

文化社會學專題：
從意識型態批判到論述分析
SOCIOLOGY OF CULTURE SEMINAR:
FROM IDEOLOGICAL CRITIQUE TO DISCOURSE
ANALYSIS

Department of Sociology, Tunghai University

Fall, 2004

Wednesday 19:10-22:00

Instructor: 黃崇憲

Office Hours: Thursday 2:00-4:00 p.m. or by appointment

Phone: (04) 23590121 ext. 2988

Office: T 539

E-mail: momo@mail.thu.edu.tw

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of the society, is at the same time its intellectual force.

--Marx

The notion of ideology appears to me to be difficult to make use of.

--Foucault

Course Description and Objectives

There are two kinds of substantive graduate courses, one is general introductory course and the other is theme-oriented seminar. General introductory course is aimed at surveying a field. They try to cover a reasonable portion of the literature that the students should know in order to be considered competent in that field. Theme-oriented seminar is more specialized and idiosyncratic explorations. They explore particular issues and perspectives rather than trying to “cover the ground” of a broader field. This can be an advantage if the particular issues and perspectives are the ones you are interested in, but it can be frustrating if you do not feel interested. This

course is definitely a seminar instead of an introductory course. It does not pretend to cover the full scope of the field of sociology of culture. It takes an explicitly Marxist perspective, focusing primarily on ideology critique and discourse analysis.

Like much else of the modern world, the concept of ideology is a child of enlightenment. And ideology has never been so much in evidence as a fact and so little understood as a concept as it is today. From the left it can often be seen as the exclusive property of ruling classes, and from the right as an arid and totalizing exception to their own common sense. For some, the concept now seems too ubiquitous to be meaningful; for others, too cohesive for a world of infinite difference. Not so long ago, the term “ideology” was in considerable disrepute. Its use had become associated with a claim to know a truth beyond ideology, a radically unfashionable position. What then explains the sudden revival of interest in grappling with the questions that “ideology” poses to social and cultural theory, as well as to political practice? This course attempts to trace the concept formation of ideology and its vicissitudes in Western Marxism and then extend to discourse analysis. Post-structuralist critiques of the theory of “ideology” have commonly developed the concept of “discourse” as the focus of an alternative theoretical model. This course will also try to make students understand the scope and significance of the shift from ideology to discourse. We will engage Bourdieu and Foucault in this regard.

Karl Marx (1818-83) and Frederic Engels (1820-95) were the founders of historical materialism, the key doctrine of which is that the conflict between exploiting and exploited classes throughout history is closely linked to the rise, development and demise of modes of material production. Marx and Engels never produces a fully-fledged theory of ideology; but their writings on other matters contain suggestive ideas in this direction and their early work *The German Ideology* (1845-46) engages the topic directly. The book was written in opposition to the so-called young Hegelians, who in Marx and Engel’s view gave undue prominence to the power of ideas in society. Against the idealism of Hegel, Marx, and Engels want to assert that all human consciousness is rooted in material conditions, and can be changed only by transforming these conditions. However, the concept of ideology—traditionally one of Marxism’s most persuasive ideas has recently been subjected to devastating criticisms. In this course we will begin by reading carefully the classical Marxist texts on the subject of ideology. We’ll then deal with Marxism beyond classical Marxism, focusing particularly on Gramsci’s, *Prison Notebooks*, as the *locus classicus* of a Marxist theory of ideology. Gramsci is known as the theorist of superstructure, focusing on the importance of politics and ideology but never losing

sight of the economic. Taking Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach* and *The Preface to the Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* as point of departure, he created a Marxism in which politics and culture assume a clear autonomy from economic forces. We'll also touch briefly upon whether Goran Therborn's reconstructed Marxist version of "ideology" is still defensible under the challenge of the linguistic and discursive turn in the social sciences..

Throughout the twentieth century, language has occupied a central position in philosophy, not least through the predominance of Heidegger and Wittgenstein, and through French philosophy, which ever since the heyday of structuralism has found inspiration in linguistics through the work of Saussure. Moreover, interest in language has tended to move from linguistic units to larger textual units—discourse. An important research orientation which has emerged in recent years, and which puts great emphasis on modes of expression is discourse analysis. Discourse analysis reveals a certain similarity with poststructuralism, in that people are assumed to be inconsistent and language is not seen as reflecting external or internal (mental) conditions. Discourse analysis differs from poststructuralism mainly in that it is an empirical and systematic research endeavor, avoiding the sometimes rather wordy philosophizing that characterizes poststructuralism. Discourse analysis claims that through language people engage in constructing the social world. We will talk about this linguistic turn and its effects in the social sciences and to examine the significance of the shift from ideological critique to discourse analysis.

In this regard, Foucault has provided a neat summary and devastating criticism of what is wrong with the concept of ideology. Very briefly, Foucault rejects the concept of ideology because (1) it is implicated, as the other side of the coin, in unacceptable truth claims, (2) it rests on a humanist understanding of the individual subject and (3) it is enmeshed in the unsatisfactory and determinist base-and-superstructure model within Marxism. "Post-structuralist" critiques of the theory of ideology, of which Foucault's remarks have now become an exemplar, have commonly developed the concept of "discourse" as the focus of an alternative theoretical model. In Part III of this course, we'll engage Bourdieu and Foucault to understand the scope and significance of the shift from ideology to discourse in social theory.

Foucault's concept of discourse is formally explained in his major methodological work *The Archaeology of Knowledge* where he elaborated a view that one might summarize, a little polemically, as the production of "things" by "words".

Discourses are composed of signs, but they do more than designate things, for they are :practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak”. In a neat reversal of the classical materialist hierarchy Foucault says that the rules of discursive practice “define not the dumb existence of a reality, nor the canonical use of a vocabulary, but the ordering of things.” Thus Foucault describes his claim that the “tight embrace” between words and things can be loosened by attending to the processes that govern the construction of objects in discourse.

