could look utterly different in different historical contexts.*** *Australia, like India, is a thriving electoral democracy, but Election Day there does not have anything of the atmosphere of festivity that I was used to it in India.”*

*“No concrete example of an abstract can claim to be an embodiment of the abstract alone.”*

1. Spatiological versus “purely abstract categories” and the “universal validity” of theories – the battle of social sciences theorizing through models about the extend of its relativism, dissolving the contradictions in the concept of objectivity towards its elimination
2. Opposing the objectivity of any, even non scientific thought, already incorporated in the categories of language as the cognitive basis and cognitive essential of thinking, replacing the essential of objective thought by their subjective appreciations (What elections are is a matter of how electing people appreciate them)
3. Eliminating objectivity of thought replaced by a multiplicity of spatially subjective appreciations - as an epistemic must of scientific theories
4. Advocating affirmatism as the essential of theorizing
5. arriving at (global) social thought as the absurdity of the co-existence of a multiplicity of spatially delimited “true” knowledges, reproducing any subjective appreciations of the social reality
6. The detected innocent “where” in spatiological thinking turns out to be the always politically constructed space, space is - the nation state; thus spatiological thinking advocates a multiplicity of spatiologically=nationally defined subjective appreciations about things **as an objective epistemological necessity;**
7. Nationalism, arguing against objective theories thus becomes the key dimension of scientific thinking through space. The globalisation of social sciences as the nationalisation of theorizing “ From a Chinese perspective…”) is the phenomenon that represents the success story of spatiological thinking.
8. Spatiological thinking therefor arrives and proclaims at explicit anti-scientificy for the sake of patriotic, “provincial” theories as a demand of this kind of (global) scientific thinking
9. **The objectives of the very abstract and as universal, but very false, idea of spatiological thinking and - the dubious merits of a false opposition against the European social science thinking**

Intro:

*“If this argument is true for India, then it is true of any other place as well, including, of course, Europe or, broadly, the West.”*

* Spatiological thinking is frivolous enough to present this thinking as a very universal and very objective epistemological truth – disregarding their own epistemic statement that there is no objective nor universal knowledge

**De-colonialisation**

1. De-colonialisation as imitation of the society model of the old colonizers - including their model of social thought as their approach to social thought
2. Once scientific knowledge is defined as necessarily spatiological=national, based on this spatial concept of knowledge, it detects – no false theories to be critiqued - but the anachronism of a global monopole on inevitably nationally constructed theories of the former colonizers: the birth of Eurocentrism
3. Thus spatiological thinking represents a re-thinking of social thought in and for the new de-colonized nation state world: from critical theorizing in the anti-colonial movements towards constructive nation state views for the new nation states arriving in a world of nation states and in their science model
4. …..by opposing a social science approach, their own interpretation of the SU “Marxism”, as a determinism – opposed by the global determinism of space as the maker of thought.
	1. **The dubious merits of spatiological thinking**

**For theorizing**

* + Thinking through space eliminates even the last ideal of scientificy in the Popperian relativism of social science thinking, the “approximation of truth” and introduces the politically fuelled arbitrariness of theorizing, thinking through nationalisms, as a mode of scientific social thought about the world, advocated as an epistemic necessity of scientific thinking.
* It radicalizes the epistemological must of relative objective knowledge (from Kant via Popper to Foucault) towards the epistemic absurdity of a necessity of subjective scientificy
	+ It is a radicalisation of the very “Euro – ethnocentric” thinking of the European social sciences thinking through their very European models, advocating multiple politically/culturally constructed truths, claiming alternative theories of the same kind - without critiquing any theory they claim to oppose
	+ The obscure and exclusive alliance between space and thought, is the “modernity” version of the obscurantism of religious social thought and hence, witnessed by the renaissance of all sorts of religious thinking
	+ (The “paradigm shift” debate about the natural sciences serves the breakthrough of spatiological theorizing (T.Kuhn) by “proving” the relativism of natural sciences with the one and only – very false- conclusion: Because natural science knowledge proceeds from false to right knowledge, it must be also only relative knowledge.)
* (Complimented by the culturalization of natural science thinking (Knorr-Cetina etc))
	+ Spatiological thinking is not only affirmative thinking, but anti-criticism, it discredits any thought that insists on scientificy (abstract categories) as “hegemonic”, “imperial” thought and alike – except the advocacy for spatiological thinking
	+ It advocates global anti-scientism promoting to argue about moral values (Wallerstein) instead of science, even omitting the old scientific scepticism (Popper and Co), which was though in an paradoxical way - insisting on scientificy, for the sake of moral values of patriotic theories

“Scientism has been the most subtle mode of ideological justification of the powerful”. Wallerstein, I., (2006) “European Universalism….

* It is carried out as self-purification of thinking from critique towards critiquing critique – from Marx to re-detecting the Heideggers:

*“This paper will give an account of a project which is designed to examine the ways in which cultural boundaries are crossed and a cultural appreciation is brought about through a close encounter with the local. This close encounter with the local is made up of the participants following ancient pathways; in the case of Japan it is the Australian participants walking the ancient pilgrimage routes in Koyasan, such as the World Heritage listed routes in the Kii Mountains Range, and in the case of Australia, the Japanese participants will walk part of the Dreaming Tracks of the Nyikina People of the Fitzroy River in the Kimberley area of Western Australia. The ethos underpinning the engagement will be the importance of Aboriginal healing notion of ‘Land is the Healer’.”*

*(C. Black)*

**For the scientific Discourse**

1. From global controversies about opposing society systems towards variations of the imperial nation state views (“multiple modernities”)
2. Not critiquing any of the spatially stigmatized “Western” theories, but ennobling any theory in the “West” as one worldwide very acknowledged spatiological view, thus establishing the “Western” theories as the global reference theories
3. It results in the non-discourse discourse among a multiplicity of the many exclusive patriotic truths of spatiological theories

**For the position scientific knowledge has**

1. No new scientific knowledge that plays any role in any debate, rather providing the buzzwords for the imperial policy agendas, such as “inequality”, therefore rewarded by Nobel prizes.
2. Due the radicalisation of the scientific relativism towards the relativism of space spatiological theorizing disempowers scientific knowledge as a powerful global voice
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