

Introduction to Cultural Studies
Dr. Avishek Parui
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology-Madras

Lecture - 02
Different Interpretations of Culture. (Marxism)

Hello and welcome to the second lecture of this particular course, Introduction to Cultural Studies. So I spent a good little time in the first lecture talking about the idea of culture as a construct, as an activity, as a category of, as a process which is happening all the time; as a process of becoming, unbecoming, rebecoming and how more importantly is the combination of material and abstract attributes you know and this combination is very useful to look at culture rather than culture being a static, inorganic entity.

Now, what I will do today is look at the way in which culture can be looked at, can be examined very gainfully. So these are some of the words which we can look at culture they can produce different interpretations of culture and sometimes the interpretations can correlate. Sometimes it can converge in very interesting ways.

(Refer Slide Time: 01:15)



So Marxism, gender studies, psychology, affect studies, and memory studies. These are I mean obviously this is by no means an exhaustive list. Can add on more disciplines but these are generally the kind of broad disciplines which were used for the purpose of this particular course

to look at culture. And so and the other thing is I mean we find that these studies these disciplines often you know sort of are dialoging with each other.

So we kind of Marxism apart from gender studies or apart from psychology affect studies and memory studies as different categories of discipline, they are not so. They often converge, there is lot of dialogue going on. This is a very interdisciplinary way of looking at culture and we know this is something I said in the very first lecture that culture as a term does not really belong to any particular disciplinary ramp.

So there cannot be anything called cultural studies which does not take into account you know gender studies or psychology or political science. Marxism of course is a **is a** component of political science to a certain extent or literature or memory studies. All these things come into play very creatively, very complexly when you look at culture especially the way we define culture as a **as a** act of production, as an activity, as an organic activity, process of becoming.

(Refer Slide Time: 02:34)

Marxism

- It's a way of examining culture as an entanglement of **base** and **superstructure**. While the base (for classical Marxism) is almost always economic, the superstructure is built on such economic determinism and constitutes culture, cultural identities and cultural codes such as language, dress, food, manners and values.
- Culture for classic Marxist scholars is largely a mode of production whereby material as well as abstract attributes such as art, literature and identities are produced and re-produced in various overt as well as covert economic conditions. So culture in classic Marxist theory often emerges as an **industry** where material as well as abstract attributes are produced and consumed.

So let us begin with Marxism what is Marxism and I am sure all of you are aware of what is Marxism. It is a kind of, it is a particular way of looking at culture as a particular system of examining culture particular model of looking at culture. So the very broad definition of Marxism could be it is the way of examining culture as an entanglement of base and superstructure. While the base for classical Marxism or Marxist is almost always economic.

The superstructure is built on such economic determination and constitutes culture, cultural identities and cultural codes such as language, dress, food, manners and values. So again this play between base and superstructure is something that Marxism you know offers us as a discipline. Now it is by no means right to say that is a rigid to binary, the base of something and superstructure of something else.

Base and superstructure are dialoging with each other and that is something which we should be aware of especially as you know people who look at Marxism from more than lens right. So the base is economic. So what do I mean when I say that base is economic. So Marxist or classical Marxist they look at culture sometime an economic activity, something which is produced out of modes of production, the politics of production, issues of ownership, issues of you know agency, issues of commodity etc.

These become part of the cultural process right. And any act of culture, any activity in culture whether it is art, language, religion, dress etc. are so manifestations or extensions of this economic activities right. So that is a very broad way of looking at the base superstructure model. The superstructure of course is a lofty structure of a particular culture and that can constitute religion, that can constitute faith, that can constitute you know literature, high art, etc.

So culture for classical Marxism scholars is largely therefore a mode of production whereby material as well as abstract attributes such as art, literature and identities are produced and reproduced and again the idea of production and reproduction is important because you know it is not just production it is endless reproduction and you know the more you reproduce something the more you disseminate something and the more you disseminate something that something gets consumed.

That is how something becomes hegemonic in the first place. So as I mentioned in the first lecture, the act of becoming hegemonic, the act of making something hegemonic is by process of production, endless production and reproduction right. Now this activity of production and

reproduction happens in various covert as well as overt economic conditions. And sometimes the economic conditions are explicit.