Foucault uses discourse to analyze diverse configurations of assumptions, categories, logics, claims and modes of articulation. Discourse is thus seen more as a framework and a logic of reasoning that, through its penetration of social practices, systematically forms its objects than as any use of language in a social context. Foucault’s interest was more in how discourse constitutes objects and subjects than in the details of language use in social interaction. Foucault is a very important source of inspiration for social theory. One reason for this is his great originality, which among other things has found expression in his refusal to accept traditional social science categories, which he has broken up and replaced by brand new ones. At the same time Foucault worked in the tradition of the great social science thinkers (Weber, critical theory and others) who pointed the searchlights at the process of rationalization in modern society. Yet he provides this tradition with entirely new dimensions through his often very unexpected and creative conceptual formations and his displacements of the foci of investigation, linked at a more concrete level with detailed empirical studies, almost lifelike in their concreteness and vividness, inspired by the art of painting. At the core of our concern in this course is to examine critically whether Foucault’s “discourse analysis” constitute a final nail on the Marx’s theory of ideology coffin or not. We’ll address this important issue when we proceed in this course. Thus, the overall objective of this course is to provide a rigorous introduction to the core concepts, ideas and theories of ideology in the Marxist tradition and beyond.

One preliminary word of caution: Discussions of ideology are particularly complex (and sometimes opaque) because they so directly impinge on questions of methodology, epistemology and philosophy. Disagreements about what is ideology and how its effects and determinants are to be understood are directly implicated in disagreements over what is knowledge and how scientific understandings are to be constructed. Frequently it happens that discussions of ideology become totally preoccupied with these methodological issues, and the actual elaboration of the real mechanisms and dynamics of ideology never get analyzed in a sustained way. This

course will try to keep the readings and discussions as substantive as possible.

Class Format/Citizenship

The class will be run as a discussion. I expect that students will come to class having read the readings and be prepared to engage in discussion. I do not intend to lecture the class. In order to facilitate class discussion, we will begin each class right after the weekly presentation with a collective attempt to establish what the central arguments of the readings are.

In a seminar course of this sort, it is my wish that I want the sessions and discussions to be as stimulating and exciting as possible, with a collegial and supportive atmosphere. Pedagogically, this seminar is dedicated to the proposition that knowledge is a collective product. This intellectual journey is intended to be collective; each participant (including me) is expected to contribute to our discussions and debates. Good seminars depend to a great extent on the seriousness of preparation by students. Let us all be good and responsible class citizens to make contributions as much as possible.

Requirements and Grading:

All participants will be expected to: 1) take an active part in discussions (20%); 2) prepare ten memos on the week's required readings(20%); 3) make at least two presentations on the readings to the seminar during the semester (20%); 4) a final term paper (40%).

Seminar Presentations: Each week two students will serve as discussion leaders. These presentations should be 20-25 minutes long for each and should try to establish a focused agenda for the discussion which follows. The point of the presentation is not to comprehensively summarize the readings, but to provide a critical evaluation, focusing on the strengths and weakness of the arguments/analyses, comparing different perspectives, and highlighting the most important issues and questions they raise as a way of launching the day's discussion.

Weekly Issue Memo: I believe strongly that it is important for students to engage the week's readings in **written** form **prior** to the seminar sessions. These weekly memos are intended to prepare the ground for good discussions by requiring participants to set out their initial responses to the readings which will improve the quality of the

class discussion since students come to the sessions with an already thought out agenda.

I refer to these short written comments as “*issue memos*”. They are **not** meant to be mini-papers on the readings; nor need they summarize the readings as such. Rather, they are meant to be a think-piece, reflecting your own intellectual engagement with the material: specifying what is obscure or confusing in the reading; taking up issue with some core idea or argument; exploring some interesting ramification of an idea in the reading. These memos do not have to deal with the most profound, abstract or grandiose arguments in the readings; the point is that they should reflect what you find most engaging, exciting or puzzling.

We will arrange to share these memos through e-mail, and the week’s presenters, if s/he likes, can use other students’ comments to prepare an agenda for discussion. In order for everyone to have time to read over other’s comments, these will be due on e-mail by 9:00 pm on Monday evening (the day before the seminar meets). *These memos are a real requirement*, and failing to hand in memos will affect your grade. I will read through the memos to see if they are “serious”, but not grade them for “quality”. Since the point of this exercise is to enhance discussions, late memos will **not** be accepted. If you have to miss a seminar session for some reason, you are still required to prepare an issue memo for that session. Since I may not total the number of memos each student writes until the end of the semester, please keep copies to be sure of fulfilling the requirements.

Term Paper

The central assignment of this course is to develop a research proposal around ideological critique and discourse analysis that are of interest to you. I have in mind two things about the term paper . I expect that most of you do not have a specific project yet. My goal is for you to consider relevant literatures and construct a possible research project. Such a project should realistically specify how you would go about collecting evidence. My hope is that you will find the assignment stimulating enough and the proposal interesting enough that you will carry through the project eventually, either as a paper or a thesis/dissertation. In case some of you already have access to data sets relevant to a given research project, you may want to produce a draft of a completed research paper in the context of this course. In any case, you are encouraged to pursue your own research work and training as part of the requirements for this course.

I will ask you to turn in a one-page description of your project on **November 24**. The proposal should suggest some questions, specify relevant theoretical and empirical literatures, and suggest how one might study the subject. Obviously at this stage in the game, I do not expect your ideas to be well developed.

The final paper should have a title page, contain an introduction, a review of the literature, a statement of your question given your reading of the literature, and a section detailing research design, and a conclusion. The conclusion should discuss briefly the contribution your research would make to the literature. You should also include a bibliography using standard journal formats. Citations in the text should use journal format. Please use footnotes sparingly.

For those of you who have data already, you should produce a final paper that includes your research design and a presentation of your results, and a conclusion that discusses the results, their implication for theory and research, and future research directions.

Reading Text

Despite the hybrid nature of the course doing the reading on time is still the foundation for. I have tried to keep the weekly assigned readings light so that you won't be overwhelmed. Be sure to do the readings carefully and critically.

Textbooks:

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York: International Publishers.

Therborn, Goran. 1980. The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology. London: Verso.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. The Archeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language. New York: Pantheon Books.

Recommended Readings:

Zizek, Slavoj, ed. 1994. Mapping Ideology. London: Verso.

Eagleton, Terry. 1991. Ideology: An Introduction. London: Verso.

Geuss, Raymond. 1981. The Idea of A Critical Theory: Habermas & the Frankfurt School. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barrett, Michele. 1991. The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault. Stanford:

Stanford University Press.

