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Chapter One

Critical Approaches to Ideology

This work deals with the concept of ideology and how it is conceptualized by some Marxist and non-Marxist theorists, including Marxist and Hegelian intellectuals, such as: Karl Marx, Hegel, Luis Althusser, Peter B. Armitage and Raymond Williams. It also attempts to shed light on views and theories written by those thinkers and philosophers about ideology, its definition and the reasons responsible for its existence, with specific reference to those ideologies related to politics, economics, women, religion, education and literary theory. This research examines the reasons which motivated the ideological institutions in Western societies to conceptualize types of ideology in a way which suits the cultural identities and the political and intellectual biases of these societies in addition to the ideologues' trends. The study suggests that ideologies cannot be separated from politics, economics, dogmas and the State’s pragmatic institutions. Ideologies are often an unconscious practice in the case of individuals, and cultural, religious and social institutions, because these ideologies are the output of an unconscious tradition imposed by these institutions on their individuals. These institutions are often unable to choose one ideology, because society forms a set of unconscious ideologies to be imposed on it through its long history. This research also addresses ideology from a Marxist perspective and shows that ideology is not a Hegelian concept, but rather a Marxist phenomenon.

In the framework of Marx's thought, the concept of ideology is the central category for relating expressions of human consciousness to the economic basis of social life which is said to condition them. Marx developed this concept most prominently in The German Ideology, a posthumously published early work written as a polemic directed at some of idealist conceptions of the Young Hegelian movement that flourished in Germany in the early nineteenth century. In Marxist terms, dominant ideology represented by bourgeois ideology is a kind of false consciousness. In other words, the bourgeois ideology and the Hegelian ideology embody false consciousness. This concept creates a gap between thought and reality. The Hegelian and religious ways of thinking widen the gap between a human being and his reality. Human beings have formed mistaken perceptions towards themselves and their nature. The world of religion, or the world of fantasy, occupies their minds. According to Marx and Engels, man should free himself from all religious restrictions. These illusions are
the essence of Hegelianism. Marx says that Hegelianism believes that political consciousness is a religious consciousness. It also connects between religion and morality as it claims that moral consciousness is a religious one. The Young and the Old Hegelians share the same belief and assert the importance of religion in the world: “Young Hegelians are in agreement with the Old Hegelians in their belief in the rule of religion, of concepts, of a universal principle in the existing world.”

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli offers different views about politics and religion, ideologizing things in a political way. His political ideology helps him play the intermediate. He does not offer clear views about vice and virtue. He expresses indifference towards morality and his work cannot be judged as moral or not. The ideology he uses hides inside a lot of complication, mystification and ambiguity. Here, ideology is dealt with as a means of ideologization. Unlike Hegelians, he separates politics from ethics and thinks that the rules of politics demand that men should not distinguish between moral and immoral actions. He criticizes the clergymen and religion, considering the Church responsible for the division in the state:

> We Italians then owe to the Church of Rome and to her priests our having become irreligious and bad; but we owe her a still great debt, and one that may cause our ruin, namely, that the Church has kept and still keeps our country divided.

Hegel’s theory, on the other hand, is based on the fact that mankind is merely a set of continuous philosophical struggles. Niki Raapana and Nordica Friedrich, as Hegelian critics, state that “Hegel’s theory is basically that mankind is merely a series of constant philosophical conflicts.” Hegel is an idealist who believes that the highest state of mankind can be achieved only through continuous ideological conflict and determination. The rules of dialectic mean that humanity can get the highest spiritual consciousness only through an everlasting conflict between ideals and the final combination of all opposites. What is rather unrealistic about the Hegelian dialect is that it states that the everlasting conflict and the intermingling of opposite ideologies will lead spiritual humanity into the highest degrees of perfection. Raapana and Friedrich share this point of view:

> The Hegelian dialectic is the ridiculous idea that constant conflict and continual merging of opposite ideologies, as established by extreme right or Left belief systems, will lead spiritual mankind into final perfection.

Some Hegelians claim that Engels and Marx’s theory is attained by the Hegelian dialect and disapprove of their postulation that all Marxist writing is based on the Hegelian dialectic. Niki Raapana and Nordica Friedrich claim that Marx and Engels’ theory of rational, inexorable,
inevitable world evolution into totalitarian communism was attained via the Hegelian dialectic.\(^5\)

Marx and Engels criticize the Hegelians who attribute everything to religion, especially those who claim that man is restricted by ideas and conceptions. This point has been made clear in *The German Ideology*: “The young Hegelians criticised everything by attributing to it religious conceptions or by pronouncing it a theological matter.”\(^6\) Marx and Engels relate the dominant ideas to the dominant class. They say that the origin of the dominant ideas comes from the reigning class. In other words, the dominant material forces are responsible for the dominant ideology:

> The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class, which is the ruling material forces of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force.\(^7\)

They define dominant ideas as the ideal expression of the relationships which make a class dominant. So, the predominant class usually falsifies people’s consciousness. Power, money and thinking are inseparable. The ruling class uses power and money in order to falsify the truths and rationalize what is irrational. It also makes its ideas general and considers them the only reasonable ones.

Generally speaking, ideology is a set of ideas, principles and doctrines of a social movement or large group that explains how society should work and offer a political and cultural blueprint for a certain social order. Some critics define ideology as scientism. They view science as an ideology in itself. Darwinism, for instance, is a kind of ideology because it still has influence on modern science with advocates and supporters all across the globe. In *Althusser, Ideology, and Theoretical Foundations: Theory and Communications*, Jennifer B. Gray defines ideology as "the powerful force behind the dominance of hegemonic institutions.”\(^8\) She comments on Althusser and his cultural theory in the following words: "Althusser’s cultural theory explains the structure and function of ideology. His thesis works from Antonio Gramsci’s concept of hegemony.”\(^9\) Althusser’s theory of ideology shows how hegemonic institutions function in a way that serves the dominant class. Gray also speaks of the concept of interpellation in Althusser. This concept means that dominant classes do not impose a particular ideology on the ruled class, but they follow a certain policy in order to make the ruled class accept a form of ideology. Gray proves this idea by suggesting that:

> Hailing is ubiquitous, and almost entirely irresistible and is at the center of any ideological system. It attempts to make another individual recognize and accept a form of ideology.\(^10\)
In this case the ruled classes do not recognize the fact that they are subjects, but they accept this subjection freely and willingly.

Francis Fukuyama is one of the writers who embody political ideology. In *The End of History and the Last Man*, he ideologizes and politicizes historical events. Every word he uses shows that he is trying his best to find justifications for the American domination of the world. In his "*Francis Fukuyama and the End of History,*" Roger Kimball considers Fukuyama as Hegel's disciple:

Following Hegel, he presents the "struggle for recognition" as the longing that drives history, and concludes that liberal democracy offers the most complete and" rational" satisfaction of that longing possible. 11

Fukuyama plays upon concepts; he connects the concept of historical progress with the holocaust. He says that a country will not progress if it has a phenomenon. He condemns the Nazis and ignores what his country does in the world. He keeps on playing on concepts especially when he connects the historical progress with the moral progress, considering Fascism and Communism as two competitive ideologies to liberal democracy. Kimball summarizes Fukuyama’s approach in the following words:

According to Fukuyama, other forms of government, from monarchy to communism to fascism, had failed because they were imperfect vehicles for freedom; Liberal democracy, allowing mankind the greatest freedom possible, had triumphed because it best instantiated the ideal. 12

Fukuyama uses historical language to change historical facts. He tries to play the historian who intends to write a new history. That is why he speaks about the end of history. He talks about democracy in platonic terms, forgetting that democracy exists only in Utopia. Despite the fact that Fukuyama works as an advertiser of American ideology, he draws attention to a very important issue which is totalitarianism, where totalitarian countries work hard to change the nature of man's beliefs; they even interfere with man's relationship with his family. This entails the necessity to talk about another kind of ideology which is totalitarianism. This ideology is often adopted by many totalitarian governments in the world, aiming to create a submissive kind of people. But, Fukuyama forgets to talk about the capitalist ideology to which Charles Dickens refers in *Hard Times,* an ideology which distorts human relations through overemphasis on utilitarian principles. Dickens makes his ideas clear in *Hard Times,* as he criticizes capitalists and politicians who stand behind the utilitarian ideology. His distorted description of Coketown is a kind of criticism of the utilitarian people. He speaks of the Coketowners as people who are similar, who lead the same routine way of life, and who behave in
the same way over and over again. He describes Coketown as follows:

> It contained several large streets all very like one another, and many small streets still more like one another, inhabited by people equally like one another, who all went in and out at the same hours, with the same sound upon the same pavements, to do the same work, and to whom everyday was the same as yesterday and tomorrow, and every year the counterpart of the last and the next.  

The Coketowners are a good example of the people the totalitarian governments want to make. Thus, Dickens meets with David Hawkes’ approach to ideology as false consciousness; Hawkes makes his attitude clear in his *Ideology*:

> However, Marx's aim was to transcend the opposition between idealism and materialism, which he saw as itself a symptom of false consciousness.

Marx criticizes ideology and treats it as a kind of false consciousness. Although he denounces ideology in general, there is no evidence that he ever actually used the phrase ‘false consciousness’. False consciousness is theoretically linked with the concept of dominant ideology. This notion of false consciousness can be implicated in the Soviet experiment. Throughout the USSR, the government deployed the strategy of false consciousness to justify authoritarian measures against the proletariat. Despite the fact that this concept is not literally used by Marx, it dominates interpretations of Marx's statements on ideology, particularly in *The German Ideology*, where he clarifies that “life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life.” This statement means that neither religion nor metaphysics determines man's consciousness, but man determines his/her own consciousness. The Marxist ideology is a subject of some controversy to some commentators: They accuse Marx of confusion and inconsistency, claiming that he uses the term ideology to refer to beliefs that he believes to be false and incomplete. It has been suggested that Marx meant to include in the class of ideological beliefs only which reach the public stage, only those which are about human nature and the nature of human societies, or only those which serve class interests. Perhaps he means that all ideas are socially determined. He might aim to say that the ideas of the ruling class are likely to be inculcated in members of subordinate classes.

After *The German Ideology*, Marx rarely uses the term ideology. He relates human's misperceptions to the contradictions in the material nature of capitalism. Moyra Haslett, as a Marxist critic, traces Marx’s concept of ideology in *Marxist Literary and Cultural Theories*. He thinks
that individuals' misperceptions are the product of contradictions in the material base of capitalism. Ideology, in this sense, is the outcome of those real contradictions: "Our misperceptions are then not the product of a 'false consciousness' but caused by contradictions in the material structure of capitalism itself." 16 Marx, in *The German Ideology*, links the distorted ideological ideas with the contradictions in the material base; in other words, ideology is the production of these contradictions. Marx also speaks of the relationship between inverted consciousness and inverted reality, which is not a direct one, but it can be embodied by competition in capitalist societies. The exchange of products in capitalist societies and in capitalist markets looks as an image of equality and freedom. The relationship between the seller and the buyer appears ideal, while in reality it is based on exploitation: "For when the worker sells his or her labour, there is no equivalence between labour and the product of that labour, the commodity." 17 When the owner of the means of production sells his commodity, he returns the cost of the commodity plus a surplus value. So, there is no equality in the production and exchange of products. In capitalist societies, social relations among people turn into material things, taking on the form of a relationship between things. Marxism assumes a kind of unconscious when it speaks of social relations in capitalist societies. Industrial capitalism subtitles the machine-like relations for human relations, creating a kind of alienation between workers and their labour, and leading workers to unconsciously accept this alienation.

The Marxist literary theory of ideology can be applied to many literary and political texts and articles in which ideology can work as a kind of ideologization and false consciousness. American ideology, for example, works hard to belittle Islam. Jason Pappas shows hostility to Islam in his writings. In "The Conservative Response to the Islamic Threat", Pappas expresses his aggression to Islam clearly:

With each report of repression, misogyny, self-imposed poverty, anti-Semitic hatred, and suicidal glorification, we are told that they are human beings just like us- don't judge! There is a pathological fear of saying anything negative about the motivating force driving our enemy: Islam. 18

Pappas seems logical when he states that Islam needs some missing element which is modernity. He also adds that it took Christianity two thousand years to rise, so it is not easy for Muslims to rise in 1400 years: " It took Christians two thousand years to grow up, we are told; you can't expect Islam to do that in 1400 years." 19 Another Western thinker, Scott Lindlaw, when commenting on the Pew Global Attitudes Project, seems to share with Pappas the opinion that a large percentage of Muslims all over the world believe that suicide bomb attacks are a justifiable defense of Islam. Similarly, Paul Johnson calls Islam "the
religion of Dark Ages', because it has no science. Thus the various views mentioned above reveal that the Western mind has a lot of hostility towards Islam. Although Pappas tries to play the objective at particular stages in his article, he is still unable to disguise his fanaticism. His language and ideas prove the fact that he is a racist. He holds that "The revival of original Islam brings with it all the imperialist ambitions and supremacist posturing that has been part of the religion since founded by Mohammad." He adds that "Islamists believe they will be rewarded when they die fighting the infidel; containment will fail." Pappas treats communism in the same way, supporting what Gerhart Niemeyer says about Americans that they cannot communicate with the communist mind, because communism has nothing to do with truth, logic or morality. In the light of what Pappas writes, one can infer that he uses ideology in a very dangerous way by ideologizing and fabricating things in a way which enables him to achieve his end. He wants to show the world that Islam and communism are the real enemies of the United States of America.

The task of ideology is to destroy religion, traditions and old constitution. For this reason, conservatives fight the concept of ideology. Russel Kirk, for example, argues that ideology is an inverted religion, denying the Christian doctrine of salvation through grace in death, and substituting salvation here on earth through violent revolution. In “The Conservatives’ War on Ideas”, Karen De Coster examines Kirk’s views on ideology, considering that Kirk associates ideology with evil:

Kirk says ideology is evil because it makes political compromise impossible, and therefore, we put the government and its politicians in a position of no-win, which then prevents the State from performing in its essential capacities.

The ideologue will accept no deviation from the absolute truth of his secular revolution. Hans Barth argues that ideology is opposed to truth. It denies the possibility of truth in politics, substituting economic motive and class interest for abiding norms. Some Americans embrace an ideology of democratic capitalism: What such people really mean when they call for a democratic ideology is a formula for a civil religion and an ideology of Americanism. Russel Kirk advocates prudence over ideology arguing that the two are polar opposites. It is ideology that necessarily leads to corrupt power; Karen De Coster points out in the following: "to Kirk, ideology is a series of "terrestrial hells" that is not favorable to a statesman's prudence because it bears the fruit of malevolent revolution against tried-and-true conservative traditions. Hence it is a serious vice." Karen De Coster adds that Kirk's viewpoints are an advocacy of maintaining the current order in spite of its corruption. To Kirk, ideas ultimately destroy institutions and create a world of
disorder. He considers abstract ideas as brutal views of life.

Karl Marx changes the formula of existence which suggests that people have always believed that their ideas, their existence, their cultural life and their social systems were the creation of human and divine reasons. He reverses this formula by stating that all ideological systems are the product of social and economic conditions. Raman Selden in *A Reader’s Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory* examines Marxist concepts and shows how they influence reality in a positive way: “Marx reverses this formulation and argues that all mental (ideological) systems are the products of real social and economic existence.”24 The material interests of the ruling class determine how people look at their social conditions, their real existence and their ideas. Laws, for instance, are not the product of divine reasons, but they are made in a way which fits the personal interests of the dominant class, which spreads some false ideas in society in order to change the formula of existence. These ideas play a significant role in determining and formulating the mentality of the masses. The common class, in turn, absorbs these ideas and establishes a ground on which they build their own satisfactions. Selden contends that Marx associates between culture and historical conditions:

Marx was arguing that what we call ‘culture’ is not an independent reality but is inseparable from the historical conditions in which human beings create their material lives; the relations of dominance and subordination (exploitation) which govern the social and economic order of a particular phase of human history will in some sense ‘determine’ (not ‘cause’) the whole cultural life of the society. 25

George Luk’acs, as a Marxist critic, insists in his writings on the material and historical nature of the structure of society. He rejects ‘naturalism’ and returns to the old realist view that literature reflects reality. This kind of reflection is not external, but internal in a way which offers a truer, more vivid, more complete and more dynamic reflection of reality. Raman Selden speaks from within a Marxist discourse and states that the Marxist dialectic has roots related to the Hegelian dialectic: “Luka’cs is able to insist on the principle of underlying order and structure, because the Marxist tradition borrowed from Hegel the ‘dialectic’ view of history.” 26 Development in history is not chaotic, but rather a dialectic one. Class struggle exists in every social organization, including inner contradictions. The capitalist mode of production is the result of destroying the feudal mode and replacing it with a socialized mode of production. In a capitalist society, workers have nothing to sell but their labour and have no control over the means of production. The real contradiction is expressed in the conflict of interests between capitalists and workers. Privatization and socialization are the essence of this contradiction. According to Luk’acs, people should
have control not only over their labour powers, but also over the means of production. What is discussed above shows that Luk'acs is influenced by Marx and Hegel.

Althusser’s views on literature and art differ from the Marxist views. He does not see art as a form of ideology, but he locates art somewhere between ideology and scientific knowledge. Art does not express the ideology of a particular class. He believes that ideology establishes an imaginary relationship between the individuals and their real conditions of existence. For example, in a religious society, a human being knows about his duties but he does not know about his rights, because the religious ideology establishes a kind of imaginary consciousness which distances a human being from his real conditions. Pierre Macherey is also one of the critics who deal with ideology and adopt a Marxist model of writing. He considers the text as a production in which a number of different materials are worked over. The text is unaware of what it is doing. Therefore, it has the trait of ‘unconscious’. When ideology, which represents the state of consciousness, enters the text, it takes on a different form; it decodes the text and exposes all contradictions implied in the text.

In *Ideology and Utopia*, Karl Mannheim speaks about two distinct and separable meanings of ideology as a term: the particular and the total: “the particular conception of ideology is implied when the term denotes that we are skeptical of the ideas and representations advanced by our opponent.”

Ideology is a renewed term. Its meaning changes according to the new circumstances. Mannheim states that for many people, ideology is associated with Marxism. Although Marxism contributes a great deal to the problem of ideology, the meaning of this term is not limited to Marxism only, but historically speaking it goes further back than Marxism, as Mannheim makes it clear in his *Ideology and Utopia*:

> It is therefore first necessary to state that although Marxism contributed a great deal to the original statement of the problem, both the word and its meaning go further back in history than Marxism.

Terry Eagleton also deals with ideology in his writing. His views are based on Marxism. In *Criticism and Ideology*, he examines the relationship between the literary text and ideology, arguing that the literary text is not an expression of ideology, but it is rather a certain production of ideology:

> A dramatic production does not ‘express’, ‘reflect’ or ‘reproduce’ the dramatic text on which it is based; it produces the text, transforming it into a unique and irreducible entity.

The relation between text and production cannot be conceived as that of an essence to an existence and it is not a matter of releasing it from
its suspended animation. To Eagleton, the relation between text and production is a relation of labour: the theoretical instruments transform the raw materials of the text into a specific product; so the literary text produces an ideology, which is itself production, in a way similar to the operations of dramatic production on dramatic text. The text's relation to ideology constitutes that ideology to unravel some of its relations to history. Eagleton looks at ideology as a kind of false consciousness. He says that “ideology is 'a false consciousness' which blocks true historical perception, a screen interposed between men and their history.” He adds that despite the fact that ideology carries elements of reality within itself, it deformatively produces a text.

Ideology pre-exists the text, but the ideology of the text forms that ideology in ways unpremeditated by ideology itself. The particular production of the ideology of the text has no pre-existence. Moreover, it is identical with the text itself. Eagleton states that ideology offers itself to the work in different forms. It presents itself in ordinary language and those particular aesthetic, political, ethical and other formulae which may immediately penetrate ordinary language. In fact, criticizing the dominant ideas in a certain society is a way writers follow in order to destroy the ideology of that society. In Crime and Punishment, for example, Dostoyevsky creates a character like Raskolnikov in order to show that all the people who adopt utilitarian ideologies will definitely have a bad end. For this reason, ideology can be defined as a kind of imaginary ideas made by clergymen, politicians and male writers.

Moyra Haslett treats ideology as an illusory belief and doctrine which people believe regardless of its falsity. Marx and Engels deal with ideology as a kind of ‘false consciousness’; but, the Hegelians emphasize the importance of ideas in the formation of society, while Marx and Engels attribute the true transformation of society to its material conditions. On the other hand, the ruling class gives itself the legitimacy to spread some ideas in society in the form of universality, considering them the only rational ones. The dominant ideology thesis in Marx's works refers to all the false arguments disseminated by the ruling class. The ideas the ruling class advertises appear as objective facts in order to hide their self-interest. The beliefs of the ruling class may not be recognized as 'ideological', but the strategies this class uses disguise their self-interest.

Many Marxists have objections to the dominant ideology thesis. It does not necessarily mean that people will be dominated by the dominant ideology. Raymond Williams, for instance, argues that no dominant ideology will be exhaustive. For him, ideology is never static or total, but in constant opposition with alternative and oppositional forces. He treats some English poems as Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia"
ideologically. He says that the use of the term *arcadia* to describe an English pastoral poem involves political deception; Williams tries to distance himself from an overly reductive treatment of this poem. He is reluctant to dismiss it as ideological in the sense of ‘false’. Instead of a direct dismissal, he argues that this poem and other poems might also be productive in the ways in which they expose ideology. In his own theorization of ideology, Williams reworks a theory of ideology and hegemony depending on Antonio Gramsci; Haslett points out in *Marxist Literary and Cultural Theories*: "Here Williams was largely reworking a theory of ideology and hegemony which he adopted from the Italian Marxist thinker, Antonio Gramsci."  

According to Gramsci, power, economy and ideology are basic elements for the ruling classes to succeed in controlling society: they maintain their power not only through domination, but also through moral and intellectual leadership. Gramsci introduces two basic ways in which the ruling class governs: the spontaneous consent and the coercive power. If the spontaneous consent fails, the dominant group resorts to the apparatus of state coercive power which legally imposes discipline on those groups who do not consent either actively or passively. Coercive and consensual powers are necessary powers for the state. Physical forces and aggressive laws are necessary to seize power, while consent is necessary to maintain power. For example, the fall of Socialism and the rise of Capitalism in 1991 show that Capitalism succeeded not because of its system of production, but because of its social and ideological organizations: “Capitalism’s dominance is thus more ideological than ever.”  

Gramsci treats ideology as a set of ideas and representations which bind people together. He argues that hegemony creates a kind of unity between classes and political groupings, because ideology and power are inseparable:  

> individuals are actively involved in their own conditioning, but also that ideology is therefore diverse, embodied in material practices rather than unified monolithically according to class.  

Gramsci’s example of the successful hegemony is that of the French Jacobins who motivate the bourgeoisie to increase its class interests. Through leading a coalition of classes, the bourgeoisie could achieve triumph in the case of the French Revolution. That is why Gramsci shows political struggle as complex relations of forces rather than a simple conflict between aggressive classes. Ideology is not a form of false consciousness only, it is more complex than that. It is not enough to say that the dominant class imposes its ideas on the subordinate classes, but the dominant class must present its interests as universal as well.  