You know you walk into a big factory and see an act of production that is explicit production, that is overt production. But sometimes more complexly the production is you know covert or implicit. You do not see it. You walk into a massive shopping mall, massive departmental store and you see lovely little commodities, lovely little goods which you can purchase and you are not aware that they are produced at some point of time.

You just consume this as readymade commodities right. So difference between a factory and a shopping mall is exactly this. And the factory is a sort of explicit production you know it is absolutely overt production whereas the shopping mall is an act of covert production you know the production is sort of hidden it is not really visible along with the commodity.

So culture and classic Marxist theory often emerges as an industry where material as well as abstract attributes are produced and consumed. So culture as an industry is something that we are very interested in especially in cultural studies. You know if you look at cultural studies from a Marxist lens you find that industry, the culture industry becomes a very interesting factor.

So by the word industry the Marxist obviously means the spectacular mode of production and dissemination and consumption and if you look at it even generically it is interesting to understand that culture is something which we consume all the time. So when I am saying I want to be a cultured person, I want to be a cultivated person what you really want to do is you want to consume the particular codes which would make you cultural which would make you cultivated right. So there is an act of consumption in culture.

There is an act of production in culture, you produce certain codes, you also consume certain codes. So culture as an industry will make a lot of sense especially if you look at it from Marxist perspective right.

(Refer Slide Time: 06:56)

- This idea of culture industry was powerfully evoked by the Frankfurt School of Marxists most prominently represented by Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno. In an influential essay entitled 'The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception' Horkheimer and Adorno examined the strategic standardization produced by mass culture which appropriates machinic modes of production as well as consumption whereby the producer as well as the consumer are alienated at a human level from the production process as well as from the finished product.

Now the idea of culture industry was powerfully evoked by the Frankfurt School of Marxists and this is you know very interesting and very famous school of Marxism in Germany Frankfurt which produced some of the finest philosophers and thinkers of 20th century most prominently represented by Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno.

These are the two you might say poster boys for the Frankfurt School of Marxism who produced great works of Marxism great works of cultural theory and they sort of looked at culture as an industry and culture as a sort of mass production right and of course the idea of mass production is to look at how degree of standardization happens.

So when you want to make something mass, when you want to make something mass production the idea is to make it standardize to make it uniform to cut away all unique edges and to make it one solid you know standardized form of entertainment from a consumption which can be reproduced endlessly. You find a model you find a prototype, a very standard prototype and you keep producing it endlessly right.

So an influential work entitled The Culture Industry Enlightenment as Mass Deception and I use the word deception over here very deliberately, Horkheimer and Adorno examined a strategic standardization produced by mass culture which appropriates machinic modes of production as

well as consumption whereby the producer as well as the consumer are alienated at a human level from the production process as well as from the finished product.

Now this is a very loaded little description and I spent some time on it. Now what is happening over here, what these people argue in this very famous work, *The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception* is that you know the public which is consuming the cultural product is basically being deceived because what they are consuming is a commodity.

So culture becomes a commodity in the hands of certain you know industrialists, in the hands of certain you know capitalists who are producing culture who are producing cultural in films, radio, television, music; so all this become industry right. So there is very quick transition from culture to industry something which is examined in this particular essay you know this particular work.

And as consumers of culture we are essentially looking at culture as some kind of a gift, some kind of a readymade food, a readymade garment which we can quickly use can quickly confirm to and in the process we too are getting standardized. So what happens in this idea of mass consumption is act of mass consumption is the producer as well as the consumer are alienated at a human level and the word alienation is a very Marxist term.

That is alienation again this is a very interesting combination of sort of Marxism and psychology to a certain extent and you know we will draw on psychology to a great extent in this particular course. So alienation is a remover from a certain location right. So when you are alienated from your human self and it become a commodity and become a consumer for commodity that becomes a tragic process and moving away from a true human self and becoming a passive consumer of a standardized product.

So you know culture and you know culture industry in the works of Frankfurt School of Marxists becomes a standardized vehicle which is meant for consumption right and the act of consumption produces or generates the feeling of alienation in the masses you know. So the consumer is

alienated from the, at a human level from the production process as well as from the finished product ok.