Boudon, Raymond. 1989. *The Analysis of Ideology*. London: Polity Press.

Easthope, Antony and Kate McGowan, eds. 1992. *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

張錦華，2001，《傳播批判理論》，台北：黎明文化

Michael Gurevitch 等編，唐維敏等譯，2003，《文化、社會與媒體：批判性觀點》，台北：遠流。

Further Readings on the Subject of Ideology:

McLellan, David. 1986. *Ideology*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

*A short and useful introductory book to the subject of ideology.

Larrain, Jorge. 1979. *The Concept of Ideology*. London: Hutchinson.

*For those who looking for an excellent book-length introduction to the topic of ideology, this book is difficult to match in historical scope and analytical power. An excellent, wide ranging introduction to the field from Francis Bacon to the Frankfurt School.

Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

*Terry Eagleton unravels the many different definitions of ideology, and explores the concept's tortuous history from the Enlightenment to postmodernism. A quite lucid interpretative work.

Eagleton, Terry, edited. 1994. *Ideology*. London and New York: Longman.

*This collection of readings on the concept of ideology is a useful complement to Eagleton's above book. The readings cover writings from the Enlightenment via Hegel and Marx, with particular emphasis on Marx and Engels themselves. The concept is taken through to Althusser and beyond. The text then goes on to discuss recent debates about ideology as a cultural system and Marxism and literary history.

Guess, Raymond. 1981. *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas & the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*This book is a particularly elegant, rigorous study of the question, with special reference to the Frankfurt School. Guess sets out the fundamental claim that Habermas and earlier members of the Frankfurt School have presented critical theory as a new form of Knowledge. It is differentiated from the natural sciences as essentially "reflective": the knowledge it provides guides us towards enlightenment as to our true interests, and emancipation from often unsuspected forms of external and internal coercion. An excellent little study of the Frankfurt school in the light of a theory of ideology in general.

Thompson, John. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

*This book examines some of the outstanding contemporary contributions to the study of ideology ranging usefully from Castoriadis to Habermas from a position broadly sympathetic to the latter. Contains suggestive chapters on Habermas, Bourdieu, Giddens and several other major thinkers, along with some interesting general reflections on ideology and domination.

Thompson, John. 1990. *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

*In this book, Thompson develops a distinctive new account of the theory of ideology and relates it to the analysis of culture and mass communication in modern societies.

Zizek, Slavoj, edited. 1994. *Mapping Ideology*. London: Verso.

*This excellent collection presents a comprehensive sampling of the most important contemporary writing on the subject. An invaluable guide to what is now the most dynamic field of cultural theory.

Barrett, Michele. 1991. *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

*This book explores the challenges to a Marxist theory of ideology posed by post-structuralist theories. Michele Barrett shows that Marx's own writings offer a confusing array of possible approaches to "ideology", which the classical Marxist tradition consolidated as "mystification that serves class interests." Barrett locates Gramsci and Althusser as key figures in the breakdown of this model—Gramsci's work presaging the separation of class, politics and ideology found in Laclau and Mouffe, and Althusser's failing to deliver an adequate approach to subjectivity. In turn, Foucault—replacing Marxism's "economics of untruth" with his own "politics of truth"—is examined as an exemplar of post-structuralist critiques of ideology.

Information about Reading Assignments

The readings in each section are grouped under three categories. These should be interpreted as follows:

BACKGROUND READINGS. These readings generally provide a quick and simple overview of a general topic area. They are frequently not as analytically rigorous as the main readings, but may be useful to get a general sense of concepts and issues, especially for people with little or no background in the particular topic.

CORE READINGS. These are the readings which all students are expected to read as

part of the normal work in the course. The lectures will presuppose that students have read of these core readings prior to the lecture.

FURTHER READINGS. In some sections of the syllabus we include additional references for students interested in pursuing a particular topic in depth. The suggested readings are listed for your reference only. There is no expectation that students will read these items during the course.

COURSE AGENDA AND WEEKLY THEMES

PART I. CLASSICAL MARXISM AND THEORIES OF IDEOLOGY

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Week 1. (9/22) | Course Introduction |
| Week 2. (9/29) | Marx's Inheriting Contradictions: The Marxist Critique of Ideology |
| Week 3 (10/6) | Ideology and Its Vicissitudes in Western Marxism: Terry Eagleton |

PARTII: QUESTIONING THE MARXIST MODEL

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Week 4. (10/13) | Hegemony I: State and Civil Society--Gramsci |
| Week 5 (10/20) | Hegemony II: Analysis of Social Relations--Gramsci |
| Week 6 (10/27) | Hegemony III: Comparative Perspectives--Gramsci |
| Week 7 (11/3) | Hegemony IV: Intellectuals and Common Sense
--Gramsci (No Formal Meeting in Class,
School Exercise Day) |
| Week 8 (11/10) | The Ideological State Apparatus: Althusser |
| Week 9 (11/17) | Mid-term Exam (No Class) |

PARTIII. RECONSTRUCTION OF MARXIST MODEL

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Week 10 (11/24) | The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology(I):
Theoborn |
| Week 11 (12/1) | The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology(II):
Theoborn |

PART IV. THE LINGUISTIC AND DISCURSIVE TURN

Week 12 (12/8)	Language and Symbolic Power(I): Bourdieu
Week 13 (12/15)	Language and Symbolic Power(II): Bourdieu
Week 14 (12/22)	Language and Symbolic Power(III): Bourdieu
Week 15 (12/29)	The Archeology of Knowledge (I): Foucault
Week 16 (1/5)	The Archeology of Knowledge (II): Foucault
Week 17 (1/12)	The Archeology of Knowledge (III): Foucault
Week 18 (1/19)	Final Exam (No Class)

PART V. SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

Week 19	Culture Industry: Adorno and Horkheimer
Week 20	Public Sphere: Habermas
Week 21	The Dominant Ideology Thesis and Its Critics
Week 22	Hegemony: From Gramsci to Laclau and Mouffe

SEMINAR SESSIONS & READING ASSIGNMENTS

PART I. CLASSICAL MARXISM AND THEORIES OF IDEOLOGY

Week 1. (9/22)	Course Introduction
Week 2. (9/29)	Marx's Inheriting Contradictions: The Marxist Critique of Ideology