Althusser is also one of the Marxist critics who examine the
concept of ideology. His theory of ideology is influenced by Gramsci’s theory of hegemony and ideology. He explains why Capitalism is a self-perpetuating system and why citizens living in a capitalist society keep supporting capitalism despite the fact that their labour is exploited by the capitalist system. Haslett sheds light on the capitalist ideology in *Marxist Literary and Cultural Theories*:

> The continuous reproduction of labour power requires not only the reproduction of skills by teaching apprentices and schoolchildren, but also the reproduction of submission to the rules of the established order.\(^\text{34}\)

According to Althusser, there are two ways through which the state can control its citizens, namely, either 'repressive' or 'ideological': the Repressive State Apparatus depends on violence and coercion, that makes use of the government, the army, the courts, the police and the prisons. All of these work together to control the subordinate class. This point is clear in Althusser’s argument:

> For example, the Army and the Police also function by ideology both to ensure their own cohesion and reproduction, and in the ‘values’ they propound externally.\(^\text{35}\)

The other way the state follows to exercise its power over its citizens is the ideological way or power of the state that functions in various ways making use of Ideological State Apparatuses, including institutions, such as the Church, the family, the school and the media:

> Thus Schools and Churches use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to ‘discipline’ not only their shepherds, but also their flocks. The same is true of the Family….The same is true of the cultural IS Apparatus (censorship, among other things), etc.\(^\text{36}\)

These apparatuses, the repressive and the ideological, help the state to enforce its dominance or punishment on the citizens whether this state is feudal or capitalist. Haslett again shows how the State apparatuses punish the citizens:

> When the development of agricultural capitalism led to increasing parliamentary Enclosure Acts in the late eighteenth century, those who picked sticks by the roadside or poached a hare might be transported to a penal colony in Australia.\(^\text{37}\)

The previous argument brings us back to the capitalist approach to ideology, which insists on keeping the capitalist mode of production to serve its own purposes and make individuals accept this capitalist mode of production willingly, but unconsciously. It leads them to believe that a low wage is quite satisfactory, because they are given
the freedom to choose the job. That is why Althusser suggests that ideology forms an imaginary relationship between individuals and their real conditions of existence. Haslett looks at ideology from a different perspective. He speaks of 'human experience' and 'nationalism' and shows that nationalism forms a false relationship between people and others who have the same nationality:

people imagine a relationship between themselves and others of the same ‘nationality’, that they share similar characteristics, speak the same language, have similar experiences, even though they will never have met the vast majority of their compatriots.  

He adds that nationalism is a kind of ideology invented by the political leaders in order to keep control over the citizens. He relates Althusser's formulation of capitalism to Benedict Anderson's theory of national identity.

Althusser looks at ideology as inescapable; it lives in us and constitutes us; it hails concrete individuals as concrete subjects. He locates ideology within consciousness itself, trying to show why individuals freely accept subjection. He follows in the steps of Freud who considers ideology the unconscious which shapes our subjecthood. Haslett finds in Althusser's argument something worthy of his support:

We are unconscious of the way in which ideology determines our behavior and thinking, a theory which is radically opposed to the humanist belief that we command our thinking.

Althusser classifies art among other ideologies. He argues that art does not constitute knowledge, nor does it constitute ideology, but it has a special relationship to them. Art offers knowledge of ideology, because it remains within ideology. Through art and science, one can know ideology. Art allows us to see and feel ideology; science permits us to know it. Haslett, in contrast, finds art and science inseparable, because both allow people to know ideology properly: "Art and science both permit us to recognize ideology."

Furthermore, Althusser goes one step further when he shares with Macherey the viewpoint that a contradictory and illusory discourse that can be made visible in a text, an idea which the latter emphasizes in his approach to literary text as fragmented and decentred, that is a kind of decentredness rather than incompletion. He focuses on the text's internal contradictions, gaps and fragments, arguing that the text's internal contradictions and gaps should be read in productive ways, because it is in the gaps of the text that ideology can be recognized. Haslett comments on Macherey's attitude in the following words:"Reading the contradictions and fractures of the text is productive because it is in the gaps and indeterminacies of the text that
ideology can be known." Ideology itself cannot show any contradictions, but its self-contradiction can be seen. The literary text puts ideology into contradiction by giving it a form that foregrounds this contradiction.

Macherey's ways of reading are different from the traditional Anglo-American criticism. The latter focuses on the unity of the text. In this case, the critic's task is to look for unity and articulation in the text. Macherey's reading is not a kind of reproduction of meaning, but a production of meaning. The purpose of this reading is not to find out unity or completeness in the text, since the text's incompleteness is determinate. The same thing applies to Haslett who supports Macherey's notion that the text can achieve completion in its incompleteness: "Indeed, we might say, following Macherey, that the text is complete in its incompleteness." Marxist readings look at this incompleteness as a kind of revelation. They make the text reveal its silence and put it into a position of self-contradiction. Unlike other readings, Marxist readings do not claim to be ideologically neutral themselves.

In spite of the obvious opposition to traditional humanist approaches to literature, Terry Eagleton and Bennet accuse Macherey of having latent formalism in his theory. According to Macherey, literature presents ideology by giving a determinate representation of it. The content of literature might be ideological and it is the form of literature that permits ideology to be read. This kind of splitting of form and content is also followed by many humanist approaches to literature. Haslett points out to this in the following words: "Indeed, this splitting of form and content is typical of many humanist approaches to literature, and, it could be argued, is itself ideological." In his *Marxist Literary and Cultural Theories*, Haslett again clarifies that Bennet and Eagleton accuse Althusser and Macherey of neglecting the materialist practices of Marxist theory when they define ideology, literature and theory as essences which have permanency in them:

The literary text, instead of being considered in its particularity (in its historical, social, economic, ideological, technological or institutional matrices), becomes a manifestation of the invariant structure which is 'Literature'.

Haslett considers that in dealing with literature like this, Althusser and Macherey are similar to the Formalists, "and the literary text is measured against, instead of being itself situated within, ideology."

Some writers and critics use ideology in their texts in order to destroy old ideology and to construct a new ideology. For example, in "Jews without Memory: Sophie's Choice and the Ideology of liberal Anti-Judaism", D.G. Myers uses an ideology based on supporting the
Holocaust and destroying Styron’s ideology. When the Nazis tortured
the Jews, the Jews used some ideology just to make the world
sympathize with their catastrophe, which is a unique one as they
claim. William Styron writes *Sophie’s Choice* as a kind of challenge to
the prevailing opinion. He offers a new vision of the Holocaust,
changing lots of facts about it: Myers sheds light on this point clearly:

Styron does not merely dissent from the orthodoxy of "uniqueness thesis"
(as it has come to be known); he delivers an elenchus, a strong rereading
of the Holocaust which goes beyond challenging the predominant view to
reverse it. 46

Styron opposes the common view of many Jewish writers who claim
that the Holocaust is unique. This phenomenon shows the Nazi
intention of totally eliminating the Jews who are its unique victims. He
criticizes the Jewish writers who offer deliberate Jewish
interpretations, regarding the Holocaust as a kind of absolute evil
which threatens humanity. Myers clarifies Styron’s views about the
Holocaust in the following words:

In its stead he advances a universalist, even metaphysical interpretation,
understanding the Holocaust as the embodiment of absolute evil, which
threatened humanity as a whole. 47

Styron says that the Jewish might be victims, but they are not the only
victims of the Nazi evil. He wants to show that Christians also suffered
from the Nazis.

Myers argues that Styron’s *Sophie’s Choice* is not about the
Holocaust as the word is usually understood, but it is written for
ideological purposes:

Although it is usually classified as a Holocaust novel, then, *Sophie’s Choice*
is not about the Holocaust as such. Its subject is the ideological
representation of the Holocaust. 48

He adds that rejecting the Jewish uniqueness is ideological in itself.
Many scholars support Styron and attack the uniqueness thesis of the
Holocaust. David E. Stannard, for example, considers the Holocaust
as a kind of hegemonic product produced by some Jewish writers and
scholars who devote their lives to support these ideas. Myers says
that the historian David E. Stannard speaks for the group when he
associates the thesis with Holocaust denial:

The hegemonic product of many years of strenuous intellectual labor by a
handful of Jewish scholars and writers who have dedicated much if not all of
their professional lives to the advancement of this exclusivist idea. 49
Styron's novel is against Jewish exclusivism that deals with universal issues, such as oppression and suffering. Myers considers the demand that the Jews give their exclusivism as a kind of violence and racism. Styron suggests that the Jews should give up the idea of uniqueness and exclusivism, thinking that regarding the Holocaust as unique is a kind of ignoring the memory of other people's suffering.

The different definitions of ideology raise controversy in the world of philosophy and literature. Williams states that the first appearance of ideology in English is embodied in a direct translation of the new French word ‘ideologie’. It was first proposed by the philosopher Destutt de Tracy who suggested to call the philosophy of mind an ideology in order to distinguish it from metaphysics. In his attack on the proponents of democracy, Napoleon Bonaparte criticises the principles of the Enlightenment and considers them as ‘ideology’. He attributes all the misfortunes which happened to France to the doctrine of the ideologue. This Napoleonic use of ideology had an influence on the Nineteenth Century. Ideologist was associated with revolutionary; ideology and ideological were considered a sense of fanatical theory. This pejorative use of ideology in the Nineteenth Century by the conservative thinkers is a direct continuity of the pejorative use of ideology by Marx and Engels in *The German Ideology*. It was considered as a theory based on self-interest. Napoleon criticized the doctrines of ideologues, while Marx and Engels in their criticism of the thought of their radical German contemporaries, focused on its abstraction from the real processes of history. They consider ideas as nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships and the failure to realize this produced an upside-down version of reality that takes the form of an ideology. This point is made clear in their *The German Ideology*:

> If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life process.\(^5\)

Ideology is abstract and false thought used to lead individuals from a true reality to a false reality. The ideological forms are expressions of economic conditions of production. They are the forms through which men become aware of the conflict arising from conditions and changes of conditions in economic production. When individuals reach a stage of consciousness, they work hard to fight out against the ruling class. Engels suggests that ideology will end when men become aware of their real economic conditions. After that, their consciousness will become scientific, because they will be in direct contact with reality.

The concept of ‘ideology’ is often used in media and social
sciences, but it is notoriously vague. Its everyday use is largely negative, and typically refers to the rigid, misguided or partisan ideas of others. Thus, the working class may have misguided ideas about the conditions of existence as a result of their indoctrination by those who control the means of production. Throughout a large part of the 20th century, and both in politics and in social sciences, the notion of ideology continued to carry its negative connotations, and was often used in opposition to objective knowledge. Originally, ‘ideology’ did not have this negative meaning. Also in contemporary political science, the notion is used in a more neutral, descriptive sense, e.g., to refer to political belief systems. One of the many dimensions highlighted in the classical approaches to ideology was their ‘dominant’ nature, in the sense that ideologies play a role in legitimizing power abused by dominant groups. One of the most efficient forms of ideological dominance is when the dominated groups accept dominant ideologies as ‘natural’ or ‘commonsense’. The concept of ideology can be used, namely, to describe specific, fundamental beliefs of groups of people. An ideology is the foundation of social representations shared by a social group. Depending on one’s perspective, group membership or ethics; these group ideas may be valued ‘positively’, ‘negatively’ or not be valued at all. Also, dominated groups may have ideologies, namely, ideologies of resistance and opposition. Ideologies are more generally associated with social groups, classes, castes or communities which thus represent their fundamental interests.

Unlike most traditional approaches, ideologies are not necessarily ‘negative.’ Whether shared by dominant or dominated groups, ‘bad’ groups or ‘good’ groups, they have similar structures and functions. Thus, we may have negative as well as positive ideologies, depending on the perspectives, values or group membership of the one who evaluates them. Not all socially-shared beliefs of a group are ideological. Thus, ideologically different or opposed groups in the same society need to have common beliefs in order to be able to communicate in the first place. This common ground consists of socio-culturally shared knowledge, which by definition, is pre-ideological within that society, although it may later or elsewhere be described as ideological knowledge. Thus, the traditionally problematic relationship between knowledge and ideology is resolved as follows: General, socio-cultural knowledge, shared by an epistemic community, forms the common ground for all social representations of all ideological groups in that community. However, each group may develop specific group knowledge based on the ideology of the group. This knowledge is called ‘knowledge’ within the group, because it is generally shared, certified and presupposed to be ‘true’. For other groups such knowledge may of course be called ‘mere belief’,
superstition or religion. In other words, beliefs that are taken for granted, commonsense, non-disputed, etc., within a community, and shared by different ideological groups, are by definition non-ideological within that community.

Ideologies embody the general principles that control the overall coherence of the social representations shared by the members of a group. For instance, a racist ideology may control more specific attitudes about immigration or affirmative action. Ideologically based social representations are general and abstract. In order to relate to concrete social practices and discourses on specific events, they need to become contextualized and specified in mental models. These (ideologically biased) mental models are the mental structures that control discourse, interaction and other social practices. It is through mental models that discourses are able to influence social representations and ideologies.

Unlike less fundamental social representations and much more than variable personal models, ideologies are relatively stable. One does not become or cease to be a feminist, socialist or pacifist overnight. Many ideologies are acquired over many years and remain active for the lifetime of group members. Ideologies are structured by a social schema consisting of a number of categories that cognitively represent the major social dimensions of groups, such as their distinguishing properties, membership criteria, typical actions, goals, norms and values, reference groups and basic resources or interests. Many ideologies are relevant in situations of competition, conflict, domination and resistance among groups; that is, as part of a social struggle. This also explains why many of the mental structures of ideologies and ideological practices are polarized on the basis of an ingroup-outgroup differentiation, typically between us and them as also ideological discourses show. Because individual people may be members of several groups, they may ‘participate’ in various ideologies. Thus, someone may be a nationalist, socialist, feminist journalist, and thus share in the ideologies of these different kinds of social and professional ideologies. Obviously, when activated (used) at the same time, in discourse or other social practices, this may sometimes lead to conflicts. The social practices, and hence discourses, of group members may be indirectly controlled by group ideologies, but are usually mediated by more specific social representations at the group level and by concrete, personal mental models at the individual level. Conversely, ideologies are personally acquired and socially reproduced by the social practices, and especially the discourses, of a group. Groups may organize the discursive acquisition and reproduction of ideologies, for instance, through special forms of education, indoctrination, job training, or
catechesis, and by specialized group members (ideologues, priests, teachers, etc.) and in special institutions.

Not all group members have the same level of ideological knowledge or expertise, nor need their ideological knowledge always be very explicit. Using an ideology is like being able to use a language without being able to formulate the grammar of that language. Many men are sexist and their sexist ideology may control much of their discourse and other social practices, but they need not always have explicit access to the contents of their ideologies. However, since many social ideologies develop as part of group relations, conflict or domination and resistance, and hence involve ideological debate that is often published in the mass media, many group members know at least the main ideological tenets of their group— and of other groups. Indeed, when their interests are threatened, they often know how and why to protect these interests.

Ideologies are the ‘axiomatic’ basis of the social representations of a group and through specific social attitudes and then through personal mental models, they control the individual discourses and other social practices of group members. More than traditional approaches, this multidisciplinary approach not only emphasizes the social and political nature of ideologies, but also their socio-cognitive nature. It should be emphasized though that this does not mean that this cognitive dimension is specifically or uniquely important. Unlike traditional social or socioeconomic approaches, this approach emphasizes that ideologies need a cognitive account besides a social theory of groups and group relations, power and interests. The point is that these different approaches can be integrated in one multidisciplinary theory. Hence, this approach does imply that a theory of ideology without an explicit cognitive component is incomplete: dealing with ideologies without talking about the nature and functions of socially shared ‘ideas’ is theoretically unsatisfactory.

Ideological social practices are by definition based on ideologies defined as shared mental representations of some kind, in a way that might be compared to the way language use is based on a shared grammar or discourse and conversation rules. It is in this sense that ideologies as socially shared cognitive resources are fundamental for social practices, interaction, intra and intergroup relations. Conversely, the general social functions of ideological practices must hence be represented as part of their ‘underlying’ ideologies. This is one of the many reasons why cognitive and social approaches to ideology need to be integrated. Ideologies are not reduced to their ‘observable’ uses, discourses or other social practices, but are defined as the members’ socially shared underlying representations or resources that govern such practices. Nor do we reduce ideologies to discourses, because
obviously they also control other social practices, such as forms of discrimination or violence.

Ideologies are accounted for in socio-cognitive rather than emotional terms, because they are by definition socially shared, and only individuals, not groups, can have bodily based emotions. When we sometimes speak of ideologies of hate, as in the case for racist or sexist ideologies, we are not speaking of emotions but of shared negative evaluations. Since ideologies are socially shared, they by definition cannot be ‘emotional’. However, their uses or applications by individual group members in concrete situations may of course trigger and be expressed as emotions. Also, for these reasons it is essential to analytically distinguish between ideologies and their actual uses or manifestations in discourse, interaction and other social practices.

This chapter reveals how the differences between Hegelian ideology and Marxism have created a lot of ambiguity and controversy in the world of literature and criticism. The definitions introduced in this chapter show that ideology is not simply the true consciousness as Hegel claims; ideology is more complicated and more dangerous. Society is usually divided into two classes: the ruled class and the ruling class. People who adopt the Hegelian ideology represent the ruled class, while the people who adopt the Marxist approach are the reformers whose job is to show the danger of Hegelian ideology. Nations use ideology in order to dominate people. Political leaders and clergymen may also use ideology to exploit the people and achieve political and religious goals. It can be concluded that ideology is a kind of false consciousness. The relationship between the individual and his living conditions is not real, but an imaginary one. It has been said that Marx criticizes the Hegelian ideas which claim that consciousness determines what life is, because he believes that life determines what consciousness is. In the light of the afore-stated argument, one can come to the conclusion that ideologies, in all walks of our social life, including man-woman relationship, social beliefs and dogmas, political, cultural and economic thought, the communal rituals and rites, and the all-over make up of our social values and behavior, are mere reproductions of unconscious, or embedded doctrines inherited from a long tradition of habits, customs, or ways of individual/collective thinking. These ways of thinking are usually embodied in ideologies practised consciously/unconsciously by communities, states, institutions, individuals, congregations, in the form of policies, rituals, rites, credos, dogmas, or social normal/abnormal practices, that formulate their identities.
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Chapter Two

The Impact of Political Ideology on Institutions

The role of political thought is to explore the nature of normative judgements. In *An Introduction to Political Thought*, Peri Roberts and Peter Sutch diagnose political thought and hold that “moral and political ideas are the foundations of politics.” They distinguish between political thought and political science which studies political institutions and constitutions empirically. It collects data and analyzes it in a scientific way, while scientific thought is a different field. It is normative rather than positive or empirical. According to Roberts and Sutch, “Political science is the study of facts and political thought the study of values.” Political thought plays a vital role in restructuring institutions and societies, while political thought produces reality. In this sense, political thought can be said to be normative for it is concerned with values and norms. Since governments are constituted and meant to reflect the individuals’ political and moral judgements, social values and codes often conflict, especially on the issue of right and wrong that seems to be relative: What seems right for some people might be considered wrong for others. Generally speaking, the task of the political thought is to criticize the bad standards and “to discriminate between the good and bad opinions, practices and ideals that structure human society.” Thus, it sounds rather naïve to say that the task of political thought is just to distinguish between ‘the good and bad opinions’, as this thought aims to restructure institutions, laws, and human society in an ideological way. Hence, political thought and political ideology become one and inseparable, because political ideology can be defined as a kind of political thought and political thought as political ideology.

Plato states that political justice can be achieved only when philosophers become rulers or politicians become philosophers. He considers politics as natural, not artificial, because justice is associated with human nature. He divides society into two classes: the artisans and the ruling guardians, who, in turn, are subdivided into supporting auxiliaries and philosophers. They rule over the artisans who represent the working class. According to Plato, the guardians and the artisans should not be allowed to have any property. Instead, they should live a life equal to that of the artisans. Roberts and Sutch throw light on this point in the following words:

> However, the lives of the auxiliaries and the guardians were to be very different indeed. These classes of citizens would be permitted to own no property. ⁴
This strategy prevents the corruption of the ruling class. The rulers will be able to apply no policy of monopoly or tyranny over the artisans.

Politically speaking, values and laws are all relative. The first step the political leaders make is to rewrite history and to re-conceptualize values and laws. This strategy enables them to rule their countries for a long period of time. For example, in the socialist countries, the political leaders start to spread Platonic and ideal theories among the people. They keep theorizing about the just city and justice, turning concepts upside down, making people live in a world of fantasy. In other words, they distort concepts and morals, as philosophers only are capable of ruling justly since they are the only people who have true knowledge and true wisdom. Roberts and Sutch make this point clear in their *An Introduction to Political Thought*:

> Since the souls of philosophers are the only ones dominated by reason only philosophers are capable of true knowledge, knowledge of the Forms and the Forms of the Good, and so of ultimate reality.\(^5\)

Actually, in totalitarian countries, totalitarian leaders fight philosophy and culture for various political purposes. The main reason is that philosophers and writers have the ability to change reality and history. If the State gives philosophers and writers the chance to write and create, they will re-conceptualize the ideas and concepts in a rational way that may not suit the leaders' ideological purposes, because rationalism and idealism do not come together. The State intends to create superstitious people who believe in idealism and superstition only. This approach seems to be similar to what Plato suggests about prospective rulers of the state. Plato's conviction is that philosophers are the only people who are able to rule justly, though not all philosophers are the same. The real philosopher is the rational one, the one who questions and looks at things in a rational way. In the light of this argument, one may conclude that the bourgeois philosophers, like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, cannot be considered as real philosophers, because they have a lot of bourgeois ideas which create a bourgeois society in which the ruling class exploits the working class. Marx seems to share with Plato the same ideas when he criticizes the bourgeois theorists, stressing that law, religion, and morality are just tools used to serve the interests of the bourgeois leaders and the capitalist society in which the working class and the ruling class are opposed to each other. Roberts and Sutch discuss Marx's views towards the bourgeois theorists in depth:

> The bourgeois theorists, and here he would have included Hobbes, Locke and the utilitarians, transform what are historically situated social relations into 'eternal laws of nature' by claiming that the way
Marx believes in the malleability of human nature. He believes that the change of the human nature reflects a series of historical developments. He “refers to this idea of stages of development as historical materialism.”  These stages of development are historical, because they suggest an evolutionary comprehension of mankind and human nature; they are associated with the materialistic because the forces which drive this evolution are not ideas or philosophies, but material forces. Marx does not look at history as a story of great men and warriors. Instead, he considers history as an economic story that enforces other histories; his doctrine of historical materialism embodies many important eras in human history characterized by different economic modes of production that show the division of labor in a class society. They also show the relations of exploitation and oppression between classes. The important eras of human history can be embodied in ‘a slave-based urban economy, where a class of masters rules and manages a class of people who should work under the supervision of their masters.

