

Neo-semantic Socialism and Marxism

Rudolf K. Q. McElwaine, dept of peace studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
H. Charles Dahmus, dept of deconstruction, Stanford University

1. Neosemantic socialism and precultural structural theory

“Class is part of the stasis of art,” says Lacan. But Brophy¹ holds that the works of Stone are an example of neocapitalist capitalism. Any number of discourses concerning precultural structural theory may be found.

In the works of Stone, a predominant concept is the concept of constructive language. However, neosemantic socialism implies that government is fundamentally unattainable. If Lyotardist narrative holds, we have to choose between precultural structural theory and subtextual deconstruction.

Therefore, Bataille uses the term ‘conceptualist paradigm of reality’ to denote a self-referential totality. An abundance of theories concerning the bridge between reality and sexual identity exist.

It could be said that Sontag promotes the use of precultural structural theory to challenge capitalism. The stasis, and eventually the defining characteristic, of neocultural deappropriation intrinsic to Stone’s *Natural Born Killers* is also evident in *Heaven and Earth*.

However, the main theme of the works of Stone is a capitalist reality. The subject is contextualized into a Marxism that includes consciousness as a paradox.

In a sense, several narratives concerning precultural structural theory may be revealed. Sartre suggests the use of neosemantic socialism to modify and analyse society.

2. Stone and subcultural capitalist theory

“Sexual identity is meaningless,” says Lacan; however, according to Buxton², it is not so much sexual identity that is meaningless, but rather the rubicon, and subsequent fatal flaw, of sexual identity. Thus, in *Melrose Place*, Spelling affirms Marxism; in *Beverly Hills 90210* he examines neosemantic socialism. Many desemiocisms concerning not narrative as such, but postnarrative exist.

“Class is intrinsically unattainable,” says Marx. It could be said that the ground/figure distinction depicted in Spelling’s *The Heights* emerges again in *Melrose Place*, although in a more self-falsifying sense. Foucault uses the term ‘Marxism’ to denote the genre, and hence the collapse, of neocultural sexual identity.

Thus, Sartre promotes the use of capitalist materialism to attack outdated, colonialist perceptions of society. Dahmus³ suggests that we have to choose between precultural structural theory and dialectic rationalism.

However, Marx uses the term ‘the neoconstructivist paradigm of context’ to denote the role of the writer as participant. An abundance of discourses concerning neosemantic socialism may be found.

It could be said that Derrida uses the term ‘precultural structural theory’ to denote not, in fact, narrative, but prenarrative. A number of theories concerning a textual reality exist.

In a sense, if Marxism holds, we have to choose between Lacanist obscurity and postcultural discourse. The characteristic theme of Porter’s⁴ essay on Marxism is the role of the writer as artist.

Notes:

1. Brophy, W. ed. (1973) *The Narrative of Dialectic: Marxism in the works of Spelling*. O’Reilly and Associates.
2. Buxton, K. P. (1990) *Marxism in the works of Spelling*. University of Illinois Press.
3. Dahmus, Y. W. P. ed. (1977) *Narratives of Rubicon: Marxism and neosemantic socialism*. Oxford University Press.
4. Porter, Q. (1995) *Marxism in the works of Koons*. Harvard University Press.

THIS IS NONSENSE!

Postmodern Engine