Marx's critique of ideology has been among the most influential of his ideas. Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud are currently seen as the great debunkers., who taught us never to take words at their face value but always to look behind them for some psychological or social interest they express or some situation that unbeknownst to the agents shape their thoughts and desire. The ideological critique by Marx and Engels seek to show the existence of a necessary link between an "inverted" forms of consciousness and men's material's existence. It is this relationship that the concept of ideology expresses by referring to a distortion of thought which stems from, and conceals, social contradictions Consequently, from its inception ideology has a

clear-cut negative and critical connotation. But what are the forces that shape and maintain ideological thinking? The standard and, as it were, official Marxist answer is *interest*, more specifically, the interest of the ruling class. However, the central question, which is usually left unresolved by Marxist writers on ideology (Including Marx), is *how--by what mechanisms*—the interests of the ruling class is supposed to shape the views of other members of society. The view that rulers and exploiters shape the world view of the oppressed by conscious, cynical manipulation is too simplistic, not because there have been no attempts to do exactly this but because they are unlikely to succeed. This is the punchline that we should keep in mind in this course when we move on. In this section, in contrast with a purely synchronic readings of Marx’s writing on ideology, it is necessary to consider the concept of ideology within the context of various stages of Mar’s intellectual development while denying any dramatic “epistemological break” between them.

Background Readings:

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1848. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers.

*Contains the first formulation of the Marxist doctrine of ideology.

Marx, Karl. 1867. “Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*”, in *Marx and Engels: Selected Works*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

*The classical formulation of the doctrine of “base and superstructure”.

Marx, Karl. 1867. “On the Fetishism of Commodities”, *Capital*, vol. 1. London: George Allen and Unwin.

*Marx’s “mature” sense of ideology as implicit in the material workings of capitalism.

于治中，1996，論馬克斯的“意識型態”，《台灣社會研究季刊》。台北：台灣社會研究，第23期，p183-218

孫善豪，1998，馬克斯論意識型態，《台灣社會研究季刊》。台北：台灣社會研究，第31期，p115-140

陳宜中，2000，再論馬克斯的意識型態批判，《台灣社會研究季刊》。台北：台灣社會研究，第37期，p163-190

Core Readings:

Marx, Karl. 1867. *Karl Marx: A Reader*, edited by Jon Elster. Pp. 299-332.

Further Readings:

- Hall, Stuart. 1978. "The Hinterland of Science: Ideology and the 'Sociology of Knowledge'" Pp. 9-31 in *On Ideology* edited by S. Hall, B. Lumley and G. McLennan. London: Hutchinson.
- Zizek, Slavoj. 1994. "Introduction: The Spectre of Ideology." PP. 1-33 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. "Ideology." Pp. 55-71 in *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Perry. 1976. *Considerations on Western Marxism*. London: New Left Review Books.
- *A succinct and brilliant survey of the Western Marxist tradition, with particular attention to its focus on culture and ideology.
- Parakeh, Bhikhu. 1982. *Marx's Theory of Ideology*. London: Croom Helm.

Week 3 (10/6) Ideology and Its Vicissitudes in Western Marxism: Terry Eagleton

There is relatively little consensus among Marxists about precisely what the term "ideology" denotes, and thus, of course, little consensus about why ideology is consequential. We will discuss several different usages of the term "ideology" that are common in Marxist discussions in this section.

Background Readings:

- Williams, Raymond. 1977. "Ideology." Pp. 55-74 in *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1986. "The Problem of Ideology: Marxism without Guarantees." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10(2): 5-27.
- Hall, Stuart et al. eds. *On Ideology*. London: Hutchinson.
- Barker, Chris. 2000. "Questions of Culture and Ideology." Pp. 35-65 in *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Geras, Norman. 1972. "Marxism and the Critique of Political Economy", in *Ideology in the Social Sciences* edited by Robin Blackburn. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Mephram, John. 1979. "The Theory of Ideology in Capital", in *Issues in Marxist Philosophy*, vol. 3, edited by J. Mephram and D-H Rubin. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Press.

Core Readings:

- Eagleton, Terry. 1994. "Ideology and its Vicissitudes in Western Marxism." Pp.179-226 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

Further Readings:

Zizek, Slavoj. 1994. "How did Marx Invent the Symptom." Pp. 296-331 in Mapping Ideology, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

Lukacs, Georg. 1971. History and Class Consciousness. Cambridge: MIT Press.

*The key text of so-called Western Marxism; its chapters on "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat" makes a dramatically original contribution to the theory of ideology.

Manheim, Karl. 1936. Ideology and Utopia. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

*A central work in the "sociology of knowledge", influenced by Marxism but critical of its major theses.

Goldman, Lucien. 1964. The Hidden God. London: Routledge.

*An important work in the Lukacsian tradition, and the founding text of so-called genetic structuralism.

PARTII: QUESTIONING THE MARXIST MODEL

Week 4. (10/13) Hegemony I: State and Civil Society--Gramsci

Gramsci broke fresh ground by analyzing in a highly suggestive manner the role of intellectuals and ideological apparatuses (education, Media, etc.) in the production of ideology. Gramsci's theory of hegemony has a totalistic quality in which everything is connected to everything else. It can't be approached linearly. Instead we make incisions into the theory and examine it from different points of view. Our first incision is "state and civil society." Gramsci's periodizes capitalism using political rather than conventional economic criteria (anarchic vs. organized, competitive vs. monopoly, etc.) The novel feature of advanced capitalism is based on the emergence of civil society which incorporates and domesticates challenges to capitalism (p.243). However, it is not simply that the state is aided and abetted by an expanding civil society in reproducing capitalism but the state itself assumes expanded functions (pp.244-47). From the standpoint of this incision hegemony refers to a form of rule that combines force and consent, dictatorship and hegemony (pp.244, 261, 263, footnote 49, p.80).

The rise of civil society and the expansion of the state to include repressive as well as ideological apparatuses pose a new terrain for revolution in which the "war of movement" no longer suffices. The revolution is first and foremost a "war of position" -- the long process of conquering or replacing civil society, turning it away from its connection to the state and toward prefigurative politics of socialism (pp.229-239;

p.265). Gramsci's theory of hegemony leads not only to a novel theory of revolution but a specific notion of socialism, as the tendential withering away of the "state" as repressive apparatus and its replacement by the flowering of civil society (pp.253, 258-9, 261-4). Gramsci also suggests that certain types of crises - organic or political crises - are more likely to provide the grounds to challenge hegemony than purely economic crises (pp.210-211; 219-223).