Moreover, Marx focuses on the feudal mode of production in which a class of slaves works for a dominant aristocratic class supported by the government. The most important mode of production is the capitalist production in which a class of industrialists and bourgeoisie exploit the proletariat who work and sell their labor to survive. Capitalist production is different from feudal production. Although both of them are supported by the state, capitalists follow a new strategy in dominating the proletariat. In the feudal society, feudalists use the coercive power to force people to work, while capitalists use a kind of ideology which deceives the proletariat who still think that they have a free choice to work. Marx believes that the development of human history is not accidental, but predetermined, and the change of human history is not random, but it has a particular order, as Roberts and Sutch point out in this concern: “Marx’s doctrine of historical materialism is a denial of a ‘timeless human nature’; human nature varies as the mode of production varies.” Unlike philosophers and economists of capitalism and liberalism, Marx does not treat capitalist values and laws as eternal ones. Historical materialism cannot be treated as a normative assessment of human history and historical development is not based on value judgements; it does not matter whether a historical stage is better than the other or not. The story of history can provide a non-arbitrary basis which helps explain the aspects of social, political, religious and philosophical trends. Historical materialism is a scientific account that embodies the individuals’ activities and their material conditions.
The best way to understand ideology is to put in mind that it is a multi-dimensional term. Its various definitions cannot be limited to one meaning. The more definitions you find for ideology, the more complex it gets. It is not enough to say that ideology is a set of ideas or beliefs adopted by a certain group of people. The best way to understand ideology is to associate it with politics, because only politicians can use ideology successfully. Some people might disagree with this idea by saying that men of religion are also successful in ideologizing reality, but one should not forget that clergymen have always been loyal to politicians. They cannot spread any ideas if politicians do not allow them to do so.

Politicians usually depend on institutions in order to dominate people's mentality. Political ideology plays a significant role in changing institutions and organizations. Many critics shed light on political ideology in their books. The influence of political ideology on schools appears in Peter B. Armitage's writings. In *Political Relationship and Narrative Knowledge*, Armitage speaks of the amalgamation of schools in Britain, which has political reasons rather than educational ones:

When the Boreham grammar school and the Crosslinks secondary modern school were amalgamated in 1972, the governors appointed Brian Fellows, the acting head of Boreham grammar, to head the new school.9

To Armitage, those governors have a political intention behind appointing Brian Fellows. They do not want to appoint someone qualified and interested in developing and modernizing the school. Brian Fellows is unable to reform the new school, because he still believes in a traditional ideology about education:

One possible meaning and interpretation of the appointment is that there was no serious effort to think through the ideas on which the new school would rest and no serious effort to change ideas and strategies of education, since the head held a traditionalist ideology of education.10

The governors' purpose of appointing a traditional head teacher was to depend on a traditional ideology in the educational institutions.

The head teacher, appointed by the governors, “has autocratic powers in the English educational system.”11 He controls the subjects taught at school and the methods of teaching and the teachers. The problem is political rather than educational, because if this highly-connected head teacher behaves in misguided ways, no one is going to oppose him. The school purpose was to retain the political current situation at the school, through following a method that was not based on constructing a new cultural system:
The school was dominated by a need to maintain the political status quo, and not rethink education practices and introduce educational and cultural change.\(^\text{12}\)

The head teacher is responsible for the vital decision which might change the school for better or worse. He is “the leader, the ‘critical reality definer’ and ‘licensed authority’.”\(^\text{13}\) His judgment is important to everyone in the school. If this judgement is wrong, the school will not succeed. Therefore, Armitage finds that governors should appoint a teacher who is qualified in the theory of education, because the lack of experienced people causes weakness in the institution. The appointment of all the senior ex-Crosslinks house teachers in the new school has a political and ideological intention, as Armitage points out:

A further major decision was not only the adoption of the Crosslinks house system but the appointment of all the senior ex-Crosslinks housemasters to be the housemasters in the school.\(^\text{14}\)

According to Armitage, the absence of rational politics is the cause of the educational weakness in the school and the problems of the school cannot be solved without politics:

I claim it was the absence of true, rational politics as analyzed by Crick which was the major cause of the educational ineffectiveness and powerlessness of the school because, without politics, the problems of the school could not be addressed.\(^\text{15}\)

The major role of the head teacher and the governors is to rule the school. There are many ways through which they can govern the school; they can do it politically or through tyranny and dictatorship.

The central role of the governors and the head teacher is to govern the school. They can do this politically or by some other form of government such as tyranny, dictatorship, authoritarian coercion, oligarchy or a combination of them all.\(^\text{16}\)

The above passage shows how politicians or governors can govern institutions and organizations. The best example on this policy is Boreham and Crosslinks schools which have historical and cultural differences. When both schools were combined, the Boreham history was denied and the past was neglected, a fact to which Armitage refers in the following words: “This denial and ignoring of history was a problem which resulted in a lack of reality.”\(^\text{17}\)

After the combination of Boreham school and Crosslinks school, the chairman of governors of Borecross school, Alfred Wellberry, held
a meeting with the teaching staff in order to introduce the issue of mixed-ability teaching. He had political intentions behind all that; Armitage sheds light on this issue:

The issue of mixed-ability teaching was deeply political and ideological and, arguably, it was for political, not educational reasons that Alfred Wellberry wanted it introduced regardless of educational consequences.\textsuperscript{18}

The chairman imposed his plan on the staff and the school. He changed the school into an instrument through which he can impose his views and practice his dictatorship. Logically speaking, the process of reconstructing and developing the school depends on the freedom of expression and democratic discussions. This chairman "would not accept criticism or opposition and was prepared to punish an offender as an example to others."\textsuperscript{19} His objective was to control the political and educational ideology of the school:

The intention of the chairman's action was ideological since he wanted to impose, undemocratically, an educational ideology based on mixed-ability teaching.\textsuperscript{20}

He did not understand the nature of politics. The art of politics depends on reconciling differences, not exterminating them: "The job of the chairman of governors is a political task, that is, the reconciling of the differing group interests."\textsuperscript{21} Actually, this chairman has no political qualifications which enable him to be a successful politician. He only behaves as a totalitarian ideologue. His action shows the real function of ideology in institutions. He claims that his ideology of education is the only reasonable one.

Armitage keeps on criticizing the schools when he says that the Crosslinks school has a dictatorial culture; He clearly expresses his criticism: "The culture of Crosslinks school had been dictatorial rather than democratic, so why should they trust to open government?"\textsuperscript{22} The head teacher's job is to interfere and reject the dictatorial culture. He should also support and find a democratic culture. In the Crosslinks school, the head teacher was passive. He avoided attending the staff meeting. He stood away from the political activity: "It was informative and significant that the head teacher neither spoke nor acted, using his power by silence."\textsuperscript{23} So, the politics followed in the Crosslinks School played a significant role in stopping development, progress and change. The absence of the democratic debate in the school also prevented the school from progress and change.

Armitage speaks of the relationship between the public authority and the subordinates. The subordinates show some kind of submissiveness out of the fear of authority, but deep at heart they hide a lot of rejection and they secretly work hard in order to fight
back. The relationship between the authority and the subordinates in a system of domination is that of the “frustration of reciprocal action.”

Thus, political ideology becomes a kind of false consciousness, because people are unable to fight against the government openly. They know that if they show resentment against the government, they will definitely be punished.

Raymond Williams in *The Long Revolution* connects between culture and education, and suggests that improving culture can be achieved through improving education. The content of education expresses consciously and unconsciously basic elements in culture. Williams argues that the aim of education is to train the members of a group to one pattern of culture which is dominant in the group. He makes this point clear in his *The Long Revolution*:

> We can, for example, distinguish a major general purpose: that of training the members of a group to the ‘social character’ or ‘pattern of culture’ which is dominant in the groups or by which the group lives.

This natural training can change and represent a kind of ‘indoctrination’. Williams traces the beginnings of English education and states that the first English schools had a vocational purpose. These schools had one intention which was teaching priests and monks to understand the instructions of the church. After that, two schools appeared: the grammar school which taught Latin and the song school which taught religious songs. The grammar school received a lot of criticism by the priests for teaching literature and pagan philosophy. The church and the state have always interfered with the schools’ educational systems, as Williams points out:

> Where the typical medieval grammar school had been a Church foundation, the typical new grammar school was a private foundation, supervised in variable degree by Church and State.

This fight between religion and literary and philosophical education shows how religion has opposed mental and intellectual development. These two competing poles, religion and free thinking, still create a dilemma up till now. This dilemma is not limited to one society. It goes further to involve all human societies. Politicians have exploited these intellectual differences between clergymen and free thinkers. In primitive societies, some of which still exist, politicians cooperate with clergymen to spread false ideas which distort people’s consciousness. The main purpose is to keep dominating people whether at schools or at universities.

In addition to cultural goals, Marxism also has political ones behind
its use of literature and ideology. Michel Ryan focuses on this side in his writing. He argues that Marxism has a very specific aim which is the political project:

That aim is political: the purpose of Marxist criticism is to enable an understanding of the social and cultural world that will contribute to its transformation.  

Marxism treats literature as part of a larger enterprise, but it excludes the pure form of literary criticism. Ryan adds that Marxism has lately expanded and it has given a lot of emphasis to the political field. He considers Marxist criticism as a category inseparable from a broader critical undertaking that includes work being done by non-Marxist radicals and that might most suitably be called either "political criticism" or "cultural criticism".

Marxist criticism is cultural, because it does not involve the study of literature only, but it also includes other fields of culture, such as popular literature and television. It is also political because it interferes with current political arguments.

Marxism is also concerned with how consciousness is shaped by social conditions. Early Marxist criticism tries to show the weaknesses in 'belleletristic' criticism which neglects the idea that class and economic conditions play a significant role in shaping culture; Michael Ryan's sheds light on this approach:

Marxism in general does underscore the way consciousness is shaped by social circumstances, and early Marxist criticism did tend to overcompensate for the way belleletristic criticism ignored the role of class and of economic circumstance in shaping culture by giving economic determination or historical context so much emphasis that all textual specificity was lost.

Marxist criticism studies the function of ideology in literary texts and examines the connection between extratextual matters and textual specificity. Marxism does not focus on the success of Capitalism, but on the way through which ideological texts work against the principles of Capitalism. Ryan argues that the development of Marxist criticism into a political criticism by intermingling different approaches “is not simply a symptom of New left eclecticism”, but rather it meant to show that the different dimensions of power, whether capitalist, economic, or powers of language, are combined to formulate reality.

Marxist theory of ideology studies the relationship between literature and ideology. It shows that the literary text embodies the writer's ideology or the class the writer belongs to. In *Practising Theory*
and Reading Literature, Raman Selden highlights this point clearly:

First, it is important to note that some Marxist explanations of literature's relationship with ideology are highly 'reductive': they treat the literary texts as the direct expression of the writer's ideology or of the class whom the writer represents. On the other hand, Althusser makes literature superior to ideology, because it has the ability to show the nature of ideology, Selden adds: "Althusser developed this insight by showing that major literature gives us a sense of what it is like to exist within a particular ideology." Other critics, such as Pierre Macherey contend that the literary form can tell something about ideology and transform it into fiction, to show the contradictions and incoherences within ideology.

In their examination of literature, Marxists consider Daniel Defoe's writings as expressions of bourgeois ideology, because they express paradoxical and contradictory views. In Moll Flanders, for example, theft is associated with a business ethic, something which falls in line with the bourgeois ideology, as Selden points out: "a successful thief needs to have the same outlook as a successful entrepreneur: ruthless opportunism and hard work." In this case, the merciless capitalists are similar to criminals. The second paradoxical thing is that Moll looks at her criminal life as a perfect lesson for the pious reader. This kind of paradoxical and contradictory nature in Defoe's text represents the influence of ideology on his novel.

In Ideology and Politics, Martin Seliger examines the nature of ideology by arguing that "ideologies contain unverified and unverifiable propositions." He asserts that critics do not have similar opinions about ideology. These opinions contain the division of ideologies into different forms. Ideology might be a belief system. Seliger speaks of the restrictive use and the inclusive use of ideology. The restrictive use confines ideology to specific political belief systems. The illusive use shows that ideology can be applied to all political belief systems: "Generally, the definitions thus defended can be divided into two categories. I propose to call one the restrictive conception.." He adds that "I will call this category of definitions the inclusive conception." According to these conceptions, the restrictive and the inclusive, ideology refers to a set of ideas which are not necessarily connected for cognitive purposes. Considering ideology as an inclusive conception shows that it includes sets of ideas on which people build their own conceptions and find justifications for a certain social or political action that does not necessarily aim to reconstruct some given order.

Seliger diagnoses ideology and considers it as denoting "sets of attitudes and ways of behaviour which can be observed in the real world." He associates ideology with politics. He considers politics as a mode of
implementation required by ideology. He also regards ideology as the rational justification of the political decisions, irrespective to whether these decisions are rational or not:

Ideology requires politics as its mode of implementation while political decisions are always, at one stage or another, related to moral principles.  

Ideology can be separated from factual knowledge and from rational justifications or moral prescriptions. According to Seliger, a small number of scholars were influenced by the restrictive conception of ideology, while in the Marxist camp many scholars of politics "either explicitly subscribed to an inclusive definition or implicitly proceeded on its basis." Julien Benda, for instance, seems to agree with Seliger, because both of them approach ideology from a comprehensive point of view. They are also against extremism in politics. Benda thinks that the true intellectual should not embrace extremism and he must give up passion for an earthly object:

Also, unlike later scholars who identified ideology with the extremism of the Left and Right, Benda allied ideology to whatever aims and positions incite political passions.

Seliger agrees with Benda's assertion that political ideologies claim to be based on science. He adds that in the 1940s, the term ideology was applied to: "All political belief systems in dictionaries such as Webster's New International Dictionary, The Dictionary of Sociology and White's Political Dictionary." Naes and his associates offer a study and analysis in which they assume that the term ideology can be applied to all political belief systems. They also reject the Marxist notion which shows the incompatibility between objectivity and ideology, as Seliger points out: "Social determination was to be treated separately from ideology, which was to be relegated exclusively to the realm of falsification, and hence to psychology." Despite the fact that the interpretation of ideology in this conception became un-Marxian because it was restricted to psychology and applied to all political belief systems, the Marxian interpretation of ideology kept its original state; for example, the ideas people support and attempt to force on others as true formulate a distortion of reality. Seliger says that in modern restrictive conception, ideology is looked at as a device for raising people according to the rules of obedience directly and indirectly.

Marxist criticism distinguishes itself from other forms of literary criticism by changing itself into cultural or political criticism. This is what makes it different from and more comprehensive than other critical approaches. Marxism avoids the narrow conceptions of literary criticism and embraces cultural analysis. It also focuses on the
historical approach to literary texts, as James knowels argues:

So, in general, Marxist critical practice eschews narrow conceptions of literary criticism and prefers cultural critique, asserting historical rather than formalist approaches to texts.\(^4^3\)

History, for Marxism, represents a kind of struggle between classes. knowels states that Western readers believe that the most familiar Marxism is the former Eastern bloc, represented by Stalinism and Leninism. In spite of their connections with tyranny, Stalinism and Leninism had an important and productive stage in 1920. Some critics portray Marxism “as Vulgarly reductive.”\(^4^4\) In doing so, they ignore the developments in Marxist theory, where “It is possible to set out in schematic form the major constituents of a Marxist theory of literature.”\(^4^5\)

Moreover, politics and economics, for Marxism, play a significant role in shaping the existence of a human being, and they also shape the history and lives of human beings. Knowels articulates his point of view in this concern clearly:

Marxism as a historical theory argues that politics and economics shape not only historical events but also human consciousness – the very ways in which we perceive and know who we are.\(^4^6\)

As for Marx, history represents a conflict between social classes and different forms of economic production. He argues that economic forces play a vital role in determining social and individual consciousness, a form that best expresses itself in a social system consisting of 'base' and 'superstructure'. Knowels, in his turn, examines Marx’s idea about 'base' and 'superstructure', concentrating on the relationship between the two:

The base, that is, productive forces, the modes of production and the relations of productions, shape the superstructure, which is legal political, philosophical, religious or aesthetic formation which the base produces.\(^4^7\)

Marxism focuses on the relationship between base and superstructure. Williams and Wolf, for example, assert that institutions, such as the family, belong to base and superstructure at the same time. Knowels, as a Marxist critic, elaborates on this point in his argument and shows how institutions, whether political or social, are associated with the base and superstructure: “The family is both economic (part of the mode of production) ideological (part of the mode of superstructural reproduction).”\(^4^8\) So, most current Marxist criticism centres on the symmetry of base-superstructure relations.

Marxists focus on ideology as central in literary criticism and critical discourse. Marx proposes the form of base/superstructure in society.
The base is associated with the means of production in society, while the superstructure forms ideology, religions and political systems in society. Because the ruling class possesses the means of production, the superstructure of society will be determined according to the interests of this class, a concept which Knowels supports clearly:

Ideology in Marxism is distinguished as a conceptual system propagated by a dominant class for its own ends, a theory which leaves the subordinate class (those at whom ideology is, in part, directed) as passive receptors, and it can seem simplistic and mechanistic. ⁴⁹

The ruling class politicizes reality and spreads a kind of political ideology in order to control the people’s way of thinking. People’s strong belief in the dominant ideology motivates Raymond Williams to overcome this problem by using the term ‘hegemony’, which is taken from Antonio Gramsci. Williams points out that cultural formations play a significant role in shaping society and consciousness. This is different from the base-superstructure form that focuses on the economic and political conditions which have the ability to change society and consciousness:

For Williams, ‘hegemony’ asserts, in a flexible and complex manner, the importance of cultural formations in the shaping of society and consciousness, as distinct from the base-superstructure model, which ultimately relies upon economic or political factors to drive change. ⁵⁰

William’s approach to hegemony was criticized by some Marxists, because it centres on the complexity of the social totality and marginalizes the economic factors:

Williams misunderstands the nature of base-superstructure, which is a ‘conceptual’ tool rather than an ontological statement, and because the logical conclusion of this argument is to deny the determination which Marx saw at the heart of his theory. ⁵¹

According to Williams, although the concept of ideology has not started in Marxism, it is still connected with it. It manifests itself in literature and Marxist thinking: "Yet it is evidently an important concept in almost all Marxist thinking about culture, and especially about literature and ideas." ⁵² Williams argues that ideology represents the belief of a particular class and a system of false ideas which can be contrasted with true consciousness. He considers that all systems of belief in classes are based on falsehood and illusion:

In a class society, all beliefs are founded on class position, and the systems of belief of all classes—or, quite commonly, of all classes preceding, and other than, the proletariat, whose function is the project of the abolition of class society—are then
In the late eighteenth century, the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy associated the term of ideology with philosophy and Williams considers the term “to be a philosophical term for the ‘science of ideas’.” Destutt regards ideology as a kind of scientific knowledge which can be used to understand the nature of ideas, especially the ones based on the empirical tradition. Williams shares Destutt the same idea, because he considers that the science of ideas is not based on metaphysicality but on nature, because all ideas are associated with man's experience in the world: “The science of ideas must be a natural science, since all ideas originate in man's experience of the world.”

On the other hand, with de Bonald, ideology has no metaphysical elements. It is against metaphysics, because the ideas of men are the only ones in the world. He relates ideology to the empirical tradition, "which had passed from Locke through Condillac, pointing out its preoccupation with 'signs and their influence on thought' and summarizing its 'sad system' as a reduction of 'our thoughts' to 'transformed sensations'.”

This above discussion brings us back to the concept of ideology as a complex term, that replaces metaphysics in its ideas and postulations, as modern philosophy argues. Williams supports the hypothesis that ideology embraces the ideas of men as the only rational ones in the world, because, for him, ideology is the proper field of empirical science, where philosophical presuppositions contest: "to a version of ideas as 'transformed sensations' and to a version of language as a 'system of signs' based, as in Condillac, on an ultimately mathematical model." These limitations are not only scientific or empirical, but they are "elements of a basically bourgeois view of human existence.”

Williams believes that the idea of science has a negative effect on ideology. The importance of the distinction between ideology and the real position of science, in terms of detailed knowledge of the political way of development of men, is that this distinction refers to concepts and assumptions which work to "prevent or distort such detailed and connected knowledge." Reaching a different definition of ideology starts from the main center of the attack on the Young Hegelians, who consider all the products of consciousness as the real restrictions of men. Here, it is really important to define ideology according to the concept of consciousness. Marx and Engels associate ideology with theory, but not with practical consciousness.

Ideology fluctuates between a system of beliefs of a particular class and a system of false consciousness, which can be contrasted with true consciousness. Ideology is the natural center of illusions. It is "separated from the (intrinsically limited)'practical consciousness of a class'." Marx emphasizes the conflict of real interests and the political and philosophical aspects through which individuals become aware of this
conflict and consequently work to fight out.

'Ideology' then reverts to a specific and practical dimension; the complicated process within which men 'become'(are)conscious of their interests and their conflicts. 61

The formula of base and superstructure is important to study the Marxist theory of culture. The first use of superstructure by Marx is by qualifying it as legal and political. The change of superstructure is a process in which individuals become aware of the social conflict and fight it out "in 'ideological forms' which now include the 'religious, aesthetic, or philosophic' as well as the legal and political." 62 The superstructure represents the ideology of the class, the consciousness and the view of this class towards the world. It has different forms, namely, legal and political formulations "which express existing real relations of production." 63 It embodies a form of consciousness which represents a specific class view of the universe. It is also a process through which people become aware of the economic conflict and they work hard to fight it out. The base and the superstructure are not separate areas, but they are indissoluble. They are the products of real individuals.

In a class society, individuals shape their lives and decisions only in abstraction. This is because of the hegemony of ideas by the ruling class. Traditionally speaking, hegemony refers to domination or a political rule between states. Marxism deals with the definition of hegemony in a more comprehensive way: "Marxism extended the definition of rule or domination between social classes and especially to definitions of a ruling class." 64 Rule has a negative meaning, because it refers to applying the policy of coercion in order to dominate individuals, while hegemony refers to "the active social and cultural forces which are its necessary elements." 65 The concept of hegemony goes beyond two important and active concepts which are culture as the social process through which people shape and express their views, and ideology "in which a system of meanings and values is the expression or projection of a particular class interest." 66

Ideology is an articulate formal system of values and beliefs which represent a class, a view or a world view. It can be applied abstractly to the real consciousness of both ruling and ruled classes. The ruling class manipulates ideology according to its own interests. The ruled class has this ideology imposed on its consciousness. It has no other way around but to accept this ideology, because the dominant class, which controls all means of production, is responsible for producing all ideas, the true and the false ones. The concept of hegemony is different, because it refuses "to equate consciousness with the articulate formal system which can be and ordinarily is abstracted as 'ideology'." 67 Hegemony does not ignore views, values and beliefs
developed and expressed by the ruling class; however, it does not work to create a kind of equation between these meanings. According to this concept, the relations of domination and subordination do not encompass political, economic, and social fields only, but they extend to involve the whole process of living. Hegemony, for Williams, is a culture which has to be seen “as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes.”