(Refer Slide Time: 10:30)

'Under monopoly all mass culture is identical, and the lines of its artificial framework begin to show through. The people at the top are no longer so interested in concealing monopoly: as its violence becomes more open, so its power grows. Movies and radio need no longer pretend to be art. The truth that they are just business is made into an ideology in order to justify the rubbish they deliberately produce. They call themselves industries; and when their directors' incomes are published, any doubt about the social utility of the finished products is removed [. . .] A technological rationale is the rationale of domination itself. It is the coercive nature of society alienated from itself. Automobiles, bombs, and movies keep the whole thing together until their leveling element shows its strength in the very wrong which it furthered. It has made the technology of the culture industry no more than the achievement of standardization and mass production, sacrificing whatever involved a distinction between the logic of the work and that of the social system.'

So this is a longish quotation that from that particular essay from that particular work of Horkheimer and Adorno. If you look at the quotation you find that the word such as violence, the violence becomes more open, so its power grows. Movie and radio need not no longer pretend to be art. The truth that they are just business is made into an ideology in order to justify the rubbish they deliberately produce.

They call themselves industries and when the directors' incomes are published any doubts about the social utility of the finished products is removed. A technological rationale is the rationale of domination itself. It is the coercive nature of society alienated from itself. Automobiles, bombs, and movies keep the whole thing going together until their leveling element shows its strength in the very wrong which it furthered.

It has made the technology of the culture industry no more than the achievement of standardization and mass production sacrificing whatever invoked a distinction between the logic of the work and that of the social system. In other words what is described in a very graphic details, in very dramatic details is you know the idea of making something into one uniform whole, a one numbed uniform whole right.

And if you look at the words over here automobiles, bombs, and movies you know the idea of combining bomb and movie is very interesting because we often hear the word blockbuster right. You use the word blockbuster for cinema. The word blockbuster actually comes from destruction, military activities like you know when you are dropping a bomb and a building is destroyed in the process that is called a blockbuster.

The origin, that was how the word was originated. Now that word is now used for cinema, for a massively hit cinema, for massively commercially successful cinema we use the word blockbuster for something which is a huge hit in theaters. So again, the whole idea of success becomes commercial. The whole idea of success becomes an economic achievement right. So the work of art is relegated.

There is no work of art at all according to this particular essay and everything becomes a standardized mode of production you know and which is consumed add infinitum, add nauseam etc. right. So the achievement of standardization and mass production sacrificing whatever involved a distinction between the logic of the work and that of the social system right. So social system and the work that logic which is there is done away with.

Everything becomes a part of entertainment, everything becomes a part of consumption process and that is how Horkheimer and Adorno look at major or mainstream 20th century art, 20th century forms of production ok and that is it is a very dystopian kind of an essay but it gives us an idea of looking at culture as an industry right; to what extent is culture an industry, to what extent is culture you know consumed as an industrialized product okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 13:23)

Three key Marxist terms that may be gainfully used in culture studies are

- **Ideological State Apparatus (ISA)**
- **Repressive State Apparatus (RSA)**
- **Interpellation**

These terms were made famous by the Marxist critic Louis Althusser who used these evocatively to examine how identities are informed and contained in repressive systems of control.

So moving on with the Marxist understanding of culture, moving on with the society of looking at culture from Marxist lens it is very useful to look at some of the terms which we use very often in Marxist theory and I just here give you a list of terms which are you know useful for this particular course. The Ideological State Apparatus ISA, Repressive State Apparatus RSA, and Interpellation.

Now these terms were made famous and used by many people but made famous most prominently by the Marxist critic Louis Althusser who used these evocatively to examine how identities are informed and contained in repressive systems of control right. So Althusser was someone who, is a very famous Marxist critic, is famous for many things and he is someone who used Marxism and psychoanalysis and psychology very effectively.

So I will use psychology later in this particular course where you understand how psychology and Marxism can be combined together to look at culture in a very effective way.

(Refer Slide Time: 14:18)

- **ISA** refers to those institutions such as schools, colleges and legislative offices which produce and protect the ideologies and codes of conduct that would protect the status quo.
- **RSA** refers to those institutions such as police stations, court rooms and detention barracks where any form of dissent would be punished corporeally as well as institutionally.
- **Interpellation** is the process through which a self becomes a subject with an internalization of ideology that sometimes takes place through an unconscious process. Althusser draws on Lacanian psychology and describes interpellation as a **mis-recognition**, inasmuch as the process operates retroactively as the individual is always already an ideological subject even before they are born.