Background Readings:

Fiori, Giuseppe. 1970. Antonio Gramsci: Life of a Revolutionary. New York: Schocken Books.

Core Readings:

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York: International Publishers. Pp. 206-276.

Further Readings:

Hall, Stuart. 1978. "Politics and Ideology: Gramsci." Pp. 45-76 in On Ideology edited by S. Hall, B. Lumley and G. McLennan. London: Hutchinson.

Bobbio, Norberto. 1979. "Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society." Pp. ??? in Gramsci and the Marxist theory, edited by Chantal Mouffe. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Boggs, Carl. 1976. Gramsci's Marxism. London: Pluto.

Buci-Glucksmann, Christine. 1980. Gramsci and the State. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Week 5 (10/20) Hegemony II: Analysis of Social Relations--Gramsci

Our second incision embarks from Gramsci's analysis of the relations between classes which is inseparable from the question of class formation (pp.175-185 and especially pp.180-2). Here hegemony is not so much a form of rule but a relation between classes. Gramsci lays out the economic, political and military relations of forces. It is within the political moment that class potentially moves from corporate, to economic to hegemonic phase. The hegemonic phase is one in which a dominant or potentially dominant class presents its interests as the interests of all. What is the hegemonic ideology with which it manages to accomplish this task(158-68; p.195)? What are the material conditions of hegemony (p.161)? Indeed, what is ideology for Gramsci (pp.125-6)? What is a political party (pp.147-157) and what is the role of the party or state in forging hegemony? What has Gramsci to say about the relation of parties to classes in general and specifically to the working class, the class of great industrialists,

petty bourgeoisie, and the peasantry? One might say his characterization of party systems defines the mechanics of hegemony.

Background Readings:

Davidson, Alistair. 1977. Antonio Gramsci: Towards an Intellectual Biography.
London: Merlin Press.

Core Readings:

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York.
International Publishers. Pp. 124-205

Further Readings:

Femia, Joseph. 1987. Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and
the Revolutionary Process. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Week 6 (10/27) Hegemony III: Comparative Perspectives--Gramsci

The third incision into Gramsci's theory of hegemony lies in his comparative analyses of different national political terrains. Gramsci develops a sophisticated and too often unrecognized comparative political sociology, very unusual for his time. There are three major axes of comparison running through Gramsci's writings.

--First, is the comparison of West and East, why socialist revolution in East, i.e. Russia, but not in the West. This has to do with the presence and absence of civil society. Gramsci argues that in the West a war of position develops a socialist hegemony before the seizure of power whereas in Russia it [must] work the other way round with the war of position following the seizure of power. That is to say civil society is constituted in the post-revolutionary period, a process that was taking place in the Soviet Union until it was abruptly reversed by Stalinism.

--The second comparison is between Italy and France, why France was able to develop a Jacobin Party that represented a bourgeois national hegemony (pp.76-8) but Italy was never able to achieve that national unity. It experienced a passive revolution or a "revolution without a revolution" (p.59) instead of a hegemonic bourgeois revolution. In Italy the bourgeoisie was weak (p.82) and the state was to constitute hegemony on its behalf (pp.105-6). The potentially hegemonic party - the Action Party - failed in its attempts at agrarian reform and thereby to represent the peasantry. Instead its initiatives were absorbed by the more conservative Moderate Party. The weakness of the bourgeoisie and civil society led to hegemonic crisis (pp.275-6, 219-223), which led to fascism rather than socialist revolution. Fascism was the

continuation of the passive revolution, the regulation of civil society from above rather than its reconstruction from below.

--The third comparison was between Americanism or Fordism and fascism. Gramsci argued that fascism was Europe's response to Americanism/Fordism. Not having feudal legacies -- pensioners of economic history (pp.281, 285-6, 293) -- to inherit and contend with, America could develop a stream-lined, hyper-rational hegemony rooted in production and projected from there into family life and civil society (pp.294-316). America may lay the economic foundation of a higher civilization but there is no hope of its realization there since the workers' movement is stuck at the "economic corporate level," defending craft unionism (p.286), opposing the development of Fordism (p.292). In Europe on the other hand the regulated economy of fascism (pp.120, 291) was the attempt to deal simultaneously with the contradictions of capitalism and competition from America. But fascism cannot compete economically because it preserves rather than destroys the old parasitic classes (pp.293-4; 316-8). Europe, therefore, can only continue to develop its economy, Gramsci intimates, if it is transformed by socialist revolution. Whether such a revolution will take place is another matter.

Background Readings:

Joll, J. 1977. Gramsci. Glasgow: Fontana.

Core Readings:

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York. International Publishers. Pp. 279-318.

Further Readings:

Adamson, Walter. 1980. Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Week 7 (11/3) Hegemony IV: Intellectuals and Common Sense --Gramsci

NOTE: We will not meet formally in class today because this is the School Exercise Day, you are however encouraged to do the reading on your own and bring up the issues for discussions in our next meeting.

Another signal innovation of Gramsci was his theory of intellectuals and ideology. We have already seen that Gramsci emphasizes the power of ideology to grip,

galvanize and mobilize the collective will, rather than its capacity to mystify reality. He seems to believe that an ideology that is effective as a social force will also turn out to be true. He argues, for example, that Marxism cannot be opposed to the common sense of the popular classes, although it might need intellectuals to interpret Marxism and turn it into a living force (pp.198-9). Intellectuals are of two types: organic and traditional intellectuals, distinguished by their relations to the class they represent. Organic intellectuals are those that share class experience with those they represent, articulate that experience in political terms. Traditional intellectuals stand apart from their class in order to represent its universal interests. Organic intellectuals mobilize subordinate classes while traditional intellectuals reproduce the hegemony of dominant classes.

The existence of two types of intellectuals correspond to the struggle between common sense into which has percolated ideas of the traditional intellectuals, especially religious ideas -- we might call it tradition -- and good sense which is rational and corresponds to real needs (pp.326, 328, 346) and which organic intellectuals try to release, articulate and make coherent. Good sense often reveals itself in moment of crisis or transformation. We have here a view of hegemony from below, the struggle between hegemonies.