Marxist critics focus on formal institutions and their influence on culture and society. Williams, for instance, concentrates on institutions and their relations to politics, economics, and culture. He argues that the relations between these institutions are complex. He states that “Formal institutions, evidently, have a profound influence on the active social process.” Williams focuses on the process of socialization in which every individual has to participate and learn, but “any specific process ties this necessary learning to a selected range of meanings, values, and practices which, in the very closeness of their association with necessary learning, constitute the real foundations of the hegemonic.” Inside and outside the family, the child goes through a process of learning; this learning is usually received consciously and unconsciously. Institutions with all their types impose selected values, meanings and activities on individuals. This fact shows that churches, mosques, and schools have a strong relationship with political institutions; in other words, they are part of these institutions. For example, Charles Dickens in *Hard Times* portrays how schools and educationalists work to spread a utilitarian ideology at school. He focuses on Thomas Gradgrind who is a member of parliament and an educationalist who teaches his students facts only, marginalizing the role of emotions and fancy in man’s life. He expresses his views by arguing that “Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else.” Grandgrind is completely convinced of his philosophy and is determined to raise his children according to his strict theories and perspectives; he contends that “This is the principle on which I bring up my own children, and this is the principle on which I bring up these children.” He intends to apply facts to everything and he even forces the small children to learn facts. Some students respond positively to him; for instance, Bitzer the faithful student of Utilitarianism defines a horse according to arithmetic numbers and figures without amounting to the totality of a horse:

‘Quadruped. Graminivorous. Forty teeth, namely twenty-four grinders, four eye-teeth, and twelve incisive. Sheds coat in the spring; in marshy countries, sheds hoofs, too. Hoofs hard, but requiring to be shod with iron. Age known by marks in mouth.’

Unlike Bitzer, Sissy Jupe gets confused and perplexed when she is asked to define a horse. She is not a girl of facts, but an imaginary person brought up in the atmosphere of a circus. What is mentioned
above shows how schools in the Utilitarian societies play a significant part in bringing up individuals according to a political ideology. This fact also proves that the relations between political, educational, and cultural institutions are based on political grounds. The purpose is to create a generation similar to the Coketowners who are dehumanized. Dickens uses a highly poetic language to describe the situations of the Coketowners; he ironically refers to workers as “‘the Hands’,- a race who would have found more favour with some people, if providence had seen fit to make them only hands, or, like the lower creatures of the seashore……” 74 Here, it is clear that workers are dehumanized and associated with machines. Dickens wants to say that the purpose of Utilitarian ideologies is to widen the gap between the government and the working class. So, workers have neither a place nor a future in the Utilitarian societies.

Ideologies do not only have general social functions, but they also have more specifically political functions in the field of politics. One way of classifying ideologies – as well as discourses -- is by the social field in which they function; that is, we have political, educational, legal, religious and health care ideologies, among others. If there is one social field that is ideological, it is that of politics. This is not surprising because it is eminently here that different and opposed groups, power, struggle and interests are at stake. In order to be able to compete, political groups need to be ideologically conscious and organized. Few ideological groups besides political parties have programs that formulate their ideologies explicitly, and that compete for new members or supporters on that basis. Few ideologies are as explicitly defended and contested as political ideologies, as we know from the history of socialism, communism, liberalism, and so on. In other words, the political process is essentially an ideological process, and political cognition is often identified with ideology.

The social organization of the field of politics, and hence of politicians and political groups, is largely based on ideological differences, alliances and similarities. The overall organization of social beliefs as a struggle between the Left and the Right is the result of the underlying polarization of political ideologies that have penetrated into society as a whole. Elections, parliaments, political campaigns, propaganda, demonstrations, and many other phenomena of the political field are thus profoundly ideological. Debates in parliament pitch opposed political ideologies as basis for political policies, measures, decisions or actions. One’s political identity, stances and allegiances are not so much defined in structural group membership, such as membership of a political party, but rather in terms of one’s ideology. Most socialists or neoliberals do not have a membership card. The same is true for other social ideologies that have profound political implications, such as feminism and racism.
If the political field is thoroughly ideological, then so are its political practices, and hence its discourses. Indeed, political ideologies not only are involved in the production or understanding of political discourses and other political practices, but are also reproduced by them. Discourses make ideologies observable in the sense that it is only in discourse that they may be explicitly expressed and formulated. Other political practices only implicitly show or experience ideologies, for instance, in practices of discrimination on the basis of sexist, racist or political ideologies. It is in discourse that we need to explicitly explain that such discrimination occurs ‘because she is a woman’, ‘because he is black’, or ‘because they are socialists’. Thus, it is largely through discourse that political ideologies are acquired, expressed, learned, propagated and contested.

The relations between discourse and political ideologies are usually studied in terms of the structures of political discourse, such as the use of lexical items, and syntactic structures such as actives and passives. It should be emphasized that discourse should be conceptualized also in terms of its context structures. In other words, contexts are subjective participant definitions of communicative situations. They control all aspects of discourse production and comprehension. Political discourses and their structures will only be able to have the political functions they have when they are enacting political acts or processes, such as governing, legislation or doing opposition, and with very specific political aims in mind, such as defending or defeating a bill or getting elected. Political representatives, for example, do not participate mindlessly in political situations, but have political knowledge, share political norms and values, as well as political ideologies. Indeed, it is through this form of contextualization that we are able to link the ideologies of the participants to their discourses. In the same way as discourses may be ideological when based on ideologies, the structures and practices of political contexts may also have such ideological basis.

Obviously, being a member of parliament presupposes a parliamentary system and hence a democratic ideology, whereas being a dictator presupposes another ideology. These categories are culturally variable: members of parliament, prime ministers or party secretaries are not exactly universal political participant categories. Other cultures may have their own specific political event types, political actions, participants, locations, time management, and of course their own political knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms and values. Thus, a minister addressing his or her peers in parliament will express and presuppose very different knowledge than does a politician giving a speech or an interview. Context models control all
levels of style of political discourse, such as lexical choice, pronouns, syntactic structure and other grammatical choices that depend on how situations are defined. Thus, lexical and syntactic style in a parliamentary debate will be much more formal than an informal political meeting of party members or a propaganda leaflet. Context models control the overall schema of political discourse, such as the formal turn-taking organization, openings and closings of a debate in parliament, the conversational structure of a political interview, and the overall organization of a party program. Thus, the rules and structures of parliamentary interaction and their participants are closely related to the structures of the discursive structures of the debate being engaged in by the MPs. It is especially the political ideology of the participants that does not only control much of what they say themselves, but also how they will understand other speakers.

In the light of the previous argument, it may be concluded that the political influence on ideology seems to be great and clear. Adopting the Marxist approach to politics, economics and society reveals a lot of facts about ideology’s relation to politics. This relation can be shown in the State’s pragmatic institutions, where individuals unconsciously cooperate to apply the rules of ideology, especially those ones invented by the state. In these ideological institutions individuals forget that they are dominated and led by the ruling class. On the contrary, they claim that they have the freedom to work or to demonstrate.
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This chapter addresses a vital issue which is the relationship between Feminism and ideology. It attempts to reveal the part ideology plays in influencing Feminism and its pioneers, and how men and women become the victims of ideology: as woman is the victim of male ideology, man becomes the victim of feminist ideology. It reveals that as Feminism has different definitions in literature, it is still struggling to establish its particular identity without isolating itself from literary tradition or melting into its ideological constructs.

As Marxism plays a significant role in changing the formula of existence by raising the question of ideology and false consciousness, feminism poses a significant challenge to the patriarchal ideology which is responsible for distorting woman’s image in literature and society. Many feminist writers have tried to re-conceptualize feminism by giving it several definitions, and to trace the relationship between feminism and philosophy. For example, The French feminist philosopher Michele Le Doeuff examines not only the ideology of knowledge, but also the way in which this ideology is produced by the structure of knowledge. She studies the relationship between feminism, femininity and philosophy. She focuses on “the double problem of the empirical exclusion of women and the theoretical repression of femininity in western philosophy”, and argues that “traditional western philosophy exhibits a striking tradition at its center.”¹ Philosophy is based on “the recognition of lack.”² It exists because there are still things to be thought about. It is also based on the imaginary hypothesis that the knowledge produced by philosophy creates a kind of completion. Its aim is to “construct a flawless structure without lack.”³ What is paradoxical for this school of thought is that “perfect philosophy would simply cease to be philosophy at all.”⁴

Woman’s image in Western philosophy is distorted. This is because she is portrayed “as lacking the phallus.”⁵ According to the patriarchal thought, woman needs a man, not philosophy. Feminist writers have shed light on woman’s position in Western philosophy, taking this lack into consideration. Toril Moi, for instance, examines
woman’s place in Western philosophy, which suggests that woman always lacks many things including rational thinking. Although she is capable of receiving education, she is still unqualified to rule a country, because if she does, the state will be in danger:

woman is an inferior thinker, in other words, not because of her lack, but because of her lack of a lack. Whether woman is thought of as a whole or a hole, she is perceived as lacking in philosophy, that is to say as irrational.  

This defective look towards woman is not applied to women only, but historically speaking, it was applied to slaves, blacks and Muslims as well.

For Kate Millet, women are oppressed and persecuted by a social organization, which is patriarchy. This organization marginalizes woman and puts man at the center. As the political institutions work to spread an ideology to dominate people’s ideas, willingly or unwillingly, man imposes on woman certain ideologies in order to make her accept her position, whether this position is good or not. Anne Jones explains Kate Millet’s views about feminism by arguing that:

Women, she notes, are subordinate to men first of all in the home. Ideological pressures tend to encourage them to devote their energies to the family and to labour long after other workers have clocked off, for board and lodging only, servicing and generating of wage-earners and producing and socializing the text.

Although women tried in the twentieth century to work to support themselves, they were confronted by men’s cruelty. Men considered themselves superior to women, because women were assessed according to their biology: “It is not biology but the social organization of biological differences which produces and perpetuates gender and differences.” Social organizations, usually represented by men, advocate this kind of gender difference.

In spite of their continuous attempts, women are still unable to change canons and social norms; on the contrary, they have always proved to be real protectors of man’s canons and social norms. It is true that men have tried to distort woman’s image in literature and society, but women themselves seem to unconsciously have helped in promoting male ideologies. These women are the victims of false male ideology. Women writers have obviously been aware of this
problem. In *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Bronte shows how women internalize male ideology and work hard to impose it on their counterparts. For example, Jane is portrayed as a woman positioned on the margin. She tries her best to resist and change this inferior position given to her by her aunt. Jane's behavior is always associated with nature. Whenever she tries to defend herself, Miss Abbot, Bessie and Mrs. Reed suppress her. At a particular stage of the novel, when Jane shows some anger against the bad treatment she receives from her aunt, Miss Abbot tells her that God will punish her if she keeps showing her ‘tantrums’. Bronte shows how women spread male ideology by looking at their counterparts as inferiors: “Besides”, said Miss Abbot, “God will punish her: He might strike her dead in the midst of her tantrums, and then where would she go?” This wrong view of woman reveals how male ideology influences women by driving them to accept this ideology and apply it to other women.

Bessie's and Miss Abbot's reaction towards Jane shows how woman becomes woman's worst enemy because of the blind internalization of patriarchal ideology. Their aggressive behavior against a female child enhances the hold of patriarchal ideology and its values. Tamsin Spargo addresses this point clearly in her writing:

> This model can be applied more generally to the way in which women often support and maintain, consciously or unconsciously, the system which actually oppresses them by encouraging or demanding that other women conform to conventional patterns of behaviour.

The fact that the now financially independent Jane conforms to patriarchal values at the end of the novel shows that even Charlotte Bronte herself could not escape the pressure of the 19th century patriarchal ideology. Though Jane is aware of Rochester's vicious side and that he drives his former wife to madness by his maltreatment, she accepts to marry him. As a female writer under a patriarchally-controlled condition, Bronte stops short of developing the liberal and subversive ideas with which she started the novel, because male institutions imposed severe restrictions on women’s writing at the time, and society itself, represented by mostly female readers, seemed to safeguard these restrictions through ultimately cherishing and upholding patriarchal ideologies about the female.

Another important issue related to women and ideology and
tackled by feminist critics is that of gender difference. This gender difference was at the centre of the patriarchal theories about dismissing women, particularly middle-class women, from the realms of education and politics and incarcerating them in the realm of home. Thus, these women practically became lifeless objects deprived of their economic, educational and political rights, because they were “different”. Rosi Braidotti, for example, argues that this difference is not limited to a difference between men and women only; it extends further to involve “differences among women: differences of class, race, and sexual preferences for which the signifier ‘woman’ is inadequate as a blanket term.” Thus, the feminist struggle to reinstate woman in society gains political connotations. Braidotti considers feminism as a political movement. The legitimization of feminism as a political movement is based on the fact that feminism has a lot of rebellion at its core and it fights against oppression. In other words, the concept of sexual difference is “political in that it focuses the debate on how to achieve transformation of self, other, and society.” The idea of transformation of self, other and society proves that feminism is a political movement which aims at affecting a change.

Feminist criticism has two dimensions; the first is concerned with woman as a reader of male literature, while the second is concerned with woman as a creator of literature. In order to understand woman’s real position in society, “one has to understand the system of patriarchy.” and its political aspects. What is even more serious is the fact that whether considering woman’s position as a reader or a creator of literature, these critics also need to look at these positions from within a patriarchal perspective. In other words, they need to take into account that men, be they writers or not, consider this patriarchal domination as natural and the majority of them can look at, evaluate and judge women, only through this order’s perspectives.

Because of its need to struggle against and free itself from internalizing patriarchal attitudes and using patriarchal terminology, feminist criticism could be considered relatively new. Although the roots of feminism extend back to the seventeenth-century, it was only after 1968 that women started to fully study literature from feminist perspective, Elaine Showalter, one of the pioneers of feminist criticism argues that after 1968, women started to think as feminist critics, studying literature "with both a political perspective formed by the women’s
liberation movement, and a training in the contemporary institutions of literary study.” This was entwined with liberation movements, and cries for freedom in politics and education.

Feminist criticism found its real voice when women, as readers, writers and editors, began to note the secondary roles given to the heroines of fiction and female writers. They questioned women’s relation to literature and criticism. They also wanted to know why women were almost written out of literary history. To understand the nature of woman’s role in literature, feminist pioneers began to focus on Marxism, linguistics, psychoanalysis, philosophy and deconstruction: all of which are analytical schools that dissect certain social, psychological and linguistic problems and attempt to find their roots in society and social economic relationships. Feminist criticism further revised all these terms and placed them within patriarchal concepts. It has changed the readers’ and writers’ views towards woman by shifting emphasis from woman’s submissiveness, mistreatment and misrepresentation in literature “to the study of women’s writing, to an analysis of the construction and representation of gender within literary discourse.” As a result of this shift, feminist criticism succeeded in making anti-feminist writers reconsider their misrepresentations of women in their writings.

Feminist critics have persistently tried to find a domain within which they can identify the specificity of women’s text and construct female literary traditions and norms. To Showalter, not only did feminist criticism suffer the problematic task of constructing a female literary tradition or canon, but Canadian and postcolonial critics also raised similar questions related to history and critical differences. They asked many questions concerning the relationship between a dominant and a muted culture:

Does a muted culture have a history and a literature of its own, or must it always be measured by the chronology, standards and biases of the dominant?  

The dominant culture is the product of male views, theories and literary texts, while the muted culture represents women writers and critics. The muted culture always works to find a history and a literature of its own.

In their pioneering work, *The Madwoman in the Attic*, on the woman
within a patriarchal literary tradition, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar examine the woman writer’s social position and literary identity in the nineteenth-century society. They question men’s conventional, social, moral, cultural, and literary views towards women. They argue that the writer’s pen is metaphorically a penis. They criticize the idea which says that the writer masters his text the way God masters the universe. They contend that “In patriarchal Western culture, therefore, the text’s author is a father, a progenitor, a procreator, an aesthetic patriarch whose pen is an instrument of generative power like his penis.” In other words, the writer is the owner of the text and the subject of his text. Therefore, the best way for woman to find a literary identity is to use the pen to write back against the literary authority represented by men. According to Gilbert and Gubar, male authors “pen” woman down in their texts as crippled and distorted. In doing so, they aim to possess women in the same way they possess and master their texts. Male literary texts incarcerate and restrict women within dominant ideologies, while patriarchy prevents them from attempting the pen. Gilbert and Gubar suggest that a woman writer should destroy the conventional patriarchal images of angel and demon attributed to her by men; they exclaim that “Specifically, as we will try to show here, a woman writer must examine, assimilate, and transcend the extreme images of “angel” and “monster” which male authors have generated for her.” Women should kill the images of angel and monster, extreme images which annihilated their presence both in real life and in literary texts, but this can be only achieved after they understand the nature of these images. The woman writer admits with rage that when she looks at the mirror, she sees a male construction, the doll’s image.

Because of the need to examine women’s abilities to establish a specific female literary tradition through re-writing male dominant literary values, a necessity rises to define what is feminist and what is not in literature written by women. Michele Barrett, for example, addresses an important issue when she inquires whether women’s fiction is a feminist fiction or not. The question has also been addressed by Rosalind Coward who suggests that women’s fiction is not necessarily feminist. She defines feminism as "An alignment of political interests and not a shared female experience; hence a tradition of women’s art is of no particular importance." This fact leads to a number of controversial issues about culture and feminism. How should readers or critics react to a work of art that claims to be based on a female
language? To what extent can a work of art prove that it is a feminist work? Barret states that feminist art cannot be completely separated from women’s experience. This act of divorcing feminism from women’s experience creates many problems. This reemphasizes the fact that women’s shared experience of oppression plays an important role in

the construction of a feminist cultural politics, which in turn must lead to the conclusion that feminist art could equally well be developed by (for instance) a man.  

Although the emphasis on women’s experience is not enough to identify a work of art as ‘feminist’, some feminists go as far as to negate the existence of a ‘feminist’ experience altogether. They go as far as to deny the existence of a feminist experience. Feminist art can be seen by critics as a category within a tradition of women’s art, but not outside it.

As a result, some feminist critics started to advocate other elements than just that of a ‘feminist’ experience to make a work of art a ‘feminist’ work. Luce Irigary, for instance, focuses on linguistic sexes and genders. She contends that the concept of valor has always been attributed to masculine in gender, while “whatever devalorized, feminine.” She adds that the sun, as masculine, represents the source of life, while the moon, as feminine, is thought of as ambiguous and harmful. Man’s mastering of language makes a God of him. Men’s appropriation of the linguistic codes gives them the chance to prove that they are fathers and that they are able to engender the cultural field as "they have been engendered in the natural domain of the ovum, the womb, the body of a woman." To Irigary, the best way for women to be liberated is not by envying what man has or by becoming men, but it all depends on the female subjects’ attempt to valorize the expression of their own gender and sex. Women writers should find mechanisms through which they can infiltrate their specifically female expressions, sentiments or criticism of male-constructed literary norms.

Sara Mills also speaks of the issue of gender and the gendered sentence. She argues that feminist literary analysis focuses on a very important debate which is "whether women writers produce the texts which are significantly different in terms of language from those of male." An illuminating approach to the issue of gender difference in writing was
undertaken by Virginia Woolf when she asserted that women writers developed the female sentence: “For Woolf, certain women writers crafted a new type of sentence which is looser and more accretive than the male sentence.”

By raising this issue of gendered writing and asserting that women’s writing is different from men’s writing, Woolf adopts specifically a female 'technique' by which she confronts male ideology. Woolf speaks of the difficulties women face when they intend to write. They face a technical difficulty represented by the sentences made by men. She considers that since language is made by men, women find it difficult to associate their ideas and expressions with a language constructed to serve men’s interests. So, for Woolf, women have to create their own language, a language which serves their specific needs too. For her, “it is necessary that women craft their own type of language.”

Nevertheless, Woolf’s hypothesis about the gendered sentence remains ambiguous or even contradictory at times. She speaks of the female sentence and praises Emily Bronte for using it, but she criticizes Charlotte Bronte for writing as a woman. She even argues that writing should be androgynous and that the serious artistic voice should be androgynous as well. Mills supports this view by considering that “It’s fairly widely held view that writing should be androgynous or sexless…” Woolf considers that the serious artistic voice is androgynous. She sheds light on this problematic issue and states that:

At other points in her writing she suggests that the best type of writing is androgynous, not sexless but bisexual writing, which, as we will see, is very close to the position of Helen Cixous.

Feminist critics have different views of 'écriture feminine'. In Critical Theory and Practice, Keith Green and Jill LeBihan define the ‘écriture feminine’ as a kind of destruction of traditional literary canons; they argue that “écriture feminine is a dramatic subversion of form and of traditional literary values.” ‘Écriture feminine' assumes that the traditional symbolic systems of language restrict women and position them in a restrictive system which marginalizes them and changes them to passive subjects. It also claims that, physically speaking, women are different from men and this difference influences their relation to language. The only way to express this difference is to find a substitute form of language.
French feminists have worked against the Lacanian theory which looks negatively at women. Helen Cixous, for example, criticizes the Lacanian idea of women as lacking the phallus and asserts that “Women as plenitude, turning qualities assigned to women by society, such as hesitation and irrationality, into virtues.”

Cixous focuses on a hierarchical order of language in which certain terms are superior to others and considers that woman is associated with negativity in the patriarchal order of language. She contends that “the feminine is absent from the patriarchal order of language; it is represented only in the negative.” She regards that the relation between man and woman is based on the formula of binary opposition in which there is always a winner and a loser. She criticizes the fact that woman is always connected with the phallus in male literature and writing. She adds that although the binary terms can be related to positivity and negativity, positivity in this case is not linked with masculine only; it is also related to the feminine, since “Either men or women could identify with the feminine.”

So, Cixous insists that woman is “the other” in a male-dominated culture. Though she reacts against the male definition of écriture feminine, Cixous does not assert that the female language is more complex than the male language. Like Woolf, she says that both men and women can use this type of female sentence. She asserts that writing must be bisexual.

Julia Kristeva, who also works from within a Lacanian framework, strongly criticizes the concept of écriture feminine. She speaks of the semiotic and the symbolic. The semiotic refers to the prelinguistic stage of development of the child, while the symbolic is the stable system of language. Mills also speaks of this two-stage development:

The semiotic is associated with the pre-Oedipal stage of unity with the mother, and is repressed into the unconscious on entering the symbolic order of the Father, the Law.

Kristeva believes that women have a special relationship with the semiotic, because they do not have a proper position within the symbolic. She holds that all speaking subjects have a specific bisexuality within themselves. This is similar to statements used by Woolf, Cixous and Irigary who try to say that women’s writing is different from men’s. Not only can women use the female sentence, but men can do so as well, and perhaps they are more renowned for this type of writing than women. Kristeva considers that the use of the
semiotic in literature is revolutionary: “Thus, in the same way as Irigary and Cixous, she holds that significant political action can be undertaken in language itself.” Kristeva thinks that invoking the semiotic in literature will subvert the foundations of the phallic position. Despite the fact that some feminist critics, such as the French ones, state that female writing is radically different from male writing in terms of linguistic structure, no critic, with the exception of Woolf, "really goes on to define the male sentence as such." Woolf offers one example of the male sentence, but she does not specify its linguistic components. The French feminists do not give examples or definitions to the male sentence, “assuming perhaps that it is a commonsense ‘naturalized’ category to which we all have access.” They also say that male writers can use the female sentence when they achieve a form of bisexuality in writing. The problem with the French feminists' approach is that it does not refer to situations where it is possible for female writers to use the male sentence.

Quite few linguistic analysts have attempted to show that men and women have different styles of writing. Mary Hiatt, for example, offers a range of elements which focus on the difference between men’s writing and women’s writing. But, Hiatt “confuses content analysis and linguistic analysis, and bases her analysis largely on stereotypes of what women are supposed to be like.” She asserts that there are significant differences between males' writing style and females’ style of writing. For instance, she says that women writers use shorter sentences, which are less complex than the longer ones men use. She argues that although the female writing style is complex and varied, their stylistic complexity is far less individualized than that of male writers. Hiatt’s classifications of texts into male and female creates a dilemma in feminist literary theories. Hiatt’s theory of linguistic analyses of difference is applied to all literary texts, because men and women can use the same style of writing in literary works.