Now, so what are these terms. What are ISA, RSA, and interpellation. So let us take a look at some of the working definition of these terms. ISA. So Ideological State Apparatus. So ISA refers to those institutions such as schools, colleges. You could also consider family as example of ISA and legislative offices which produce and protect the ideologies and codes of conduct that would protect the status quo. So again, the idea is to protect and preserve the status quo right.

To have some kind of a production mechanism, some kind of a defense mechanism and ISA the Ideological State Apparatus, those apparatus including family, including religion, including schools, including colleges, including legislative offices which would produce a loss. So those loss those codes were produced out of the ISA apparatus and those of course are meant to be confirmed to by the human subject.

RSA refers to those institutions such as police stations, court rooms and detention barracks army barracks where any form of dissent would be punished corporeally as well as institutionally. So you know RSA is Repressive State Apparatus, something which will punish you; the apparatus which is designed to punish you if you dissent from the Ideological State Apparatus, if you dissent as a subject.

So if you are a dissenting subject, if you are non-confirming subject then RSA could be used to bring it back to align you back to the status quo. You know you could be imprisoned you could

be you know sentenced to you know confinement. You could be hospitalized. Again, I did not use the word hospital over here but sometimes you know you can look at the very complex collusion between medicine and politics you know which you use by medicine.

You know hospitals can be used to contain people who are dangerous, to contain “madman” because the word madness is a very interesting subject which can be studied should be studied and we will study it in cultural studies. Again madness is something which brings psychology and ideology in a very interesting combination right. So who is a mad person? Someone who is a dissenter, a potential dissenter, a potential problem will be a mad person.

So RSA refers to those institutions you know which will repress you, which will punish you, contain you etc. Now, interpellation is a very interesting term. Again, it combines psychology. It combines the mind and ideology. It is the process through which a self becomes a subject with an internalization of ideology that sometimes takes place through an unconscious process. So it is an act of internalization, how you internalize, you consume an ideology without questioning it.

And you internalize it to such an extent that you know you act as a passive subject. You act as a readymade passive confirming subject to that particular ideology and the process of internalization is called interpellation. So Althusser, he draws on Lacanian psychology and Jacques Lacan a very famous psychoanalyst you know that he is someone that Althusser draws on very interestingly to describe interpellation.

So he describes interpellation as a mis-cognition. This is very complex you know mis-recognition. So it is not really an act of recognition but a mis-recognition because you know even before you have a will of your own according to Althusser you become a cultural subject. You become an ideological subject. So even before you become a human being you become an ideological subject.

Because you are born into a family, you are born into a code, you are born into a narrative of values and you confirm, you consume those values and in the process you become a confirming citizen. You become a confirming subject. So even before you are a human being you become a

subject. So this whole act involves mis-recognition. It involves an idea of you know interpellation which is a combination of mis-recognition and confirmation to a certain kind of code right.

So and the process operates retroactively according to Althusser as the individual is always already an ideological subject even before they are born right. So even before they are born they become a ideological subject. So this whole idea of the subject formation is something which is very usefully described by Althusser. So these are 3 terms which I think are very useful if you look at culture from Marxist lens; ISA, RSA, and interpellation.

Of course there are many more terms that you can add. There are many more terms that you can look at but for the purpose of this particular course we will stick to these terms right.

(Refer Slide Time: 18:48)

• Dialectical Materialism

This can broadly be defined as a materialist examination of history, breaking away from the Hegelian humanism. Marx used this notion to study the **productive capacity** and **relations of production**. Related to productive capacity is the idea of **ownership** and **collective consciousness**. Marx provides an elegant definition of the materialist understanding of human history and the paradigm shifts characterizing the same in the 1859 Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.

Now perhaps the biggest thing, the biggest contribution of Marxism in terms of looking at culture and cultural studies is idea of dialectical materialism. Now what is dialectical materialism. Again, you see the word materialism is already there in Marxism and this is one of the you know offerings of Marxism in cultural studies.

And idea of looking at culture as a material, as something which is not something abstract, not something lofty, not something elegant and really fine but something which is refine, something

which is you know a very solid material process. So what is dialectical materialism? This can be broadly defined as a materialist examination of history breaking away from the Hegelian humanism. So Marx breaks away from Hegel, this is a philosophical break.