Background Readings:

Karabel, Jerome. 1976. "Revolutionary Contradictions: Antonio Gramsci and the Problem of Intellectuals." *Politics and Society* 6: 123-172.

Core Readings:

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers. Pp. 5-23, 321-377.

Further Readings:

Burawoy, Michael. 1979. *Manufacturing Consent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 1985. *The Politics of Production: Dactory Regimes under Capitalism and Socialism*. London: Verso.

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mouffe, Chantal. 1979. "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci." Pp. 168-204 in *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*, edited by Chantal Mouffe. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Anderson, Perry. 1977. "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci." *New Left Review* 100:???

*The best available account of Gramsci's concept of hegemony.

Sassoon, Anne Showstack. 1987. *Gramsci's Politics*. London: Hutchinson.

Week 8 (11/10) The Ideological State Apparatus: Althusser

Althusser has presented the most influential exposition of ideology in the last three decades. He distinguishes a theory of ideology in general, for which the function of ideology is to secure cohesion in society, from the theory of particular ideologies, for which the former general function is overdetermined by the new function of securing the domination of one class. These functions can be performed by ideology in so far as it is a "representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence." And in so far as it interpellates individuals and constitutes them as subjects who accept their role within the system of production relations. On the other hand, Althusser also affirms the existence of dominated ideologies which express the protest of exploited classes. Althusser insists that science is the absolute opposite to ideology, but at the same time he describes ideology as an objective level of society which is relatively autonomous. The difficulty in this approach lies in the fact that it is impossible to reconcile the existence of a revolutionary ideology with the assertion that all ideology subjects individuals to the dominant systems. Moreover, it is very difficult to reconcile ideology as a misrepresentation opposed to science with ideology as the objective superstructure of society, unless the superstructure contains nothing but ideological distortions and science is located elsewhere, but this is also problematic.

Background Readings:

Althusser, Louis. 1970. *For Marx*. New York: Pantheon Books.

*Sketches the main outlines of Althusser's psychoanalytic theory of ideology.

Althusser, Louis, and Etienne Balibar. 1970. *Reading Capital*. London: NLB.

Core Readings:

Althusser, Louis. 1994. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Pp. 100-140 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso.

*The single most influential account of ideology in recent times.

Further Readings:

Hall, Stuart. 1985. "Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-structuralist Debates." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 2(2):

91-114.

McLennan, G. et al. 1977. "Althusser's Theory of Ideology." Pp. 77-108. in *On Ideology* edited by S. Hall, B. Lumley and G. McLennan. London: Hutchinson.

Laclau, Ernesto. 1977. *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*. London: Verso.

*A major work of Althusser's work.

Elliott, Gregory. 1987. *Althusser: The Detour of Theory*. London: Verso.

*Perhaps the single most perceptive and exhaustive study of Althusser's work.

Callinicos, Alex. 1976. *Althusser's Marxism*. London: Pluto Press.

*An impressively compact and judicious assessment of Althusser's major tenets.

Benton, Ted. 1984. *The Rise and Fall of Structural Marxism*. London: Macmillan.

*Another admirably judicious study of Althusser's career.

Ranciere, Jacques. 1985. "On the Theory of Ideology—Althusser's Politics, in *Radical Philosophy Reader*, edited by R. Edgley and P. Osborne. London: Verso.

*A voice of dissent from within the Althusserian camp.

Hirst, Paul. 1979. *Law and Ideology*. London: Macmillan.

*An exemplary text of British Althusserianism, with two important essays on Althusser's theory of ideology.

Balibar, Etienne. 1988. "The Vacillation of Ideology." Pp. 159-209 in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg and Cary Nelson. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

*One of Althusser's most distinguished students reflects on the idea of ideology.

Macherey, Pierre and Etienne Balibar. 1981. "Literature as Ideological Form", in *Untying the Text*, edited by Robert Young. London: Routledge.

*A strikingly original essay on ideology by two of Althusser's colleagues.

Macherey, Pierre. 1978. *A Theory of Literary Production*. London: Routledge.

*The single most interesting attempt to apply Althusserian theory to the field of literature.

Eagleton, Terry. 1976. *Criticism and Ideology*. London: New Left Books.

*Another such attempt in a similar vein.

Thompson, Edward. 1978. "The Poverty of Theory: Or an Orrery of Errors", in *The Poverty of Theory*.

*A devastating anti-Althusserian polemic from Britain's leading twentieth-century labor historian.

Week 9 (11/17) Mid-term Exam (No Class)

PARTIII. RECONSTRUCTION OF MARXIST MODEL

Week 10 (11/24) The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology(I): Theoborn

The problem of subjectivity has become an increasingly salient theme in all varieties of critical theory. Within the Marxist tradition such concerns are generally theorized under the rubric “ideology and consciousness”, whereas in some other traditions “culture” is the buzzword for the study of subjectivity in social life. The increased attention to such themes within Marxism is partially a reaction to the underdevelopment of the theory of ideology in early Marxist work and partially a result of a growing realization that capitalist societies are reproduced not merely through repressive force but through the pervasive impact of various forms of ideology on the subjectivity of workers. In the following two sections, I will defend an overarching conception that has some of its roots in the work of Louis Althusser as this has been transformed by Goran Therborn. I will argue that other conceptions of ideology—conceptions which revolve around the concepts of false consciousness, mystification or normative beliefs—all make important contributions, but are incomplete. Instead of viewing ideology as primarily a set of ideas whether mystified or normative, following Therborn, I will argue that ideology should be regarded as a kind of practice (or perhaps more rigorously, as a specific dimension of social practices), namely *a practice which produces human subjectivity*. (Sometimes this is referred to as practices which produce subjects, or subject-producing practices). Ideology is a social practice, a structure of real activities which have the effect of producing and transforming forms of human subjectivity.

Background Readings:

Therborn, Goran. 1978. *What does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules*. London: Verso.

Core Readings:

Therborn, Goran. 1980. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. London: Verso. Pp. 1-49

*Probably, Therborn’s best book ever written. This is an excellent examination and analyses of all the different approaches to ideology, bridging the two prominent European modes of interpretation of phenomenology and Marxism. This book can also be seen as a reconstructed version of Marxist approach to ideology.