Feminists, who wished to deconstruct the ways in which gender is represented in literature, have been confronted by a male dominated critical school which gives male authors an impregnable authority, when it considers that their ideology and personal life are separated from their literary writings. Raman Selden is an example of the feminist critic who shows the intellectual dimensions of feminist criticism. He argues that feminist criticism in America works hard to
change the theory of the impersonality of the author and the reader put by new criticism:

Feminist criticism in America was very conscious of its need to shake off the apparent objectivity of New Criticism with its insistence on the 'impersonality' of author and reader. 37

Many male writers have adopted the theory of the author and the reader. For example, when the novelist Norman Mailer faced criticism from a group of representatives of the women’s movement, who considered him as the embodiment of patriarchal authority, he strongly objected to the view that his male characters’ look at women represents his real look. He defended himself by stating that "one of the first principles of literary criticism requires the critic to separate the author from the literary work." 38 Mailer argued that if one of his characters uses violent phallic imagery, this does not mean that he, as a writer, believes in this device. Mailer’s justifications support what feminist critics say, that the history of literature has been dominated by a patriarchal authority which has always devaluated women in several ways. This strategy of separating the author from the literary work is a means of justification on which male authors depend to marginalize the woman writer and deprive her of her literary rights.

Critics have raised many questions about the legitimacy of women’s writing. Do women have their own literary language? Do they write differently from men? Do the biological differences between men and women create a gendered sentence and a gendered language? Historically speaking, the domination of a male literary culture constrained female writers and they had to adopt a male strategy of writing in order to be accepted by male literary institutions. Selden sheds light on this and argues that women

have aped the styles and followed the generic conventions of an essentially male culture. They have written anonymously or pseudonymously in order to conceal their gender. 39

Women writers had to change their names into male ones in order to be accepted in the world of literature; for example, Emily Bronte became ‘Ellis Bell’ and Ann Evans became ‘George Eliot’. The fact that Bronte and Evans adopted the characteristics of the male writers shows that this male/female dichotomy is untrue, because not only can men write like women, but also women can write like men.
Many feminist critics have considered women as victims of patriarchal ideology, treating men as real oppressors and women as victims. Such assumptions depend heavily on a theory of sexual discrimination. Extremist feminists keep on insisting that women are still oppressed, forgetting that women today have become equal to men in most countries. Women have got places in political, social, economic and social institutions. These feminists believe that women should have more rights than men. Instead of treating people as individuals first and members of a gender group second, they believe that all men are intrinsically oppressors and all women are victims. Thus, the only way for women to fight back is to have more power and more rights than men. This is a rather fundamentalist view of the world where society is based on your membership in a particular power group. These feminists tend to create an artificial ‘women versus men’ ideology. In this ideology, men are clearly discriminated against as women are discriminated against in patriarchal ideology.

For instance, Nancy Holmstrom in her article “The Socialist Feminist Project” examines the position of women in Liberal and socialist societies. She contends that in 1970, many women within the women’s liberation movement were not satisfied with the spreading analyses of women’s oppression. She believes that “Liberalism was not radical enough, and radical feminism ignored economic realities.”

Socialist feminism appears to adopt some of the same tenets of Marxism, but instead of focusing on economic determinism as the primary source of oppression, the socialist feminist sees oppression as having psychological and social roots. Socialist feminists share with Marxist feminists a genuine concern for women that transcends politics. Their focus is on real people. To the socialist feminist, the prostitute is a victim of corruption in a society which suffers from class distinction. The oppression of class in a materialistic society degrades people. They are categorized in a particular class and objectified so that they become merely parts of a mechanism that can be replaced by other parts of similar characteristics. In both the socialist feminist and Marxist feminist perspectives, prostitution is discouraged, but neither school of thought seeks a legal remedy for its elimination. They believe that the cause of prostitution is in the structuring of society, and that is where the solution should reside. Socialist feminism accepts Marxism’s analysis of capitalism, but it rejects the view that women’s oppression has turned to class oppression. Women’s position in society is related to the economic system and the gender system or patriarchy. Socialist feminists claim that Marxism focuses on the relations of production rather than on the relations of reproduction. They add that Marxism has ignored the issues of sexuality and relations in the family; Holmstrom states that “Such
categories ignore sex differences among individuals and workers, feminists argued, and hence neither liberalism nor Marxism could explain women’s oppression. ¹⁴¹

Socialist feminists work from within Marxism. They try to alienate themselves from Marxism, ignoring the fact that all their arguments still carry Marxist elements within. They also ignore the fact that Marxism motivates women to change their position in society from the margin to the center. Marxism also criticizes the dominant ideas about women and their duties and rights in society. It stimulates women, and men, to rebel against the dominant ideology which dominates them. Holmstrom’s argument about Feminism and its demands embodies a real female ideology which seeks to marginalize man and to give woman the authenticity to dominate society. In this case, man turns to be a victim of a strict female ideology. This ideology can be shown in Holmsrom’s words:

Feminists are justified in wanting a social theory that gives a fuller picture of production and reproduction than Marx’s political economic theory does, one that extends questions of democracy not only to the economy but to personal relations. ¹⁴²

Kate Millet attacks men’s attitude towards sexual relations and claims that men have a primitive mechanism to defend themselves; they look at sex as something funny and dirty and associate it with women. They do not consider themselves sexualized creatures, but rather represent humanity. She adds that men make their problems and suffering universal, but they ignore women’s suffering throughout history and they forget their crimes against women. She argues that “Because of the smoke-screen of masculine propaganda one hears endless cant about castration--whereas real and actual crimes men commit against women are never mentioned.”¹⁴³ She also refers to the cases of rape in New York city every year. The strategy Millet follows to attack men, is based on a hidden ideology which targets to marginalize man and strip him off his human identity. Using a rather strong language, she states that men “have always been able to believe in the innate evil of women.”¹⁴⁴ She contends that in both primitive societies and religious texts women are portrayed as unclean and taboo. She envies man for having a phallus. She says that as long as a big number of peoples worshipped the phallus throughout history, there must have been peoples who have worshipped the womb once. She thinks that the global oppression and contempt for women indicate that men are afraid of the female powers which, once unrestrained, might threaten their patriarchal authority. She claims that man has a hidden envy towards women, because they possess this miraculous capacity to bring a human being out of their bellies. She adds that man gives himself an access to the supernatural and establishes a relationship with the new male God.
He then starts “to announce his kinship with the divine through a long and impressive list of patriarchs and prophets, high priests and emperors.” She keeps on claiming that after man goes into partnership with God, he appoints himself as God to the female.

Millet argues that the oppression of women is not only economic, but it is psychological as well. She relates this oppression to the earliest childhood, where woman is instructed to behave in a way which attracts men. She is taught to transform herself into a sex object; Millet clarifies this issue by stating that a woman “must be pretty and assessed by the world: weighed, judged and measured by her looks alone.” If a woman is beautiful, she can have the chance to marry; then she can devote all her life to her children and husband. This is woman’s life in the male society. For Millet, the best solution to end social oppression is to solve racial and economic problems and to eliminate violence and power. She also focuses on the revolution in sexual politics; she contends that “a revolution in sexual policy is not only part of but basic to any real change in the quality of life.” Rebuilding values and restructuring personality lead to a change of consciousness, which is a basic element in revolution.

Feminists seem to face problems in finding final definitions for certain terms and concepts. For example, they say that “equality” means that women are equal to men. But, radical feminists reject the laws of equality between male and female and go beyond them. Lindell Mitchell sheds light on this issue in her article “Pack of Lies-7: Male and Female Roles Are Interchangeable”. She shows how Radical feminists attack the institution of marriage claiming that it is a kind of slavery; Mitchell argues that “Since marriage reinforces a hierarchy they find objectionable, feminists argue for the abolition of such "servitude."” Radical feminists add that a woman can get her freedom only after the abolition of marriage. Those feminists aim to dehumanize men, because if they succeed in abolishing marriage, man will be the victim in the sense that he will lose the chance of achieving a social and stable type of life. They also attack the political institutions such as religion claiming that it reinforces man’s oppression of woman. They attack the churches which discriminate between men and women. Mitchell uses religious doctrines in order to prove that feminists have an incomplete view of equality:

Feminism’s denial of gender-based roles tramples essential distinctions in
Christian doctrine pertaining to the home and the church. Its socialistic view of equality is incompatible with religious freedom.\footnote{49}

It is clear that Radical feminists still have aggressive attitudes towards men. In their persistence to go beyond the issues of equality, they seem to be heading towards the formation of a society in which men become victims.

Jacques Lacan, in turn, has offered many views about women metaphorically and physically. These views have raised controversies in feminist discourses. Lacan depends on Freud in analyzing and examining feminism. He positions woman outside the cultural structures. Keith Green and Jill LeBihan argue that “Lacanian theory suggests that identity is constructed(badly) in gendered terms.”\footnote{50} He re-conceptualizes Saussure’s theory of the relationship between the signifier and the signified and its influence on meaning. The Lacanian analysis and formulation of linguistic theory is not the only part that matters to literary critics; his re-conceptualization of literature is also significant. As it has been mentioned above, Lacan re-conceptualizes feminism from a Freudian point of view. Freud states that infants go through a period of sexuality formulation and definition; within this period, the girl looks at the penis as something desirable and feels the lack of this penis. The small boy realizes the female lack of his penis, so he starts to get afraid not to lose his own. In the light of these Freudian analysis of human sexual behaviour, it can be concluded that Freud criticizes the woman and describes her as lacking the phallus. Green and LeBihan elaborate on this point and argue that:

\begin{quote}
Despite Freud's attempts to give an account of the psyche, his explanation of the Oedipus complex comes down to fairly basic biological essentialism, and it privileges the penis, against which women are judged as inadequate or lacking.\footnote{51}
\end{quote}

Lacan uses Freudian terms to clarify his critique of ‘the socialization of the subject’, which is considered as “a process that he calls the transition from the imaginary to the Symbolic through the process of the Mirror Stage.”\footnote{52} The infant has a symbiotic relationship with the world; this relationship is disrupted by the patriarchal law represented by the father. Green and LeBihan argue that “This authoritative intervention is about locating the infant within an already existing societal frame.”\footnote{53} The subject starts entering the realm of the Symbolic, language and representation through the Mirror Stage. The image of the mirror is
important in literature; the ‘not-self is reflected by the self; the character can realize its otherness through the other. For example, in *Jane Eyre* Jane constructs her subjectivity through ‘the madwoman in the attic’. Green and LeBihan contend that

The raging and howling Bertha Mason, the first wife of Mr Rochester, appears as the savage counterpart to the domesticated Jane, Mr Rochester’s wife-to-be. 54

Bertha’s suffering and severe mental illness represent the consequences of avoiding and resisting the patriarchal law. If Jane resists the patriarchal law of the father, she will meet the same end. Bertha indicates to Jane what might happen to her if she evades the patriarchal law. Green and LeBihan show this point in their argument: "It is thus a reflection of both herself and not-herself that Jane sees in the long mirror: it is Bertha and herself defined by Bertha that Jane recognizes." 55

Lacan associates between the unconscious and the language. He argues that “the unconscious is structured like a language”. 56 Language enables the subject to cope with the society and to internalize the differences of gender. Language constitutes the identity and the position of the subject in society. In Saussurean terms, when the signifier is closely attached to the signified, the identification of the subject will be limited to one position, while, in the post-structuralist analysis of language, “one signifier relates to another along a constantly shifting, open-ended chain..” 57 In the structuralist model, the individual is not aware of the fact that he/she is part of a signifying series. For instance, the signifier ‘woman’, semantically speaking, is a biological female. In this case, she is separated from all the other cultural and ideological connections. This traditional look at woman as a biological female has created controversy to feminists. The relationship between the signifier and the signified is a kind of relationship between the self and the other; the only way to understand one of the signifiers is by looking at the relation between the two signifiers. Green and LeBihan assert that Lacan examines the relation between the signifier and the signified by clarifying that “language operates with the signifier in a position of authority over the signified, and he associates this operation with the condition of the Symbolic.” 58 Lacan chooses the phallus as the ‘privileged signifier’ to show the difference between gendered subjects. Green and LeBihan argue that the phallus is different from the penis and both men and women lack the phallus, because they do not have it. Men and women
need the phallus, because it represents a kind of authority, stability and authenticity of meaning. Lacan associates men with the phallus and asserts that men can identify with the phallus, while women cannot. He asserts that linguistically, not biologically, woman lacks the phallus. She becomes the other because she is not associated with the phallus:

Lacan puts ‘woman’ in the position of the excluded term. He explains that the position is not inherent, that it is linguistically, rather than biologically, determined. 59

Women’s writing has always been excluded from literary canons on the bases of this lack. Women have been accused of offering texts inferior to those written by men. For this reason, women have started to establish their own literature and feminist criticism. Feminists have started to question the accusations directed against them. They have found their own appropriate criteria:

Feminists have argued that women’s writing is not inferior to men’s writing, merely that it does not correspond to the same evaluative criteria. Feminist critics have therefore constructed new sets of criteria that are appropriate. 60

This negligence of women in literary canons have motivated feminist writers to re-scrutinize and re-diagnose these literary canons. The negligence was clear in the way women have been portrayed: they are either virtuous or vicious. Feminist criticism writes back against this traditional portrayal of women. It is clear that women in general, and women writers in particular, were marginalized and misread in the past, but at the present, many things have changed; women have got access to the world of literature and criticism. They have just started to establish their own literary identities by re-examining and rewriting the conventional standards of evaluation of their literature: “Despite the claims that women writers have been marginalized in the past, in the present they have revolutionized traditional forms.” 61

In the end, it can be concluded that ideology becomes dangerous when it is pushed to extremities. It may widen the gap between the man and the realities of life. It becomes more problematic when it is blindly adopted by individuals. Men an women often become victims of ideology. For example, women in patriarchal societies are looked at and treated as inferior to men; still, they seem to unconsciously internalize and adopt the ideologies of the same institutions which
oppress them, whether these institutions are social, economic, political, or even religious. Historically and literary speaking, woman is the woman’s worst enemy. Many writers have shed light on this issue. It is clear in *Jane Eyre* that although Mrs. Reed is a woman, she looks at Jane from a patriarchal perspective. She also associates Jane’s behaviour with nature and imprisons her. This fact proves that women are real protectors of patriarchal norms and values. Feminist writers have attacked Western philosophy, because it distorts woman’s image and considers that woman lacks the phallus. Writing is the best way through which a woman can fight back against Western philosophy and male ideology. Kate Millet considers that women are oppressed and persecuted by a social organization, which is patriarchy. This organization marginalizes woman and puts man at the center. As the political institutions work to spread an ideology to dominate people’s ideas, willingly or unwillingly, man imposes on woman certain ideologies in order to make her accept her position, whether this position is good or not. It has been argued that not only are women the victims of ideology, but men as well. Radical feminists, for example, have worked to dehumanize and marginalize men in society. They support the male/female dichotomy. They try to turn laws upside down. They seem to have failed because of their hostile and often extremist attitudes against men, which change those men into the victim of this Radical feminist ideology. Still, away from extremism and fundamentalism, feminist criticism strives to establish its particular identity without isolating itself from literary tradition or melting into its ideological constructs. It aims at placing female writing within an overall literary tradition, and still keeping the individualistic characteristics of such writing.
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Chapter Four

The Ideological Approach to Literature

Critics have focused on the relationship between ideology and literature. Literature involves many ideological issues. Writers inject their literary texts with ideology for different reasons. Through this act of injection they can send a message to the reader about political, economic, and religious reality. E. Balibar and P. Macherey, for example, stress, in *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader*, that literature is an ideological form:

> literature is produced finally through the effect of one or more ideological contradictions precisely because these contradictions cannot be solved within the ideology.\(^1\)

Literature helps in reproducing ideology; it enables people to appropriate ideology and make themselves its free constituents. The literary text could also be a means of ideological subjection: it does not offer itself as a religious dogma and does not force readers to believe in its contents. The readers follow and absorb the implications of the literary text out of free choice. Moreover, they get hypnotized by the ideology of the text. Balibar and Macherey argue in this concern:

> The literary text is a privileged operator in the concrete relations between the individual and ideology in bourgeois society and ensures its reproduction.\(^2\)

Balibar and Macherey think that literature is used in secondary education to dominate and suppress the main language of the ruled class. The dominant class can use literature to wash the brains of students and common people in society.

In *Critical Practice*, Catherine Belsey, similarly, distinguishes between the interrogative text and classic realism. She argues that the interrogative text puts readers in contradiction, while classic realism
works hard to eliminate contradictions. She adds that this distinction between the interrogative text and classic realism is not limited to the fact that the former is good, while the latter is ideological and bad: She defines her ideology in the following way:

In arguing that the interrogative text enlists the reader in contradiction while classic realism does its best to efface contradiction, I do not mean to suggest that the interrogative text is therefore ‘good’ and classic realism ideological misleading and therefore ‘bad’. But if we are not simply to subject ourselves (in every sense) to ideology, we need a new way of approaching classic realism.³

Belsey argues that ideology, which shows coherence, is limited and contradictory. The realistic text that embodies ideology takes part in this incompleteness. Belsey shows in her writing that ideology forms the raw material of the literary text: “Literature is a specific and irreducible form of discourse, but the language which constitutes the raw material of the text is the language of ideology.”⁴ She also argues that the literary text claims to have a relationship between its elements: In its attempt to create a kind of coherence, the realist text reveals incoherence and transgressions which show that the language of ideology is unable to create harmony and coherence.

Many writers have examined the concept of ideology and applied it to their literary works. George Orwell is one of these writers who apply ideology to literature, especially in his Animal Farm in which he embodies all types of ideology. This novel presents a real picture of how politicians ideologize reality, and how the dictatorial governments exploit people and make them blind to reality. To achieve his aim, Orwell uses symbolism as a technique to create many characters in the shape of animals. He presents, for instance, Old Major in the novel as a symbol of revolution: he “was so highly regarded on the farm that every one was quite ready to lose an hour’s sleep in order to hear what he had to say.”⁵ He is shown as a good orator when he speaks to other animals. He once summons all the animals, for example, and tells them about his dream. He tries to motivate them to rebel against their old owner. He tells them that “The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth.”⁶ Old Major's language contains a lot of aggression against the dictator Jones. His words represent Orwell's way of thinking. Orwell criticizes the totalitarian ideology and governments indirectly: “He sets them to work, he gives back to them the bare minimum that will prevent them from starving, and the rest he keeps for himself.”⁷ Orwell wants to say that utilitarian governments exploit their people and give them ‘the bare minimum’ that will keep them alive only.

The best way through which exploited people can get rid of exploitation is to rebel. Old Major tells the animals “That is my message to you, comrades: Rebellion!”⁸ Before he dies, he gives animals some
instructions, and if they follow them, they will be free for ever. With his death, old Major symbolizes the idealistic or abstract vision that leads to rebellion. His death paves the way for other younger figures to seize the revolutionary enthusiasm which is sweeping the farm and use it to propel themselves to positions of power. Napoleon, Snowball, and Squealer are cleverer and more aggressive than the other animals. They soon rise to power as the leaders of the revolutionary movement. They benefit from old Major’s teachings and develop them to become “a complete system of thought, to which they gave the name of Animalism.” They used to hold secret meetings while Jones is asleep, and they started to pass the principles of Animalism to the others. In the meetings, some animals have shown a lot of loyalty to Jones and considered that “If he were gone, we should starve to death.” Those animals represent the dominant class in a totalitarian society. They have gone through a process of brain washing and they are still under the influence of the totalitarian ideology. Because of Jones’ neglect and mistreatment, the animals rebel against him and dismiss him from the farm. The animals get excited and ecstatic after they regain their freedom. The pigs reduce the principles of Animalism to Seven Commandments, which consider all creatures that walk on two legs as enemies and “Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings is a friend.” They also prevent animals from wearing clothes, sleeping in a bed, drinking alcohol, and killing each other. The goal is to spread equality among animals.

When the pigs make sure that the animals are now satisfied with the new changes, they send them to work in the field. The pigs’ superior knowledge help them rule, direct, and supervise animal workers successfully. They “did not actually work, but directed and supervised the others. With their superior knowledge it was natural that they should assume the leadership.” The pigs’ strategy in ruling the animals represents the strategy dictatorial governments follow to dominate the people. The Wild Comrades’ Re-education Committee, and the reading and writing classes the pigs establish to tame the wild animals, is similar to the institutions the dictatorial governments establish to re-educate the people to be submissive and easy to lead. When Jessie and Bluebell give birth to nine sturdy puppies, Napoleon takes these puppies away from their parents, saying that he will “make himself responsible for their education.”

In Animal Farm, the pigs appoint themselves as leaders in the farm. They violate the principles of Animalism. These pigs symbolize the politicians in the dictatorial countries, who usually make the laws and force people to follow them, while they are the only ones allowed to break these laws. Not only do pigs violate the laws, but also they exploit the other animals’ naivety. They follow a certain ideology which enables them to control these animals. Whenever the animals get
angry, they calm them down by sending the good diplomat, Squealer. For example, when the animals find out that only pigs benefit from apples and milk, the shrewd Squealer justifies this by telling them that pigs take apples and milk not because they are selfish. Actually, they hate milk and apples but they eat them to preserve their health. Squealer also uses the language of science to convince the other animals claiming that “Milk and apples (this has been proved by Science, comrades) contain substances absolutely necessary to the well-being of a pig. We pigs are brain-workers.” He adds that milk and apples help pigs perform their duties completely in this farm and if pigs fail in their duties, Jones will come back. The animals seem convinced with Squealer’s false analysis. This policy of maneuvering Squealer follows is similar to the policy dictatorial governors adopt to cover up their dictatorship.

Despite the fact that Snowball does his best to develop the farm, he finds himself in a fight with Napoleon who has always been planning to dismiss Snowball from the farm. Later on, Napoleon succeeds in expelling Snowball with the help of his nine dogs who were secretly working for him. Napoleon’s strategy in ruling is similar to the leaders’ strategy in countries under dictatorships. He does not allow any one to share the authority with him. His secret nine dogs represent the secret intelligence which works secretly for dictators. These dogs are the same puppies which Napoleon snatched from their mothers. He has raised them to guard him when he is in danger. They have gone through a process of brain washing. After Napoleon gets rid of Snowball, he issues new decisions; he cancels the Sunday morning meetings claiming that they are not necessary any more:

The animals would still assemble on Sunday mornings to salute the flag, sing ‘Beasts of England’, and receive their orders for the week; but their would be no more debates.

Like every dictator in the totalitarian government, Napoleon bans debates and shows the animals all types of dictatorship. Napoleon’s policy in ruling embodies the policies the totalitarian leaders use to dominate their people, including the elimination of the freedom of expression. Squealer, whom Napoleon uses to suppress mutiny, also uses the language of maneuver and manipulation. He tells animals that he is sure that “every animal appreciates the sacrifice that Comrade Napoleon has made in taking this extra labour upon himself.” He wants to convince them that Napoleon is the only one who should lead them, because he believes that all animals are equal. He justifies Napoleon’s decision of eliminating debates by suggesting that if animals make wrong decisions, like Snowball, they might lead the farm to destruction. In the end, he convinces them when he tells them that the aim of these decisions is to keep their enemy, Jones, away
and of course they abide by his rules because no one wants Jones to come back.