We need not go into details of it for this particular course. But for the purpose of this course it is important to understand that break is from Hegelian humanism to a material you know way of looking at history. Marx used the notion to study the productive capacity and relations of production right. So again you know Marx brings to attention a very banal economic conditions of culture right. How is culture produced and how is commodity produced.

What is the, what is the politics of production. What is the politics of ownership. So how is excess production possible right and what happens to excess production. So excess production becomes someone's property, someone's you know someone owns it right and how is ownership related to consciousness right.

So how is ownership related to collective consciousness. So when someone owns something how do we sort of look up to the person in solitude, in obedience, in adoration etc. So Marx provides an elegant definition of the materialist understanding of human history and the paradigm shift characterizing the same in the 1859 Preface to this very famous book called A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.

So you know this is a very you are right in the heart of political science over here and as I mentioned I am using Marxism as a component of political science to understand culture and cultural studies. So you know this is one of the beauties as well as the complexities of cultural studies. It is notorious interdisciplinarity you know it brings in all kinds of disciplines, political science, psychology, linguistics, literature, you know affect studies, memory studies in order to understand what this phenomena of culture is.

So this particular book A Contribution written in 1859 two years after the sepoy rebellion in India, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy right.

(Refer Slide Time: 16:05)

‘The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or — this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms — with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The

And what does Marx say in this quoting? This is a longish quotation that I am using from this book, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. So the idea is to look at the political superstructure and to which corresponds definite forms of consciousness. So again you see even from the very beginning, the very inception of Marxism if unconsciousness becomes very important category in Marxism right.

So this idea of how the inside, your inside, you know what you are as a self, what you are as a subject, what you are as a thinking person how is that being formed and influenced by what is outside. What is the economic environment outside. So this play between the economic environment outside and the inner self inside this is what constitutes Marxism and it is a very interesting way of looking at culture through this Marxist lens.

So the more the production according to Marx of material life conditions, the general process of social, political, and intellectual life; so more the production influences intellectual life and this is a very revolution thing to say. Because what it does is it takes away the glamour of you know isolated artistic activity. No artistic activity can happen in isolation. So every human being is a subject. Every human being is a subject to a certain cultural, political, economic condition.

So no matter how revolutionary the art is, no matter how avant-garde the art is, it is part of the cultural condition, it is part of the material condition on that particular point of a soluble time. So

it cannot be divorced from it entirely. So it is not this is one of the most often quoted sentences in Marx. It is not the consciousness of men that determines existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness.

So Marx is not saying that it is not consciousness which determines existence. It is not the inner mind which influences how we live outside, how we look at the world outside. It is not that. The world outside determines how we look at ourselves. The world outside determines how we think. So it is the other way around. So it is the social existence, the world outside, the material conditions outside that determines consciousness.

So it is a very revolutionary thing to say. It completely breaks boundaries between the inside and the outside and it takes the way the glamour of this thinking isolated man cut away from material conditions cut away from the human conditions and instead it offers the idea that the human conditions, the material conditions outside those influence, those determine how we think inside okay.

So at certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with existing relations of production or this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development or the productive process of forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins the era of social revolution.

(Refer Slide Time: 24:18)

changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic — in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production.'

The changes in economic foundation leads sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformations of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science and the legal, political, religious, artistic, or philosophic in short ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out.

Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness but on the contrary this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict of existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. So this is what he means by dialectical materialism. So dialectic is a Hegelian term.

This is movement from you know Hegel used this term as a movement from a synthesis you know antithesis and synthesis. So we have argument A, we have argument against A and the two synthesize and have a different argument. So this is how arguments move. This is how ideas move. This is how Hegel defines a dialectic as a movement from a thesis to a antithesis and then a synthesis.

Now what Marx does, he revises Hegel right. He says you know this does not happen only at the level of idea. This happens at the level of material productions. So we have a certain kind of material production and then you have the anti-kind of material production, a different kind and the two come to conflict with each other and then we have a different kind of material production which is produced right.

So the materiality of dialectical process is useful over here right. This is a revision that Marx does on Hegel. So dialectics does not happen only at the level of ideas. Dialectic happens also at the level of production right and this is important to understand and he says the consciousness of the change must be explained. This is the last sentence, must be explained from the contradictions of material life. So you know the conflict of consciousness is produced out of the conflict of material life.