Further Readings:

- Wright, Erik. 1999. *Class Counts*. Pp. 185-215. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, Erik. 1985. "What is Class Consciousness?" Pp. 242-250 in *Classes*. London: Verso.
- Hall, Stuart. 1977. "Culture, Media and the 'ideological effect'" Pp 315-48 in *Mass Communication and Society*, edited by J. Curran, M. Gurevitch and J. Wollacott. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hall, Stuart, 1982. "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Repressed in Media Studies." Pp. 56-90 in *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by M. Gurevitch, J. Curran and J. Wollacott. London: Methuen.
- Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill and Bryan Turner. 1994. "Determinacy and Indeterminacy in the Theory of Ideology." Pp. 152-166 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso
- Therborn, Goran. 1994. "The New Questions of Subjectivity." Pp. 167-178 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

**Week 11 (12/1) The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology(II):
Theoborn****Background Readings:**

- Barker, Chris. 2000. "Issues of Subjectivity and Identity." Pp. 165-192 in *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.

Core Readings:

- Therborn, Goran. 1980. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. London: Verso. Pp. 53-125.

Further Readings:

- Elster, Jon. 1982. "Belief, Bias, and Ideology." Pp. 123-48 in *Rationality and Relativism*, edited by Martin Hollis and Stephen Lukes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Ideology as a Cultural System", in *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Hutchinson.
- Gouldner, Alvin. 1976. *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology*. London: Macmillan.
- Harbermas, Jurgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press.

Jameson, Frederic. 1981. *The Political Unconsciousness*.
Zizek, Slavoj. 1989. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.
Barthes, Roland. 1973. *Mythologies*. London: Paladin.

PART IV. THE LANGUAGE AND DISCURSIVE TURN

Week 12 (12/8) Language and Symbolic Power(I): Bourdieu

Culture is unthinkable without language. The one presupposes the other. This is the conventional sociological and anthropological view, to which Bourdieu subscribes in the strongest possible terms. He insists that language cannot be analyzed or understood in isolation from its cultural context and the social conditions of its production and reception. So the first thing to note in *Language and Symbolic Power* is that they are a critique of pure, formalist linguistics, most obviously the work of Saussure and Chomsky. In particular, he objects to Saussure's distinction between *langue* (language) and *parole* (speech), and Chomsky's differentiation between "competence" and "performance". Each depends on the methodological constitution of an abstract domain of language—simultaneously "real" and "ideal"—which is drawn upon in the production of mundane written or spoken language in all of its variety.

He argues that uniform, linguistic communities of the kind which these linguistic models imply do not exist. "Standard language", such as they are, are the product of complex social processes, generally bound up with a history of state formation., and are simply one version of a language—and a socially highly specific one at that. They are not *the* language. Moreover this kind of linguistic analysis "freezes" language, creates it as "structure".

In the second place, Bourdieu's writings on language are an extension to a new empirical topic of the theoretical approach which he has developed in his anthropological work and in his studies of education and cultural consumption. He thinks "that the division between linguistics and sociology is unfortunate and deleterious to both disciplines". Since language is intrinsically a social and practical phenomenon it is fair game for sociologists. More than that, the analysis of communication and discourse should constitute one of the foundation stones of the sociological enterprise. Nor does Bourdieu see his analyses of language, education and cultural consumption as separate enterprises: they are all concerned with the manner in which domination is achieved by the manipulation of symbolic and cultural resources and with the collusion of the dominated.

Please be noted: Bourdieu is a difficult writer: often writing in language which has been described as "truly remarkably obscure and abstract which undermines its

readability. In Bourdieu's work, one is forced too often to query the communicative necessity of much of the jargon. Moreover, his writing has become increasingly dense, elliptical and long winded as his career has progressed. These being said, he is still an original theorist worth engaging seriously.

Background Readings:

Barker, Chris. 2000. "Culture, Meaning, Knowledge: The Linguistic Turn in Cultural Studies." Pp. 66-95 in *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Terry Eagleton. 1994. "Doxa and Common Life: An Interview." Pp. 265-277 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. "A Lecture on the Lecture." Pp. 177-198. in *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*.

Core Readings:

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 37-89.

Further Readings:

Jenkins, Richard. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Recent Developments in Theories of Language and Ideology." Pp. 157-62 in *Culture, Media, Language*, edited by Stuart Hall et al. London: Unwin Hyman.

Week 13 (12/15) Language and Symbolic Power(II): Bourdieu

Background Readings:

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." Pp. 123-139 in *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*.

Core Readings:

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 105-159.

Further Readings:

Calhoun, Craig, et al. eds. 1993. *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shusterman, Richard. 1999. *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Week 14 (12/22) Language and Symbolic Power(III): Bourdieu

Background Readings:

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Core Readings:

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 163-251.

Further Readings:

Lamont, Michele and Marcel Fournier. 1992. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, Michele. 1992. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*.

Swartz, David. 1997. *Culture and Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Week 15 (12/29) The Archeology of Knowledge (I): Foucault

“Discourse” has been a key concept in modern literary criticisms. The work of Michel Foucault has given a special prominence to the concept of “discourse” in contemporary intellectual and political analysis. He used the term throughout most of his significant writing, but with his methodological book, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, the idea gained a new rigor and a new significance that, one might say, has effectively changed the way in which we think of language and its relation to social institutions, systems of power, and the role of intellectuals in our society. It must be said that in light of the new tenor given to “discourse”, we can no longer easily ask such questions as, What is a discourse? Or, What does discourse mean? Instead, we should, then, ask another set of questions: How does discourse function? Where is it to be found? How does it get produced and regulated? What are its social effects? How does it exist—as, say, a set of isolated events hierarchically related or as a seemingly enduring flow of linguistic and institutional transformations? In effect, then, to understand the new sense of “discourse”, one must try to position it, to see it in its own terms, to describe its place within a network of other analytical and theoretical concepts which are “weapons” for grappling with contemporary society and its history. For example, Foucault gives us a strong sense of discourse as an enduring flow by tracing the genealogy of “discipline” as a series of events existing as transformations of one another.