After Snowball’s expulsion, Napoleon starts the project of the windmill, which was originally Snowball’s idea, though he objected to it before claiming that it would bring no benefit to animals. The animals get surprised to know that Napoleon has supported the project of the windmill. Once again, Squealer interferes and hypnotizes the animals with his ideologized language. He justifies Napoleon’s adoption of the project:

On the contrary, it was he who had advocated it in the beginning, and the plan which Snowball had drawn on the floor on the incubator shed had actually been stolen from among Napoleon’s papers.  

He also maneuvers and tells the animals that Napoleon’s initial objection to the project is a kind of tactics to get rid of Snowball who has a dangerous character. The animals neither understood his logic nor were they satisfied with his justifications till after they saw the dangerous dogs.

These incidents remind us of Antonio Gramsci’s view about ideology, especially his contention that the ruling class follows two basic ways in ruling the people: the consensual and the coercive. If the first way does not work, the ruling class follows the other way which is punishing the passive group in society. In this novel, Napoleon uses both ways; if the animals do not respond to the former, he can use the latter, where he uses his guardian dogs to scare other animals. Napoleon succeeds in dominating the animals by applying to them the ideology of consent. Although the animals have been treated like slaves, they remain happy, because they still believe that “everything that they did was for the benefit of themselves and those of their kind who would come after them, and not for a pack of idle, thieving human beings.”  

The animal’s society in this novel represents the human society. Napoleon’s ideology in managing the animals is similar to the ideology of any dictator leader in the dictatorial countries. Though animals had worked sixty hours a week throughout spring and summer, Napoleon used to claim that on Sunday afternoons there was still extra work to do. This work is claimed to be voluntary, “but any animal who absent himself from it would have his rations reduced by half.” This strategy is also followed in the dictatorial societies, where the ruling class creates an imaginary relationship between individuals and their reality. Althusser clarifies the nature of this ideology stating that “Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.” Similarly, Napoleon in the novel creates an imaginary relationship between animals and their reality. They still think that they have everything and that they are working for themselves not for Napoleon.

Although Napoleon has implemented some laws which prohibit
animals from dealing with human beings, he breaks the laws and gets engaged in trade with men. He claims that he engages in trade “not, of course, for any commercial purpose, but simply in order to obtain certain materials which were urgently necessary.” On the other hand, Napoleon and Squealer work hard to distort Snowball’s image in front of the animals by accusing him of deceit and blaming disasters on him. Squealer uses his shrewdness to convince the animals that Squealer’s bravery in the battle is just false. He accuses him of working for Jones and he attributes all the destruction which happens in the farm to him. Squealer says to the animals that “Snowball was Jones’s agent from the very beginning—yes, and from long before the Rebellion was ever thought of.” Napoleon manages to get rid of the four pigs who have always been against his unfair decisions. He accuses them of dealing with Snowball and forces them to confess about things they have nothing to do with. Under pressure they confess that they had been secretly in touch with Snowball ever since his expulsion, that they had collaborated with him in destroying the windmill, and that they had entered into an agreement with him to hand over Animal Farm to Mr Fredrick. They added that Snowball had privately admitted to them that he had been Jones’s secret agent for years past.

This policy of violence, usually used by dictator leaders to dominate the suppressed class, is referred to in Althusser’s theory of ideology:

What distinguishes the ISAs from the (Repressive) State Apparatus is the following basic difference: the Repressive State Apparatus functions ‘by violence’, whereas the Ideological State Apparatuses function ‘by ideology’.

So, here Napoleon uses the strategy of violence to repress the rebellions in the farm. He also performs a series of executions of the animals who confess that they committed some mistakes. In doing this, he terrifies the animals and eliminates any attempts of disobedience or rebellion. Some animals go through a state of paradoxicality. Clover, for example, did not want to reach this situation, nor did she know why:

they had come to a time when no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to pieces after confessing to shocking crimes.

The situation Clover speaks of exists inside every dictatorial society, a case to which Althusser refers in his theory of ideology. He argues that the State depends on the repression of the dominant class, while it gives the ideological way a secondary role:
This is the fact that the (Repressive) State Apparatus functions massively and predominantly by repression (including physical repression), while functioning secondarily by ideology.  

Gramsci also speaks of the state coercive power and its apparatus:

This apparatus is, however, constituted for the whole of society in anticipation of moments of crisis of command and direction when spontaneous consent has failed.

In this novel, some animals internalize Napoleon’s ideology and work to spread it among other animals. They even begin to attribute their successful achievements and good fortune to Napoleon. For instance, one of the hens says to the other:

‘Under the guidance of our leader, Comrade Napoleon, I have laid five eggs in six days’; or two cows, enjoying a drink at the pool, would exclaim, ‘Thanks to the leadership of Comrade Napoleon, how excellent this water tastes!’

Napoleon, the farm leader, commands that there should be a spontaneous gathering once a week; the purpose of this gathering is to celebrate achievements and victories in the farm. This corresponds with the methods Gramsci speaks of when dictators use them to rule their people, namely, the coercive and the consent:

this consent is “historically” caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production.

Here Napoleon uses the consent method to rule the animals which enjoy the celebrations. They still believe that now they are truly their own masters and that the work they have done is for their benefit. These celebrations made them forget “that their bellies were empty, at least part of the time.” Boxer is an example of the working hard animal and his motto has always been that he will work harder and harder and Comrade Napoleon is always right. Despite the fact that he has been loyal to Napoleon and to the farm, he faces a bad end when he is sent to be slaughtered. Napoleon, the representative of Utilitarian and totalitarian ideology, cares only about money. He does not appreciate the efforts and services Boxer offers to the farm; the moment Boxer gets ill, Napoleon sells his body to the horse slaughter and tells the animals that Boxer has been taken to a hospital where he has died. Boxer is the victim of Napoleon’s hypnotic ideology. It can be concluded here that those who are hypnotized by ideology will definitely face a bad end.

Orwell focuses on the political side of art. In Animal Farm, he
harmonizes political concerns with art, writing directly and indirectly against totalitarianism. Howard M. Unger considers in his article “Orwell and Marx: Animalism vs. Marxism”, that Orwell intends to show in Animal Farm that democracy and Socialism in Russia were not true, but a kind of falsehood. He regards Animal Farm as

a criticism of Karl Marx as well as a novel perpetuating his convictions of democratic Socialism; these are other inherent less discussed qualities in Animal Farm besides the more commonly read harsh criticism of totalitarianism.  

Orwell and Marx have different views on Socialism and its effects on nationalism, religion, society and its leaders. Orwell shares many views with Marx especially his views about revolution, but Orwell is against Marx’s concept of a utopian future. Orwell’s social theory and his criticism of Marxism can be seen in the way the concept of Animalism is used in Animal Farm. Unger raises this issue in his article above pointing out that:

Orwell’s Animalism, what I believe to be his moderately Marxist-Leninist ideology, is different from the animals', but it is Orwell’s Animalism that can best be compared to Marxism.  

Animalism is found by old Major, a prized-bore of Mr. Jones, who has the ability to gather the animals on the farm to tell them about his previous dream. He was highly respected on the farm that “everyone was quite ready to lose an hour’s sleep in order to hear what he had to say.” He tells the animals about their real place in nature, that is on the margin, and how they can change it and move to the center. According to Unger, old Major’s way of theorizing is:

very much like Marx’s writing on the social consciousness of the proletariat in A Contribution to the Political Economy and the evil practices of bourgeois-controlled capitalism in The Communist Manifesto.

Old Major’s speech to animals is completely Marxist. He reminds the animals of their miserable situation. He drives them to revolt against their owner. He tells them that “The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth.” His Socialist theory is similar to Marx’s Socialist theory; both of them motivate people to revolt against reality.

Moses, the raven, is the only animal who sleeps through old Major’s speech. Moses does not work on the farm; he just seduces the animals with tales of the Sugarcandy Mountain, a mythical place in the clouds where all animals go after they die. He is first described as the ‘especial pet’ of Mr. Jones. He has worked as a spy for Jones and after Jones’s death he moves to work for Napoleon. The animals have
hated Moses, because he tells tales and does not work, but some of them believed in Sugarcandy Mountain and the pigs had to argue hard to persuade the animals that this place does not exist. After the animals succeed in revolting against Mr. Jones, Moses disappears and later on he comes back to be used as a tool by Napoleon. Moses represents Orwell’s view of the church. To Orwell, the church is used as a tool by dictatorships just like the sugarcandy mountain to keep the working class people hopeful and productive. Unger sheds light on this point and states that “Moses, like Marx’s view of religious institutions, is a tool of the state.”

Orwell uses Moses to criticize Marx’s belief that the Church will just go away after the rebellion. Jones first used Moses to keep the animals working, and he was successful in many ways before the rebellion. Moses is first rejected by the pigs, but later on, the pigs do not object to his existence, because his presence has become important after the animals have already realized that the outcome of the revolt is a farce.

Because of the complete hypnotization and indulgence in Napoleon’s ideology, the animals forget the old days before the revolution. Only Clover, Benjamin, Moses, and a number of pigs still remember the old days. Clover still remembers the past days, because she has had some doubts about the rebellion but she could not do anything. Old Benjamin is one of Orwell’s elusive and intriguing characters. He is described as rather unchanged since the rebellion. He still does his work the same way, never becoming too excited or too disappointed about anything. He has not expressed his opinion about the revolution and

when asked whether he was not happier now that Jones was gone, he would say only ‘Donkeys live a long time. None of you has ever seen a dead donkey,’ and the others had to be content with this cryptic answer.

He repeatedly says that donkeys live a longer life than other animals. He symbolizes the old generation, the critics of any new rebellion. He is the only animal who seems as though he could not care less about Napoleon and the farm. It is almost as if he could see into the future, knowing that the revolt is only a temporary change, and will consequently come to an end. He is the only animal who does not seem to have expected any positive outcome from the revolution. He has been different from other animals. Unlike others, he is not influenced by Napoleon’s propaganda. The only time he seems to care about the others is when Boxer is carried off in the glue horse slaughter’s truck. It is almost as if the old donkey finally came out of his shell, especially when he tried to warn the others of Boxer’s fate. Benjamin seems to be finally confronting Napoleon and revealing his knowledge of the pigs’ hypocrisy. After the animals have forgotten
Jones and their past lives, Benjamin still remembers everything as Orwell states:

Only old Benjamin professed to remember every detail of his long life and to know that things never had been, nor ever could be much better or much worse- hunger, hardship, and disappointment being, so he said, the unalterable law of life.  

Pigs still remember the old days before the rebellion, because they surround and support Napoleon. They, unlike the other animals, live in luxury and enjoy the benefits of the society they help to control.  

*Animal Farm* gains special importance in the world of literature and politics, because it shows how art and politics are inseparable. In addition to its artistic value, *Animal Farm* presents a real picture of the current political situation in some countries. Totalitarianism to which Orwell refers and which he criticizes still exists in some states. This novel shows how ideology, with all its types, can play a significant role in changing the people's future. Although Orwell did not witness the destruction of Socialist Russia, he seemed to predict in *Animal Farm* that democratic Socialism would not last for long. Some critics claim that Marxism will be destroyed. They are wrong because they have not understood the nature of Marxism and its goals. Marxism does not advocate people to kill or exploit each other. It has nothing to do with Totalitarianism. Some writers connect the collapse of the Eastern camp with the collapse of Marxism. The problem does not seem to lie in Marx's theories, but in the application of these theories. The Soviet leaders benefited from Marxism, but they took the theoretical part and left the practical one. Marx has always supported the working class and urged them to change their conditions. The Eastern camp leaders did not follow the Marxist method in ruling the people, but they followed the Capitalist method. Though Marx has always criticized Capitalism and the Capitalist leaders who exploited the working class, the Soviet leaders were Capitalist rather than Marxist.  

Ideology acquires a dangerous aspect when it is adopted by politicians who use ideology as a tool to achieve their political goals through hiding facts and changing history. In the past, the world was divided into two camps: the Eastern camp and the Western camp; or in other words, the Socialist camp and the Capitalist camp. The writers who supported the Western camp wrote against Communism and Marxism claiming that both movements are based on exploitation and dictatorship, while the writers who supported the Eastern camp wrote against Americanism and the American ideology which aims to occupy the world politically, economically, socially, and culturally. Theoretically speaking, Animalism in *Animal Farm* can be associated with Marxism; but, practically it can be associated with Americanism.
and Capitalism. Raymond Williams, for instance, diagnoses Orwell's works and biases; he contends that Orwell attacks the disciplines of socialism and focuses on the criticism of communism: "What he did attack, in socialism, was its disciplines, and, on this basis, he came to concentrate his attack on communism." 39 Orwell in *Animal Farm* adopts a political ideology and attacks Marxism. His political biases towards Americanism at the time influence his literary work. The theory that old Major raises in *Animal Farm* is based on Marxism, whereas the policy that Napoleon follows in ruling the farm is based on Capitalism. So, it is wrong to think that Orwell’s Napoleon is a Marxist leader, because all his actions prove that he is a Capitalist leader. He claims in front of the animals that he is working to apply Animalism to reality, while in fact he does the opposite. Napoleon is a very important character in the world of fiction and non-fiction. He seems to be similar to Claudius in *Hamlet*, because both characters use similar language and follow the same strategy in ruling the people. Napoleon is a modern character, because he is similar to many political leaders who are ruling their countries now using the same way Napoleon has adopted. The fall of Animalism and the rise of Capitalism in *Animal Farm* show that Capitalism is more successful than Socialism in the world of politics.

Orwell diagnoses the concept of nationalism in his essay “Notes on Nationalism”. He separates between nationalism and the question of emotions. Nationalism means to him “the habit of identifying oneself with a single nation or other unit, placing it beyond good and evil and recognizing no other duty than that of advancing its interests.” 40 Orwell distinguishes between nationalism and patriotism. For him, patriotism means to devote yourself to a certain place and to a specific way of life without forcing it on others; politically and culturally speaking, patriotism has a defensive nature. He adds that nationalism “is inseparable from the desire for power.” 41 The nationalist aims to secure power, not for himself but for the nation he belongs to and believes in. Nationalism includes movements such as Communism, Zionism, and Anti-Semitism. This concept does not mean the loyalty to a country or a nation. A nationalist may be a negative or a positive one; nationalist feeling might be negative. Some people belong to a certain country, but they have no positive feeling toward this country. Orwell gives an example of the Trotskyists who became enemies of the U.S.S.R without showing a tendency to belong to any other group.

Nationalists or the people who believe in nationalism are usually susceptible to be hypnotized by nationalist ideology. Political leaders are usually careful to promote this sense of nationality in the dominated class. When individuals absorb this false nationalism, they become ready to sacrifice themselves to gratify their strong feelings
towards nationalism. Political leaders follow many methods through which they can create the sense of nationalism in the ruled class. They can achieve this at schools and at universities, through teaching students some lessons and delivering some speeches about nationality and nationalism. Media can also serve the interests of political leaders. So, these are the factors that help the political leaders in dominating the working class. Capitalists distort the notion of nationalism. In *Animal Farm*, Napoleon deceives the animals by telling them that the means of production and the farm are theirs. The animals believe him and start working hard. Nationalist ideology is dangerous, because it creates an imaginary relationship between a man and his reality. Excessive identification with the imaginary world may lead to internalization or to fundamentalism.

Orwell not only reveals how ideological concepts are twisted for political ends, but also suggests that language could be twisted for political ends. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Orwell gets his themes from reality and from his own experience. He witnessed the Spanish Civil War and noticed how political leaders falsify facts and news. He portrays in this novel how the State uses and distorts language in order to control the people. Gwyneth Roberts in his essay “George Orwell: ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’” shows how Orwell diagnoses the political language and the political ideology. He argues that “Another major concern was the way in which language was being twisted and corrupted for political ends.”

Orwell shows in his novel that Newspeak has been made to remove the politically undesirable ideas and to keep only those ideas supported by the State. Roberts in his “George Orwell: ‘Nineteen Eighty-Four’” makes this point clear:

> The aim of Newspeak is that all ideas which do not follow the principles of Ingsoc will be impossible to hold, and to this end all the politically undesirable words and meanings are being surgically removed from the language.

Orwell criticizes the deliberate use of complex language and regards it as one of the greatest mistakes. He also attacks the unconscious use of language which breaks the contact between the writer and the truth of what he has written about. Language is very dangerous especially when it is used by politicians. They manipulate and distort this language for political ends. In *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Orwell criticizes the State for interfering with the private life of individuals. He believes that “the State should provide a social framework for its citizens but not dictate how their private lives are to be lived; if it does, they become, in a basic sense, less than human.”

The introductory sentences in the novel show that there is something wrong with the atmosphere. The way the writer describes Winston Smith not only reflects the kind of life he is leading, but it also
gives us a hint about what is likely to happen to him. Orwell starts his novel in the following way:

It was a bright cold day in April, and the clocks were striking thirteen. Winston Smith, his chin nuzzled into his breast in an effort to escape the vile wind, slipped quickly through the glass doors of Victory Mansions, though not quickly enough to prevent a swirl of gritty dust from entering along with him.  

Number thirteen is a bad sign in this novel. The physical situation the writer describes in the first page refers to the bad conditions the people are going through; the lift was rarely working and the electrical power was cut off. In addition to that, the Big Brother’s picture is keeping an eye on the people. Roberts associates the Big Brother with Stalin; he argues that “The physical appearance of Big Brother very strongly suggests Stalin, as do many of the elements of his regime and his methods of keeping power.” Orwell criticizes the dictatorial regimes which exploit the people and impose on them unfair laws. The State uses many tools to dominate people. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the State uses the telescreen, the police patrol and the ‘Thought Police’ to keep an eye on the people. Orwell states that “It was the police patrol, snooping into people’s windows.” The job of the Thought Police is to watch the people and to scrutinize every move they make. Orwell mentions four giant Ministries; what is paradoxical about them is that each one is concerned with the quality opposed to its name. The Ministry of Truth was concerned with news and education. The Ministry of Peace was concerned with war. The Ministry of Love was responsible for keeping law and order, while the Ministry of Plenty was concerned with economic affairs. Winston is an important character in the novel through which you can understand the nature of the society that Orwell portrays in this novel. Winston has always moved carefully, because he knows that the telescreen is watching him all the time. He starts to open a diary; he knew that:

This was not illegal(nothing was illegal, since there were no longer any laws), but if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced-labour camp.

This fact shows that totalitarian States usually work to dehumanize individuals and strip them of their human rights for political ends. The coercive power is really a necessary method for totalitarian governments. It is clear that Orwell criticizes totalitarian regimes, which were there before and after the Second World War; but unfortunately, these regimes still exist particularly in the Middle East. Winston’s rebellion against the Thought Police starts from his diary. He has written about an act of bombing a ship and about acts of violence in other places. His diary enables him to express his anxiety
and restlessness in the totalitarian society he lives in. He seems to hate all women, especially the young and the beautiful ones. His hatred lies in the fact that women absorb the political ideology quickly and they work for the Thought Police. Orwell makes this point clear when he speaks about women:

He disliked nearly all women, and especially the young and pretty ones. It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the party, the swallowers of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy.\textsuperscript{49}

Emmanuel Goldstein is one of the leading figures of the Party. That is why he is called, in the novel, the enemy of the people. He has been condemned to death because of his involvement in counter-rebellious activities: he escapes and disappears. He is not on good terms with the Big Brother. On the screen, he keeps attacking the doctrines of the party, the dictatorship of the Party and the Big Brother. He advocates the freedom of speech and the freedom of press. Although people hate him and despise him, although his theories and books have been ridiculed on the telescreen, he has succeeded in getting some supporters. Orwell clarifies this point by stating that “A day never passed when spies and saboteurs acting under his directions were not unmasked by the Thought Police.”\textsuperscript{50} The people’s reaction towards Goldstein’s speech was very negative; there is a girl who picks up a heavy dictionary and throws it at the screen. On the contrary, Winston’s hatred was not directed against Goldstein, but against the Big Brother and the Party. The people’s negative reaction toward Goldstein shows that they are still hypnotized by the Big Brother’s ideology. Winston goes through an inner conflict; he has been influenced by the people’s hostility to Goldstein. Suddenly, his hatred of the Big Brother changes into love. Orwell describes Winston’s sudden change like this:

At these moments his secret loathing of Big Brother changed into adoration, and Big Brother seemed to tower up, an invincible, fearless protector, standing like a rock against the hordes of Asia, and Goldstein, in spite of his isolation, his helplessness, and the doubt that hung about his very existence, seemed like some sinister enchanter, capable by the mere power of his voice of wrecking the structure of civilization.\textsuperscript{51}

Here, Winston goes under the spell of the Big Brother’s charming ideology for a while. It is hard for him to rebel against the whole society. The writer describes the Big Brother as one who is full of power and mysterious calmness; his words are full of encouragement. Although he appeared on the screen for few seconds, he attracted the people in a strange way; even a little sandy-haired woman dashed forward murmuring and calling him ‘the Saviour’. At this moment, all the people unconsciously start chanting for the Big Brother as if they
were chanting for Jesus Christ in the church. Orwell describes the people’s reaction like this: “Partly it was a sort of hymn to the wisdom and majesty of Big Brother, but still more it was an act of self-hypnosis, a deliberate drowning of consciousness by means of rhythmic noise.” The writer intends to say that people in totalitarian countries behave and react towards their leaders unconsciously; they are hypnotized by a strict political ideology. Out of fear, Winston joins the choir. When he stops for a while, he glances at O’Brien. Both of them exchange the thoughts and share the same hostile attitude for the Big Brother.

When Winston comes back home, he opens his diary and writes ‘down with Big Brother’ filling half a page. He could not avoid feeling like scared, because he knows that the Thought Police will arrest him sooner or later for committing a ‘Thoughtcrime’. He is aware of the fact that “Thoughtcrime was not a thing that could be concealed for ever. You might dodge successfully for a while, even for years, but sooner or later they were bound to get you.” What is more frightening about the arrests is that they happen at night only. People suddenly disappear; their names and their existence are wiped out. This horrible picture of the night arrests shows how merciless and dangerous totalitarian regimes are. Winston is aware of the fact that the rebellious individuals will be punished severely, but he insists on writing. His writing includes a lot of challenge and aggression against the Big Brother. When Winston goes to help Mrs. Parsons in fixing the water pipe, he is surprised when called a traitor and a thought-criminal by her children. The children tell their mother that they want to go to see the hanging. They still think that this is a game only. This incident shows that the influence of the political ideology on the individuals starts from childhood. The Big Brother’s regime dominates the people from the age of childhood. Orwell describes how the children behave and react in totalitarian States:

On the contrary, they adored the Party and everything connected with it. The songs, the processions, the banners, the hiking, the drilling with dummy rifles, the yelling of slogans, the worship of Big Brother—it was all a sort of glorious game to them.

Parents have started to be afraid of their children, because the children have been encouraged by the regime to tell of their parents’ political biases. The newspapers, for example, praised the child, who denounced its parents to the authorities as counter-revolutionaries, by calling him a ‘child hero’. This incident shows how dangerous ideology is, especially in totalitarian countries. This ideology does not create a barrier between a man and his reality only, but it also makes a barrier between a child and its parents.