So the material life influences consciousness which is what he said at the beginning of this particular quotation. Now it is not consciousness which brings about social existence but social existence which brings about consciousness. It is how we think depends on how we are, the external conditions outside, those determine how we think. So this is a very progressive, very revolutionary thing to say at that point of time right.

(Refer Slide Time: 26:44)

- An excellent example of this play between materiality and abstraction that constitutes culture and cultural identity may be derived from the Marxist literary critic Pierre Macherey's *A Theory of Literary Production* (1966) where he deliberately replaces the word creation with production.

So next we come to the play between materiality and abstraction that constitutes culture and cultural identity and you know this idea of materiality and production, let us look at something like literature. So when we look at literature we use literature as more or less an absolute activity. You know it is a work of fiction, it is a story, it is a beautiful imagination etc.

So that becomes very important for us but this is a very interesting book and I suggest you read it Pierre Macherey's *A Theory of Literary Production* and use the word production quite deliberately over here because he wants to emphasize the productive process of literature. It is not an active creation. It is not an active production. So like Marx said, consciousness does not depend, does not you know influence material conditions.

Material conditions determines consciousness. So likewise Macherey over here is saying that literature you know does not produce existence. Existence produces literature. So the kind of literature produced at a given point of time depends on the material conditions of that particular historical point of time and it is important we pay attention to it right. So he deliberately in this particular book replaces the word creation with production.

(Refer Slide Time: 27:54)

"The various 'theories' of creation all ignore the process of making; they omit any account of production. One can create undiminished, so, paradoxically, creation is the release of what is already there; or, one is witness of a sudden apparition, and then creation is an irruption, an epiphany, a mystery. In both instances any possible explanation of the change has been done away with; in the former, nothing has happened; and in the latter what has happened is inexplicable. All speculation over man the creator is intended to eliminate a real knowledge: the 'creative process' is, precisely, not a process, a labour; it is a religious formula to be found on funeral monuments." (68)

And you know this is something and he quotes from the book page 68 from this particular book the various theories of creation all ignore the process of making, again the process of making, the

very material process of making. So theory of creation, a very lofty, elegant term but that ignores completely the process of making. They omit any account of production.

One can create undiminished, so paradoxically creation is the release of what is already there or one is witness of a sudden apparition and then creation is an irruption an epiphany a mystery. In both instances any possible explanation of the change has been done away with. In the former nothing has happened and in the latter what has happened is inexplicable. All speculation over man the creator is intended to eliminate a real knowledge.

The creative process is precisely not a process; a labour it is a religious formula to be found on funeral monuments. And the word labour over here is a keyword I think. So he looks at literature as a labour and again this is a very original, unique revolution (()) (28:54). So he looks at literature as a labour activity. An activity which is produced out of certain material conditions. So when you are telling a story essentially, you are telling a story of your times.

You are telling a story out of your material times. So the story is produced by the external conditions and this goes back to Marx right when he says consciousness is produced by the social existence, not the other way around right. So this is what Marx said and this is something which Macherey in this really interesting, remarkable book, *A Theory of Literature Production* sort of emphasizes again.

He says some of the idea of epiphany, mystery, imagination, creation so all these things deliberately take your attention away from the material processes of these productions. But as Marxist theories, as people who are setting cultural studies in a very serious systematic kind of a way using the Marxist lens we should be aware of the labour component of the whole process right.

Just to conclude this lecture, so we saw in the first lecture how culture you know we talked about culture as a combination of materiality and abstraction, a combination of material conditions and abstract conditions and I will move on to looking at culture using certain disciplinary lenses, Marxism, psychology, memory studies etc. When we come to Marxism we find one of the ways

in which we look at culture very interestingly is to look at culture as a mode of economic production right.

An economic production which produces this unique superstructure right and the superstructure is something which is related to the structure, the base, the economic condition. So even when we are looking at literature we are reading hounds of Shakespeare or Macbeth or watching or seeing Darwins' Mona Lisa. We must be aware, we must be consciousness of the economic material conditions which produce that. So any act of culture, any activity in culture is an extension of the economic condition and we must never take our attention away from it right.

So this concludes our second lecture for this particular course. Next lecture we will be looking at the question of identities. How is identity produced and how is hegemonic identity produced and conversely more interesting how is the identity of the other produced, the process of othering; how does the process of othering happen to a combination of economic material as well as profound psychological processes. So thank you for your attention and I will see you in the next lecture. Thank you.