“Discourse” provides a privileged entry into the poststructuralist mode of analysis precisely because it is the organized and regulated, as well as the regulating

and constituting, functions of language that it studies: its aim is to describe the surface linkages between power, knowledge, institutions, intellectuals, the control of populations, and the modern state as these interact in the function of systems of thought. “Discourse” is one of the most empowered ways in modern and postmodern societies for the forming and shaping of humans as “subjects”. In a now-famous play on words, we might say that “power” through its discursive and institutional relays “subjects” us: that is, it makes us into “subjects”, and it “subjects” us to the rule of the dominant disciplines which are empowered in our society and which regulate its possibilities for human freedom—that is, it “subjugates” us.

The study of “discourse”, then, leads inevitably to a study of institutions, disciplines, and intellectuals: poststructuralists like Foucault would argue that the research areas opened up by this concept of “discourse” are inherently restricted to matters of the local; other thinkers, especially those who might try to align some of these poststructuralist notions with certain forms of recent Marxist thinking—much of it derived from Gramsci—would argue that such study can not stop at the local level but must be expanded to outline the relationship of these discursive institutions to the larger forms of power—civil society and the state. In both cases, though, there seems to be a common concern: to understand how these material discursive realities act upon the actions of others, that is, of all of us, no matter where and how differently placed we are in the grid of identity and privilege these realities constitute.

Overall, the major theme of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* is a discussion of an alternative mode of investigation, archaeology, appropriate for a neglected domain of objects, statements, to which the following three sections will turn.

Background Readings:

Foucault, Michel. 1980. “Truth and Power.” Pp. 109-133 in *Power/Knowledge*, edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.

Smart, Barry. 1988. Michel Foucault. London: Routledge.

Sheridan, Alan. 1990. Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth. London: Routledge.

Cousins, Mark and Hussain Althar. 1984. Michel Foucault. London: Macmillan.

Core Readings:

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books. Pp. 3-76.

Further Readings:

Dreyfus, Hubert and Paul Rabinow. 1982. Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Brighton: Havester Press.

Bakhtin, M. 1934-5 (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Volosinov, V. N. 1929 (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Seminar Press.

Week 16 (1/5) The Archeology of Knowledge (II): Foucault

Background Readings:

Merquior, J. G. 1985. *Foucault*. London: Fontana.

Miller, James. 1993. *The Passion of Michel Foucault*. London: Harper Collins.

Core Readings:

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books. Pp. 79-148.

Further Readings:

Gutting, Gary, edited. 1994. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 17 (1/12) The Archeology of Knowledge (III): Foucault

Background Readings:

Danaher, Geoff, Tony Schirato, and Jen Webb. 2000. *Understanding Foucault*. London: Sage.

Core Readings:

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books. Pp. 149-211.

Further Readings:

Hoy, David Couzens, edited. 1986. *Foucault: A Critical Reader*. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell.

Week 18 (1/19) Final Exam (No Class)

PART V. SUPPLEMENTARY TOPICS

Week 19 Culture Industry: Adorno and Horkheimer

According to the Frankfurt School, the culture industry reflects the consolidation of commodity fetishism, the domination of exchange value and the ascendancy of state monopoly capitalism. It shapes the tastes and preferences of the masses, thereby moulding their consciousness by instilling the desire for false needs. It therefore works to exclude real or true needs, alternative and radical concepts or theories, and genuinely threatening political opposition. It is so effective in doing this that people do not realize what is going on. In a reconsideration of the concept of the culture industry, Adorno defined what he meant by the concept of the culture industry:

In all its branches, products which are tailored for consumption by masses, and which to a greater extent determine the nature of that consumption, are manufactured more or less according to plan... This is made possible by contemporary technical capabilities as well as by economic and administrative concentration. The culture industry intentionally integrates its consumers from above. To the detriment of both it forces together the spheres of high and low art, separated for thousand of years. The seriousness of high art is destroyed in the speculation about its efficacy; the seriousness of the lower perishes with the civilizational constraints imposed on the rebellious resistance inherent within it as long as social control was not yet total. Thus, although the culture industry undeniably speculates on the conscious and unconscious state of the millions towards which it is directed, the masses are not primary but secondary, they are an object of calculation, an appendage of the machinery. The customer is not king, as the culture industry would have us believe, not its subject but its objects.

In a nutshell, the power of the culture industry to secure the dominance and continuity of capitalism resides, for Adorno, in its capacity to shape and perpetuate a “regressive” audience, a dependent and passive consuming public.

Background Readings:

- Jay, Martin. 1973. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. Boston: Little Brown.
- 1984. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukcs to Habermas*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Core Readings:

Horkheimer, Max and Theodor Adorno. 1989. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception" Pp120-167. in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Continuum

Further Readings:

Adorno, Theodore. 1991. *The Culture Industry*. London: Routledge.

Adorno, Theodore. 1994. "Message in a Bottle." Pp. 34-45 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

Hesmondhalgh, David. 2002. *The Cultural Industries*. London: Sage.

Adorno, Theodore. 1973. *Negative Dialectics*. London: Routledge.

*Perhaps the major philosophical work of the Frankfurt school, strongly influenced by Hegel and, in its conception of ideology as "identity thinking", strikingly prefigurative of modern-day post-structuralism.

Dews, Peter. 1994. "Adorno, Post-Structuralism and the Critique of Identity." Pp. 46-65 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

Benhabib, Seyla. 1994. "The Critique of Instrumental Reason." Pp. 66-92 in *Mapping Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso

Dews, Peter. 1987. *Logics of Disintegration: Post-Structuralist Thought and the Claims of Critical Theory*. New York: Verso.

Week 20 Public Sphere: Habermas**Background Readings:**

Habermas, Jurgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Core Readings:

Calhoun, Craig. 1992. "Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere." Pp. 1-51 in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Further Readings:

Calhoun, Craig, ed 1992. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

McGuigan, J. 1996. *Culture and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.

Dahlgren, Peter. 1995. *Television and the Public Sphere: Citizenship, Democracy and the Media*. London: Sage,

Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill and Bryan Turner, eds. 1990. *Dominant Ideologies*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Hill, Stephen 1990. "Britain: The Dominant Ideology Thesis after a Decade." Pp. 1-37 in *Dominant Ideologies*, edited by Nicholas Abercrombie , Stephen Hill and Bryan Turner. London: Unwin Hyman.