Winston was sick with the current situation and with the Party. He is
no longer able to bear seeing the slogans or the Big Brother’s picture which was on the coin, on the books, and on the banners. He does not know for whom he is writing the diary, but he knows that he, if caught, will face death and elimination. Orwell clarifies this point by stating that “The diary would be reduced to ashes and himself to vapor. Only the Thought Police would read what he had written, before they wiped it out of existence and out of memory.” Winston remembers his dead family; he also remembers the love he received from his mother; but now he lives in a state of paradox, because the situation he is in now is different. He lives in a world full of fear, hatred and pain. He knows that Oceania was in alliance with Eurasia, but as long as the Party denies the fact that Oceania and Eurasia were allies, everyone will consider what the Party tells as true. This incident shows that politicians can be historians. They usually change historical facts to serve their personal interests. Objectively speaking, history is no longer history, but it is just a set of made up tales. Orwell in Nineteen Eighty-Four highlights this point stating that “And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed-if all records told the same tale-then the lie passed into history and became truth.” So, politicians do not only politicize and ideologize reality, but they also politicize history and falsify historical facts. Once again, Winston goes back to the world of memories. He tries to remember the first time he has heard of the Big Brother. The Party considers the Big Brother as the founder and the guardian of the Revolution. The party invents a lot of lies and claims in the books of history that they have invented the aeroplanes; Winston is aware of these lies, but he has had no proof or evidence. Orwell sheds light on this point in the following words:

It was not true, for example, as was claimed in the Party history books, that the party had invented aeroplanes. He remembered aeroplanes since his earliest childhood. But you could prove nothing. There was never any evidence.

Winston meets Syme who is a specialist in Newspeak. Syme tells Winston how excited he was to watch the hanging of the prisoners. He also tells him that his main job is not to invent new words, but to destroy language and words every day; he says that “You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We are destroying words-scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We are cutting language down to the bone.” This shows that politicians and their supporters work hard to destroy and distort language; it means that language is one of the strongest weapons the State depends on in order to twist facts and to dominate people’s minds. Syme tells Winston about the strategy of destroying words. He gives him an example of this destruction which is the word ‘good’. The opposite of ‘good’ should be ‘ungood’. He adds that ‘ungood’ is the direct opposite of ‘good’, while
'bad' is not. The Big Brother is responsible for this distortion; Syme argues that “It was B.B.'s idea originally, of course, he added as an afterthought.” Syme explains to Winston that through this strategy they can narrow down the range of thinking. Then, thoughtcrimes will be impossible to happen.

Syme and the Big Brother aim to create a generation which has a lateral way of thinking. In this case, the process of domination can be complete. When Winston and Syme speak of the 'proles', Syme tells Winston that the 'proles' are not human beings and that in the future all types of knowledge of old speak, including the literature of the past, will disappear. He adds that “Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron—they'll exist only in Newspeak versions, not merely changed into something different, but actually changed into something contradictory of what they used to be.” Syme's views show that the Big Brother is aware of the fact that literature and writers threaten the existence of the State when they include revolutionary in their writing. The Big Brother wants to create a literature of his own. He does not want a literature which corrects the social reality, but he intends to find a literature which distorts reality and language. This fact shows that the relationship between literature and political ideology is inseparable. Political leaders work to fight the literary language which deals with facts; they try create a lateral language, a language which has no complexity inside. Winston gets surprised to see the people gather to thank the Big Brother for raising the chocolate portion to twenty grammes, because he still remembers that last week the portion was thirty grammes and only yesterday it was reduced to twenty grammes a week. Winston wonders how people have forgotten the whole situation quickly: “Was it possible that they could swallow that, after only twenty-four hours? Yes they swallowed it.” This event shows that people who are under the influence of political ideology behave unconsciously and consciously at the same time; they know deep at heart that if they show any resentment against the State, they will definitely be eliminated from existence.

The problem with totalitarian countries is that they interfere with the individual's private life. A man is not allowed to have promiscuous relationships. The purpose of marriage is to bring children to serve the Party. The Party established an organization called the Junior Anti-sex League. Winston remembers his relationship with his ex-wife. She was loyal to the Party; she insisted on having a baby for the sake of the Party. He remembers Katherine's white body as “frozen for ever by the hypnotic power of the Party.” Winston has always wanted to break the wall of virtue; he knows that the sexual act is a kind of rebellion against the Party and desire is a thoughtcrime. He also knows that “Even to have awakened Katharine, if he could have achieved it, would have been like a seduction, although she was his wife.” Winston is aware of the fact
that the patrols will catch him and punish him if he takes the risk and dates a woman in the night. It is really horrible to be watched all the time and to get no right to behave as a human being.

Winston still believes that hope exists in the 'proles' only. He believes that the 'proles' can rise up and destroy the Party. When Winston is walking down the street, he hears a lot of loud voices full of anger and despair. Suddenly his heart leaps and he thinks that the 'proles' have started their revolution against the party. He is surprised to discover that these voices are just women’s voices fighting over a silly issue and wonders: “Why was it that they could never shout like that about anything that mattered?” 64 Winston justifies the 'proles' situation before the Revolution that they were oppressed by the capitalists: women were forced to work in the coal mines; children were sold to the factories at the age of six. Nothing has changed after the revolution: women are still working in the coal mines and the proles are treated like animals by the Party: “But simultaneously, true to the principles of doublethink, the Party taught that the proles were natural inferiors who must be kept in subjection, like animals, by the application of a few simple rules.” 65 The 'proles' were completely neglected. They grew up in very narrow areas. It was easy for the State to control them. The spies of the Thought Police were always among them to spread some false rumors and to eliminate the people who were going to cause any danger to the Party. Orwell clarifies this point by arguing that “All that was required of them was a primitive patriotism which could be appealed to whenever it was necessary to make them accept longer working-hours or shorter rations.” 66 The Big Brother knows that the proletariats have primitive minds and can cause no problems to the State. For this reason, he did not force them to stick to the civil laws: “In all questions of morals they were allowed to follow their ancestral code.” 67 Promiscuity and divorce were permitted. The Party announced that ‘the proles’ are free just like animals. Orwell attempts in his writing to change this horrible image of the proletariat in totalitarian societies. He criticizes the Big Brother who represents every dictator in the world. Orwell also attacks the totalitarian ideologies which widen the gap between the individual and the real world he lives in.

Dostoyevsky is also one of the writers who diagnose and question the utilitarian ideology in his writing. In Crime and Punishment, he portrays, through Raskolnikov, how dangerous ideology could be. Raskolnikov is an educated man who strongly absorbs the utilitarian ideology and tries to apply it to reality. He is influenced by the liberal and Napoleonic ideas of that age. He tries to break the barriers and go beyond the moral laws in society. He goes under the spell of half-baked ideas. He finds out that the act of crime is the best way to get rid of destitution. He decides to kill for the sake of money. He adopts
strict utilitarian ideas. This fact shows that ideology is a kind of false consciousness. Raskolnikov is deceived by the utilitarian ideas and becomes the victim of false ideology. He thinks that he can be a Napoleonic hero. Although Napoleon kills lots of people, history still glorifies his acts. Raskolnikov wants to connect between aesthetics and ethics. He intends to make the immoral act a justified one. Utilitarianism and Napoleonism play a significant role in urging Raskolnikov to commit a crime. The motives of his crime are social and economic ones. Raskolnikov is sick with the fact that his mother and sister are still supporting him. When he receives a letter from his mother, his motives to commit the crime increase. He cannot bear to know that his sister will marry a man she does not love; she accepts to get rid of poverty and to help Raskolnikov to get on in this world. In the letter, his mother defines him as a person who will not allow his sister to be humiliated. On the other hand, she motivates him to accept his sister’s sacrifice. Malcolm V. Jones clarifies this point in his Dostoyevsky after Bakhtin by arguing that “Of course Raskolnikov’s mother has unerringly put her finger on Raskolnikov’s most painful problem.” 68 Raskolnikov has been satisfied that he has the right to commit a crime; he has been hypnotized by the utilitarian ideology. He alienates and isolates himself from the people. He inherits this alienation from the bourgeois ideology which gives the legacy to the concept of individualism in society.

Raskolnikov, in his article, divides the people into two groups: the ordinary people who live obediently and cannot transgress the law, and the extraordinary people who have the right to commit crimes and to break boundaries. Raskolnikov thinks that this old woman is an obstacle. If he kills her, he will be able to finish his study and support his family. He believes that the end justifies the means. He tries to justify his crime by giving examples of extraordinary people who have the right to do anything for their discoveries even if they were forced to eliminate people. He still thinks that he is superior to others. He gets this belief through his theoretical reading of utilitarianism. This point leads to an inner conflict between what he is and what he wants to be. Jones speaks of this conflict in his Dostoyevsky after Bakhtin:

The one enables him to contemplate and in part to commit his murder through labelling himself as a ‘great man’ and Alyona Ivanova as a ‘louse’ within a system of ideas which permits members of the former category under certain conditions to dispose of the lives of members of the latter. 69

Raskolnikov knows deep inside that he belongs to the working class, but he aims to break the barriers and become an extraordinary man like Napoleon. He thinks that he can commit a crime without having any sense of guilt. Raskolnikov looks at the people as units in
mechanical construction. He looks at the old woman as a material object. He tries to formulate a lateral way of thinking. He depends on reason only and marginalizes the emotional side in his personality. He claims that he will kill the old woman to avenge the poor students. He thinks that a man can live with mind only, but the crime shows that this theory is wrong, because Raskolnikov suffers a lot after committing the crime. Raskolnikov’s crime is a practice of his Napoleonic ideas. When he starts to suffer after he commits the crime, he finds out that he is not one of the extraordinary people as he has thought before. He fails in stepping over the limits as he himself admits that he killed a principle and could not step over the barriers. He reveals this idea in one of his monologues:

The old woman was only an illness-I wanted to transgress all barriers as quickly as possible-I killed not a human being but a principle! Yes, I killed a principle, but as for transgressing the barriers, I did not do that; I remained on this side.  

Luzhin is an example of the utilitarian people; he proposes to marry Dunya, because he considers her a fallen woman after her reputation is spoilt. He thinks that he is making charity by marrying her. He denies the principle of brotherhood and claims that helping neighbors causes a lot of troubles to the person. Svidrigailov is also one of the utilitarian characters in the novel. His name means that he is a true barbarian. He has violated all moral values for the sake of personal benefit. What Raskolnikov knows about Svidrigailov is that he has abused his sister. The analogy between Raskolnikov and Svidrigailov is that both of them hold the same philosophy; both have committed crimes. The only difference between the two is that Svidrigailov can kill and forget, whereas Raskolnikov can kill but he cannot forget. Raskolnikov has been attracted to and repelled from Svidrigailov at the same time. He highly admires him, because he is a successful utilitarian and Raskolnikov has always wanted to be a successful utilitarian like Svidrigailov. At the same time, Raskolnikov is disgusted by Svidrigailov’s immoral acts. When Raskolnikov tells Svidrigailov that people say that he drove his wife into the grave, the latter answers that:

I mean, you mustn’t think that I have any misgivings on that score: everything was quite regular and correct; the medical inquiry revealed apoplexy, as a result of bathing immediately after a heavy meal taken with almost a bottle of wine, and indeed there was nothing else it could have shown….  

This incident reveals that Svidrigailov has no remorse for killing his wife. So, this novel shows that utilitarian ideologies are very dangerous, because they motivate the individual who embraces them to break all moral, social and human values for the sake of achieving
personal benefit. What happens to Raskolnikov shows that people who adopt the false utilitarian ideas suffer psychological conflicts which lead them to trespass the moral laws and to kill people just to achieve some personal goals. Through the long history, political leaders have tried to spread some destructive ideologies and theories among the people in order to be able to dominate them.

Another important writer who deals with ideology in his novels is Nathaniel Hawthorne. In *The Scarlet Letter*, he scandalizes the Puritan ideology and proves that it is based on falsehoods and hypocrisy. Through creating characters like Hester Prynne and Arthur Dimmesdale, he criticizes the false puritan ideology and shows how repressive and dangerous it could be. Condemned to wear a bright scarlet "A" over her breast wherever she went, Hester Prynne had been convicted of adultery by Boston's Puritan leaders. A child had been born to her during her husband's long absence. On the scaffold, she suffered scorn and public humiliation. A minister in the crowd denounced her crime and called on her to reveal the identity of her partner. Another minister, Arthur Dimmesdale, pled with her more gently. He, in compassion, also begged her to unmask her lover, saying: "If thou feelest it to be for thy soul's peace, and that thy earthly punishment will thereby be made more effectual to salvation, I charge thee to speak out the name of thy fellow-sinner and fellow-sufferer!" Unknown to the multitude, however, Dimmesdale himself was that lover; his gentle insistence was in fact a kind of unsatisfying effort to urge a confession from Hester which he knew she would never make-and which he himself could not find the courage to make. People who are hypnotized by the religious ideology claim that the scarlet letter Hester has put on, "had the effect of a spell, taking her out of the ordinary relations with humanity, and inclosing her in a sphere by herself. " Hester suffers silently and shows no complaint against the abuse she receives from the puritan society. She has been forced to bear social ostracism as women have avoided her, and clergymen have pointed to her as a living example of the consequences of sin.

Roger Chillingsworth, Hester's husband, does his best to discover his wife's lover. He suspects that Dimmesdale is his wife's lover; he uses many methods to force the clergyman to confess his crime. Soon it became clear that Dimmesdale was indeed Hester's lover; but, rather than expose him then, Chillingsworth chooses to continue torturing the preacher and finally threatening his moral sanity. Dimmesdale's sense of guilt grows, ultimately causing his health to fade. Dimmesdale has always appeared holy to his congregation who regards him as unique in piety. Hester convinces Dimmesdale to escape with her to Europe, where they can enjoy a new, unfettered life
together. Their plan is to depart after the minister delivers his final sermon. When the day of departure comes, Hester waits anxiously outside the church. Nearby, the captain of the ship on which they will sail mentions to her that Roger Chillingsworth will also be a passenger on his vessel. So, she gets worried and realizes that Chillingsworth will never allow them to be free. After the service ends, Dimmesdale makes his way out of the procession and feebly walks toward the scaffold in the marketplace. Then he turns and beckons Hester and Pearl to come to him. Chillingsworth hurries up and tries to prevent Dimmesdale from getting next to Hester and her daughter, warning him that his reputation will be spoiled. Dimmesdale answers Chillingsworth that it is too late: “Ha, tempter! Me thinks thou art too late!” answered the minister, encountering his eye, fearfully, but firmly. “Thy power is not what it was! With God’s help, I shall escape thee now!” He extends his hand to Hester and admits to his partnership in her sin, and berates himself for the years he has lived in deceit. Then, he focuses on Roger Chillingsworth and exposes the true identity and sinister nature of the man. This confession seems to be fatal to him. As he collapses on the wooden planks, supported on Hester's bosom, Dimmesdale bids farewell to his beloved, and then to little Pearl.

Another example on victimization by ideology is brought by Charles Dickens. In *Hard Times*, Dickens portrays how the working class people become victims of ideology and false consciousness. He creates characters like Gradgrind, Louisa, and Tom in order to show that utilitarian ideology leads people to an inevitable failure. Gradgrind believes that children should learn mathematical sciences and relate everything to maths. He teaches his students and his children how to analyse things mathematically. He criticizes Tom and Louisa for going to the circus; he believes that circus teaches children fancy only, not facts. When he is talking to his student Sissy Jupe, she uses the word ‘fancy’. He gets angry and tells her never to use it again: “Ay, ay, ay! But you mustn’t fancy,” cried the gentleman, quite elated by coming so happily to his point. “That’s it! You are never to fancy”. He insists on and emphasises the importance of focusing on facts: “Fact, fact, fact!” said the gentleman. And “Fact, fact, fact!” repeated Thomas Gradgrind. Gradgrind is a representative of utilitarian ideology. He focuses on reason only and marginalizes emotions and imagination. His wrong instructions cause the social destruction of his children. Louisa marries a man she finds abominable just to please her brother Tom. In his article on *Hard Times* "Louisa as Victim", Tom Hale considers Louisa as one of the most tragic characters in the novel. He portrays her as one who is aware of her misery, but still cannot escape it: "These events show Louisa to be a complex and dynamic character, able to recognize her misery, yet unable to escape it." Louisa is not the only victim of Gradgrind's ideology; Tom also becomes a total failure as a result of Gradgrind's wrong
upbringing. His father’s theory leads him to think that self-interest is the prime consideration. So, he sacrifices his sister and robs a bank. Dickens shows in his novel that rich people can break the moral values, while poor people cannot. Bounderby, for instance, can afford to divorce his wife easily because he is a rich man, while a poor person like Stephen Blackpool cannot divorce his wife who has turned his life into misery, simply because he is poor and cannot afford the divorce. Blackpool represents the working class in the utilitarian society. He is the victim of the utilitarian and the industrial capitalist world. It is ironic that he works at a loom, which is a symbol of weaving and making fiction, yet he is unable to fictionalize. This novel reveals the atrocity of utilitarian ideologies and their bad influence on the working class.

All the novels discussed in this chapter emphasize that ideology and literature are inseparable. Some writers use literature as a means to serve the capitalist leaders’ interests. It is clear that a literary text can be a political and ideological one as it does not only address literary issues, but political ones as well. Politicians fight against the revolutionary type of writing, the writing which motivates the workers to rebel against the social, economic and political reality. Orwell’s novels reveal how the best way for the political leaders to dominate the workers is by hypnotizing them. The process of hypnotism is achieved through political speeches, media, schools, universities, mosques, and churches. The political leaders fight the books which include criticism against the distorted reality and they impose a lot of books which deal with nationalist, religious and idealist issues. The workers’ naivety motivates them to accept all types of ideology imposed on them by the State. These false ideologies play a significant role in dominating the people’s minds. The army and the police also have their own roles in the dictatorial societies. If the ideological way does not work, the State prepares the army and the police to interfere by punishing those who have any rebellious ideas against the State. In addition to using educational institutions, the State may also use religious institutions to consolidate certain ideologies or promote them. In Europe, religious authorities often helped preserve the status quo, especially that of classes. Religious men often preached for the class order as God's will, and they even advised working class, suppressed, or poor people to accept their lot and to attempt to change it and promised them of heaven if they do so.

In Hawthorne’s The Scarlet Letter, the Puritan religious ideology creates frightened and even unstable individuals. It torments people in the name of preserving order, kills love, and annihilates personal
freedom. Furthermore, in Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, political ideology works as an instrument of social repression, of disorder as it seems to breed only crime, hate, and individual psychological struggle when individuals fall preys to poverty and are unable to change the status quo. What has been written above asserts that ideology is very dangerous, particularly when it is used by the State. Ideology can play a significant part in changing the individuals' social, economic, and political trends. This change is often negative, because ideology strips ordinary individuals from their identities. It does not allow people to develop their societies as it creates an imaginative barrier between man and his reality.
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An ideology is an organized collection of ideas. It can be thought of as a comprehensive vision, as a way of looking at things as in common sense and several philosophical approaches or a set of ideas proposed by the dominant class of a society to all members of this society. Many people seem to think alike in startling ways. Social scientists relate such instances of common opinion to the presence of an ideology. Every society has an ideology that forms the basis of the "public opinion" or common sense, a basis that usually remains invisible to most people within the society. This dominant ideology appears as "neutral", holding to assumptions that are largely unchallenged. Meanwhile, all other ideologies that differ from the dominant ideology are seen as radical, no matter what the content of their actual vision may be.

Ideology is not the same thing as philosophy. Philosophy is a way of living life, meanwhile ideology is an almost ideal way of life for society. Organisations that strive for power will try to influence the ideology of a society to become closer to what they want it to be. Political organisations and other institutions try to influence people by broadcasting their opinions. When most people in a society think alike about certain issues, or even forget that there are alternatives to the current state of affairs, we arrive at the concept of hegemony, about which the philosopher Antonio Gramsci wrote. To understand ideology, one should relate ideology to meta-ideology. Meta-ideology is the study of the structure, form, and manifestation of ideologies. Meta-ideology assumes that ideology is a coherent system of ideas, relying upon a few basic assumptions about reality that may or may not have any factual basis, but are subjective choices that serve as the seed around which further thought grows. According to this perspective, ideologies are neither right nor wrong, but only a relativistic intellectual strategy for categorizing the world.

Karl Marx proposed a base/superstructure model of society. The base refers to the means of production of society. The superstructure is formed on top of the base, and comprises that society's ideology, as well as its legal system, political system, and religions. For Marx, the base determines the superstructure. Because the ruling class controls the society's means of production, the superstructure of society, including its ideology, will be determined according to what is in the ruling class's best interests. Therefore, the ideology of a society is of
enormous importance since it confuses the alienated groups and can create 'false consciousness'. Critics of the Marxist approach feel that it gives too much importance to economic factors in influencing society. The ideologies of the dominant class of a society are proposed to all members of that society in order to make the ruling class' interests appear to be the interests of all. Critics have different approaches to ideology. For example, Lukács describes ideological process in society as a projection of the class consciousness of the ruling class, while Antonio Gramsci advances the theory of cultural hegemony to explain why people in the working-class can have a false conception of their own interests.

The Marxist view of ideology as an instrument of social reproduction has been an important touchstone for the sociology of knowledge and theorists, such as Karl Mannheim. However, Mannheim attempted to move beyond what he saw as the 'total' but 'special' Marxist conception of ideology to a 'general' and 'total' conception which acknowledged that all ideologies (including Marxism) resulted from social life. Althusser also invented the concept of 'Ideological State Apparatuses' to explain his theory of ideology. His first thesis was that "Ideology has no history": since the epistemological break is a continuous process, and not a determined event, science and philosophy must always struggle against ideology, which is, according to Marx, defined as the reproduction of the possibilities of production. His second thesis, "Ideas are material", explains his materialist attitude. In social studies, a political ideology is a certain ethical, set of ideals, principles, doctrines, myths or symbols of a social movement, institution, class, or large group that explains how society should work, and offers some political and cultural blueprint for a certain social order. A political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what ends it should be used. It can be a construction of political thought, often defining political parties and their policy. Studies of the concept of ideology itself (rather than specific ideologies) have been carried out under the name of systematic ideology.

The philosophy of science mostly concerns itself with reducing the impact of these prior ideologies, so that science can proceed with its primary task, which is to create knowledge. There are critics who view science as an ideology in itself, or an effective ideology, called scientism. Some scientists respond that while the scientific method is itself an ideology, as it is a collection of ideas, there is nothing particularly wrong or bad about it. Other critics point out that while science itself is not a misleading ideology, there are some fields of study within science that are misleading. Two examples discussed
here are in the fields of ecology and economics.

However, ideology tends to refer to the way in which people think about the world and their ideal concept of how to live in the world. This is slightly different from philosophy in the sense that ideology encompasses the concept that one’s ideals are the best way. Philosophy on the other hand may examine the way ideology affects others from a more distant perspective. Philosophy, however, may become ideology when a philosopher sets forth ideal concepts for the way people should live. Plato’s *Republic*, for instance, is his ideology of the best way to proceed in life. The term ideology may also be used to describe the shared beliefs of a group of people, such as a nation, a sect of a religion, or a group of theorists. The term was most likely coined first by the French philosopher, Count Destutt de Tracy, who used the term in the 1700s to describe the more specific definition of the science of ideas as opposed to metaphysics. Ideology can be used in a more specific sense to differentiate between different groups of thought. The ideological differences between conflicting factions of Islam are a subject of great debate. Understanding these competing ideologies allows one more insight into how to address cultures with which one has either hostile or peaceful contact. Thus, an examination of an ideology must account for variation. Other theorists--notably Terry Eagleton, Etienne Balibar and Pierre Macherey--have questioned the acceptance of aesthetic value as a proper concern of Marxist criticism. They acknowledge Althusser’s breakthrough in freeing Marxist criticism from the “reflectionist” problematic, but they reject Fredric Jameson’s assumption that literature has a universal function which is the source of aesthetic value. Macherey sees this notion as an unnecessary concession to bourgeois ideology. Aesthetic value is not universal; it cannot always be traced to a particular function of the text, even if that function is conceived within Marxist-oriented problematics, such as defamiliarizing ideology, or resolving social contradictions.

The issue of selfhood and otherness is also important, because it encompasses all the sides of society. In feministic terms, the male society dehumanizes woman and considers her as the other. This male ideology has created a big gap in thought between man and woman. It has also motivated women writers to write back against it. For example, in *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir argues that the relationship between man and woman is not like that between two electric poles, because man represents the positive and the negative at the same time, while woman, according to the society, represents the negative only. Man defines woman as something related to and dependent on him. He looks at her as a sexual being. Simone de
Beauvoir adds that man is the subject and the absolute, while woman is the other. In society, it is possible that a certain category dominates another; the majority usually imposes its rule on the minority. For de Beauvoir, although women do not represent the minority in society, they are persecuted and exploited by men. The case of women in a patriarchal society is similar to the case of proletariat in a capitalist society; despite the fact that women and the proletariat do not represent the minority, they are persecuted by others. Historically speaking, women have been subordinated to men, but women’s subordination is not related to historical events. It is related to religious, economic, social, and political reasons. Although man invented the religious ideology, woman proved throughout history to be a real protector of this invention. Woman is responsible for her dehumanization and marginalization in a male society: de Beauvoir blames women for their passivity and inability to rebel against patriarchal values. She adds that women have no past, no history or religion of their own. They need to organize themselves into a unit in order to change the social norms.

De Beauvoir pushes women to rebel not only against male rules, but also against men themselves. She wants women to think of edging men out. This fundamentalist way of thought creates a lot of controversy in the world of literature and criticism. Moreover, de Beauvoir’s notions are neither realistic nor applicable. Women are more influenced by ideology than men. In spite of their continuous attempts, women are still unable to change patriarchal values; they have always proved to be the real protectors of men’s invented laws. Man has created a moral system and forced women to stick to it. While in fact he has broken this system depending on women’s support. This fact proves that women are the victims of false male ideology. Not only are women the victims of ideology, but men are as well. In a capitalist society, male workers own nothing, but they still believe that they get their full wages. They are hypnotized by the capitalist ideology which distorts men’s look toward reality.

This research shows that ideology has a big influence on criticism and literary studies. Literary writing is the production of ideologies inherited from the old generation of writers. Even if the writer claims that his work is isolated from ideology, he cannot avoid the fact that he has used or adopted a certain type of ideology. In the Dark Ages, most writers wrote as if they were priests; in other words, all types of literary writing were about religion, Trinity and Jesus Christ. This fact indicates that all writers at the time were influenced by religious ideologies imposed on them by the Church. Politicians and clergymen have always worked to spread ideology among people, because this is the only way through which they can dominate the
people. The relationship between religion and politics is inseparable. Political leaders usually appeal to clergymen to help them dominate and spread their rules. In the past, religious men protected kings and queens by advocating that they were protected by God. Clergymen play a significant role in making people believe these false ideas. In the end, people show a lot of submissiveness to the king. Using the same hypothesis, Marxism expresses the ideology of the proletariat which fights back against the bourgeois ideology. If the bourgeois ideology is false, it is not because it is ideology in general, but because the bourgeois class situation is structurally limited. However, the bourgeois ideology dominates and contaminates the psychological consciousness of the proletariat.

Politicians can also dominate people's mind through educational, political, economic, and social institutions. The State, for Gramsci, follows two important methods to dominate people: the spontaneous and the coercive. The state, for example, drives people to demonstrations which support the state and if they don not do that, the state uses the strategy of force. The state also politicizes and ideologizes the courses at school. These courses may not always aim at offering education and culture to students, but may be directed to teach them how to accept the dictatorial laws the government wants to pass. This shows that ideologies could be dangerous, especially the political and literary ones. As a matter of fact, this research has shed light on the relationship between ideology and literature and showed how literature may become an ideological product. Some writers who criticize the ideology of a country or a Party are themselves ideologues. When we deal with Orwell, we can speak of the Orwellian ideology; Orwell himself is influenced by the political ideology. The purpose of his writing is to criticize the Russian Revolution, because his country was not on good terms with Stalin's regime at the time.

Literature then could be used as a tool by the state to distort individuals' look towards some social issues. For example, the bourgeois writers fight and write against the proletariat; the bourgeois writers' interests are connected with the bourgeois leaders' interests. In other words, the bourgeois writing is the production of the State. The State works hard to marginalize and eliminate the proletarian literature. Marxist theories and concepts have always been attacked by the political chauvinist writers; those writers claim that Marxism is part of the utopia. Orwell is one of the political writers who criticize Marxism in his novels. He claims that Marxist ideas are fantasy; they cannot be applied to reality. Orwellian ideology is the product of political ideology. He interfered with the political conflict during the second world war. He used literature as a weapon to fight against Communism and Marxism. He could not separate himself from this
political struggle trying to support his State. His writing is the product of the capitalist ideology which strongly rejects the proletarian ideas and literature.

Marx is one of the philosophers who outline a cultural theory. He believes that individuals’ social existence determines their consciousness. The Marxist theory of culture takes into consideration diversity and complexity in addition to continuity within change, without ignoring the fact that the economic structure and social relations play a significant role in forming culture. Williams, as a Marxist writer, contends in this concern: “Marx indeed at times regards ideology as a false consciousness: a system of continuities which change has in fact undermined.”

The Marxist theory of culture focuses on the formula of structure and superstructure. The economic element is a potential one in history and the religious, political, and philosophical theories formulate the course of historical struggles. Some writers claim that Marx with his theory of structure and superstructure diminishes the value. He did not diminish or deny the value, but he denied what had been commonly believed, that it is not the consciousness of individuals that determines their existence, but their existence determines their consciousness. Marxism gives a high value to culture, a fact to which Williams clearly refers in his *Culture and Society*: “It had to be shown that Marxists gave a high value to culture, although this proof that culture was important seemed, to other thinkers at least, unnecessary.”

Marxist literary theories assert the fact that texts are the product of a particular class, society and context; these texts are determined by material conditions rather than divine reasons. Marxists do not consider terms like aesthetic and literature as absolutes, but rather as historical concepts and materials. Marxism benefits from the Hegelian dialectic and yet, it criticizes the essence of this dialectic. Marx asserts the fact that his method is different from the Hegelian dialectic. Hegelians claim that ideology is the true consciousness. Marx criticizes the dogmatic meaning and utilization in the Hegelian dialectic. Louis Althusser, in “*On Marxism*”, argues that “This dogmatism does violence to reality in order to make it fit the dialectic schema at all costs.”

Hegel forces his dialectic to conform with reality. The only way which makes the Hegelian dialectic valid is not its reliance on the philosophical system, but its dependence on the scientific method. Althusser clarifies this point by contending that “The dialectic is validated only by its concrete [positif] utilisation, by its scientific fecundity. This scientific use is the sole criterion of the dialectic. It alone makes it possible to speak of the dialectic as method.” Marx’s theory is different from the Hegelian dialectic, because it conforms more to reality. In his *Lenin and Philosophy and Other essays*, Althusser examines Marx’s views about the working class; he states that workers find easiness in dealing with Marx’s book *Capital*. This is because the book uses scientific terms
related to reality and deals with the types of exploitation the workers suffer from in capitalist societies. The historians, sociologists, and psychologists do not understand *Capital*, because they are still submissive to the ruling ideology, the ideology which interferes with their ideas, writings and methods, as Althusser states in his *Lenin and Philosophy and Other essays*:

> Inversely, the specialists in history, political economy, sociology, psychology, etc., have had and still have such trouble ‘understanding’ *Capital* because they are subject to the ruling ideology (the ideology of the ruling class) which intervenes directly in their ‘scientific’ practice, falsifying their objects, their theories and their methods.⁵

They are not in a position which allows them to understand the nature of illusions they are in; they are blind to reality.

Althusser clarifies in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other essays* that Marx re-examines and re-studies history in a scientific, materialistic and dialectic way which enables individuals to understand the history of class struggle. Marx deals with a different type of science, a science which unveils the strategies of class exploitation, domination and oppression. This science, which shows the social classes the nature of exploitation, has always been fought against by the bourgeoisie and its allies:

> This science, which brings the social classes face to face with their truth, is unbearable for the bourgeoisie and its allies, who reject it and take refuge in their so-called 'social sciences': it is only acceptable to the proletariat, whom it 'represents' (Marx).⁶

This Marxist science represents a revolutionary weapon to the working class. Althusser contends that Lenin makes a crucial contribution to the dialectical materialism; he comes to the conclusion that Marx’s scientific theory does not produce a new philosophy, but a new practice of philosophy. Lenin considers that philosophy is not a science, but he associates philosophy with politics. He thinks that “Philosophy is a *practice* of political intervention carried out in a theoretical form.”⁷ Lenin and Marx reject the idealist conception of philosophy which denies the fact that philosophy expresses a class position.

The State, for Althusser, is an apparatus of repression and suppression. It allows the ruling classes, represented by the bourgeois and capitalist classes, to assert their domination over the ruled class represented by workers. The State apparatus includes all the repressive institutions represented by the police, the army, the courts and the prisons which work together to make the proletariat subject to the State’s unfair laws. The State is the axis of the political struggle between classes. Althusser distinguishes between the State power
and the State apparatus:

This first clarification obliges me to distinguish between State power (conservation of State power or seizure of State power), the objective of the political class struggle on the one hand, and the State apparatus on the other. He adds that it is necessary to add to this distinction between the State power and the State apparatus another reality which is 'the ideological State apparatuses'. These apparatuses should not be confused with the repressive State apparatuses which function by violence. Althusser defines the 'ideological State apparatuses' as "a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions." He states that these apparatuses include the Church, the School, the trade unions, the family, and all the cultural and educational institutions. The 'Repressive State Apparatus' belongs to the public domain, while the larger part of the Ideological State Apparatus belongs to the private domain; some parties, schools, newspapers and institutions are private. The State resorts to the ideological apparatus to dominate all types of institutions, the public and the private. Althusser clarifies this point by arguing that

As a conscious Marxist, Gramsci already forestalled this objection in one sentence. The distinction between the public and the private is a distinction internal to bourgeois law, and valid in the (subordinate) domains in which bourgeois law exercises its 'authority'.

So, private institutions can work as Ideological State Apparatuses. The only difference between The ‘Repressive State Apparatus’ and the Ideological State Apparatus is that the latter functions by ideology, while the former works by violence. The Repressive State Apparatus depends massively on repressing the ruled and using violence against them while taking the ideological way as a second priority. All ideological State apparatuses work to reproduce the relations of production in order to give the capitalists the chance to assert their domination over the proletariat. The political apparatus works to make individuals subject to the political and democratic ideology. Media also politicizes and ideologizes the daily events by theorizing false ideas about nationalism, liberalism, and morality; this apparatus is represented by the press, the radio and television. The same thing is applied to the cultural apparatus which fights the rebellious ideas and imposes on writers and intellectuals some false ideas about how good writing should be. Althusser shows how the different State apparatuses function together to impose the state ideology on people; he argues that the religious apparatus functions
by recalling in sermons and the other great ceremonies of Birth, Marriage and Death, that man is only ashes, unless he loves his neighbour to the extent of turning the other cheek to whoever strikes first.\textsuperscript{11}

One of the most dangerous types of ideological apparatuses is the School. The school teaches the children a specific type of culture and education. Children study a false history which is usually written by politicians themselves or under their censorship. Children also study a lot of false nationalist ideas, regardless of religious sciences which teach them how to work hard and accept the laws. The purpose of the School apparatus is to produce people who are submissive to the State. Althusser criticizes the School, the Church and the Army which are used as tools by politicians and political leaders:

Of course, many of these contrasting Virtues (modesty, resignation, submissiveness on the one hand, cynicism, contempt, arrogance, confidence, self-importance, even smooth talk and cunning on the other) are also taught in the Family, in the Church, in the Army, in Good Books, in films and even in the football stadium.\textsuperscript{12}

Althusser re-conceptualizes ideology and considers that the expression of ideology was created by Cabanis and Destutt de Tracy. Marx has used the expression of ideology later and given it a different meaning. Althusser argues that “Here, ideology is the system of the ideas and representations which dominate the mind of a man or a social group.”\textsuperscript{13} Marx has given ideology a new meaning by associating it with politics, economics, and culture in general. Ideology, in general, regardless of its forms, expresses class positions and class struggles. In terms of class, ideology has a history, because the theory of ideology depends on the history of social formulations, on the modes of production associated with social formulations and on class struggle. Althusser asserts that ideology forms a barrier between man and his reality. Ideology, in all its forms: political, ethnic, religious, and social, creates a distance between man and his real conditions. In other words, men misconceive and misinterpret reality. Although ideology imposes on them a lot of illusions, they still believe that they are virtually connected with their reality. The political and religious ideologies are the most influential ones, because individuals consider them more realistic and more true. For example, in totalitarian societies, the king was considered responsible for his people. It was thought that he had a secret relationship with God. The clergymen cooperate with the kings to falsify reality. Althusser asserts this point by stating that

There is therefore a cause for the imaginary transposition of the real conditions of existence: that cause is the existence of a small number of cynical men who base their domination and exploitation of the 'people' on a
falsified representation of the world which they have imagined in order to enslave other minds by dominating their imaginations. 

Every work of art has aesthetic and ideological elements, that make it have a strong relationship with ideology; it becomes an integral part of the ideological and political system. The artist uses aesthetic elements to hypnotize readers and motivate them to accept a particular ideology. He injects his text with a lot of aesthetic and ideological aspects which the reader fails to resist. As such, the reader falls a victim to the aesthetic language and the ideological text. The reader’s passive imagination is usually confronted by the artist's active imagination, creating a gap between the reader’s and the artist’s mentalities, and making the artist as the god of the text and the reader as the worshipper of the text.

Raymond Williams uses a very modern way to define art. He separates art from the dominant bourgeois norms. He argues that "Art' is a kind of production which has to be seen as separate from the dominant bourgeois productive norm: the making of commodities." Not every literary text can be regarded as a work of art. Bourgeois literature, for example, distorts the forms of art, and the bourgeois writer falsifies facts by inserting aesthetic elements into his text, reducing it to a pseudo-form of art. Here, it is possible to speak of the relationship between aesthetics and ethics. What is aesthetic cannot be considered ethical and vice versa. Some literary texts have a lot of aesthetic elements inside, but ethically, they are questionable. Some forms of art are used to describe and praise the king's good works, showing a lot of aesthetic features, though they hide a lot of facts at the same time. This type of art can be considered as one-sided art, because it deals with one side of thought, and is used for ideological purposes only. Therefore, not all that has been written can be regarded as art: the pure and true form of art is the one which is free from all ideological, theological, political, and moral restrictions.

Lenin, in *What Is to be Done*, examines the beginning of Marxism in Russia and how the working class was influenced by Marxism; it is all clear in its struggle against the political situation. The reasons behind the belief in Marxism is the bad economic and political situation in the country; where the country was ruled by an autocracy, the press and the protests were suppressed and persecuted. These virtual reasons paved the way for Marxism to interfere with literature, culture, and with all domains of society:

In a country ruled by an autocracy, with a completely enslaved press, in a period of desperate political reaction in which even the tiniest outgrowth of political discontent and protest is persecuted, the theory of revolutionary Marxism suddenly forces its way into the *censored* literature and, though expounded in Aesopian language, is understood by all the "interested".
Lenin insists that workers need to have political knowledge and political training. They should work to develop their political consciousness. The economic struggle motivates workers to understand the State’s attitude towards them. Marxism focuses its attention on the need to create a theory of political practice whose development became more related to class struggles and party organizations. In this context, the political ideas of classes in conflict acquired new importance and needed to be theoretically accounted for. In a situation of class confrontation, ideology appears connected with the interests of the ruled class. In other words, the analysis of the ruling class ideology is carried out from a different class position and from a different ideological perspective. For Lenin, ideology becomes the political consciousness connected with the interests of the various classes. He particularly focuses on the juxtaposition between bourgeois and socialist ideology. He also considers that the ideological subordination of the proletariat is the result of the bourgeoisie possession of an older ideology and its having more powerful means of disseminating ideas. In this case, ideology is no longer a necessary distortion which conceals contradictions, but rather becomes a neutral concept referring to the political consciousness of classes, including the proletarian class.

Lenin’s approach to ideology influences Gramsci, who clearly rejects a negative conception. He examines the original meaning of ideology and considers it a critique of the origin of ideas. Gramsci’s idea of the negative conception does not correspond with that of Marx: “The bad sense of the word has become widespread, with the effect that the theoretical analysis of the concept of ideology has been modified and denatured.” He distinguishes between ‘arbitrary or rationalistic ideologies’ and ‘organic ideologies’, and focuses on the latter. Historically, ideologies have a psychological validity: “they “organize” human masses, and create the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle, etc.” They are arbitrary in the sense that they create individual movements only. Ideology in this sense is “a conception of the world that is implicitly manifest in art, in law, in economic activity and in all manifestations of individual and collective life.” It is more than a system of ideas; it has to do with a capacity to inspire concrete attitudes and provide orientations for action. It is socially pervasive in the sense that men cannot act without rules of conduct, without orientations. It is in and by ideology that a dominant class can exercise hegemony over other classes.

In *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx traces the relationship between the Hegelian dialectic and Modern criticism. He argues that some Hegelian critics are unable to see the relationship between Hegelian philosophy and modern criticism, because they are
still within the confines of the Hegelian logic. Feuerbach is the only one who has a critical approach and attitude towards the Hegelian dialectic. According to Feuerbach, philosophy is a form of religion. His argument is weak because philosophy is not restricted to one form of knowledge. Philosophy surpasses all moral and religious confines; it questions the concept of God, heaven and universe. It deals with existence in an objective, logical, and rational way. Hegel argues that the phenomenological, ethical, artistic, and religious mind can be regarded as valid only after it affirms itself as an absolute knowledge, while wealth and power become

as entities estranged from the human being, this only happens in their form as thoughts ... They are thought-entities, and therefore merely an estrangement of pure, i.e., abstract, philosophical thinking.\(^\text{20}\)

He adds that sense and religion are just spiritual entities and the true form of mind is the religious thinking and speculative one. Economically, Hegel sees labour as the true essence of man. He focuses on the positive side of labour and neglects the negative one. The only labour he knows is the mental and abstract one. He regards objectivity as "an estranged human relationship which does not correspond to the essence of man, to self-consciousness."\(^\text{21}\) He looks at man as non-objective and as a spiritual creature. What is mentioned above proves that ideologies play a significant part in shaping man’s way of thinking; this shaping is not limited to one side of society, but it goes further to involve the political, social, economic, and intellectual sides of society. Politically speaking, ideology and politics are inseparable. Political ideology falsifies facts and imposes on individuals one-sided way of thinking; all they know is that they should work to lead their country towards prosperity.

According to Marx, man’s ideas and consciousness are associated with the conditions of his material existence; as they change according to this existence. Marxist analysis of mode of production depends on two basic elements: the economic base and the ideological superstructure. The economic base consists of a series of forces used in production, including labour power, raw materials and the technology used to process them, forces that give rise to specific relations of production and lead to different sets of relations. The relations between people might take the form of slave-master at different times and particular stages of development of productive forces. These relations embody relations of classes and of people with other classes; historical stages are characterized by a different class structure, as Roberts and Sutch assert in their An Introduction to Political Thought:
This structure consists at each stage of two main classes in conflict as oppressor and oppressed, masters and slaves, lords and serfs or the bourgeoisie and proletariat.\textsuperscript{22}

The economic base is constituted by the forces and relations of production, paving the way for an inseparable relation between the material base and the superstructure. According to Roberts and Sutch,

This materialist base is the foundation for the superstructure, the institutions of law, morality, politics and religion as well as the ideas that make up the common sense of the age.\textsuperscript{23}

The level of development of the economic base determines the form that these institutions take. Liberal politics with all its attitudes which are based on religious morality is a natural outcome of capitalism, that consists of two basic economic classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The labourer is forced to sell his labour to the bourgeoisie who, in turn, buys it at the minimum value. Thus, the relationship between the bourgeoisie and the proletarian is based on oppression. In the bourgeoisie society, the workers have the advantage of numbers, while the bourgeoisie have the advantage of resources. The bourgeoisie benefit from this advantage and extend their interests at the expense of the working class:

The class that is dominant in economic relations, since the institutional and ideological superstructure is shaped by the economic base, becomes dominant also in that superstructure.\textsuperscript{24}

The bourgeoisie raise a lot of ideas about freedom and culture in order to deceive the working class and to keep control on it. The state plays a significant role in helping the bourgeois class keep dominating the workers, reducing itself to a tool for protecting the interests of the bourgeoisie. Roberts and Sutch find Marx’s view towards the state and its function convincing:

Rather than fulfilling the function of a guardian of the rights of the people, or of an expression of mutual freedom or of a common power enabling each to live without fear, the state is a tool for oppression and for the protection of the interests of one class at the expense of another.\textsuperscript{25}

Some countries still hold the policy of protecting the interests of one class and oppressing another. The protected class is usually the capitalist one, while the oppressed class is the working one. In Marxist terms, the state supports one class and neglects another. The state paves the way to capitalism to rise. It oppresses the working class and helps the capitalist system develop. In this way, the state creates a
new conflict, which is the class conflict, and a new form of ‘alienation’. Marx deals with the concept of ‘alienation’ when he explains the nature of capitalism. He considers that the relation between the worker and the product is based on alienation. This idea is clarified in Roberts’ and Sutch’s argument: “More importantly, the product escapes her control; in fact the product controls the worker.”

Destutt de Tracy and his fellow idéologues invented a system of national education that they believed would transform France into a rational and scientific society. Their teaching combined a fervent belief in individual liberty with an elaborate program of state planning, and for a short time it became the official doctrine of the French Republic. Napoleon at first supported Destutt de Tracy and his friends, but he soon turned against them and he even went so far as to attribute France’s military defeats to the influence of the idéologues, of whom he spoke with scorn. Some historians of philosophy have called the 19th century the age of ideology, not because the word itself was then so widely used, but because so much of the thought of the time can be distinguished from that prevailing in the previous centuries by features that would now be called ideological. Even so, there is a limit to the extent to which one can speak today of an agreed use of the word. The subject of ideology is a controversial one, and it is arguable that at least some part of this controversy derives from disagreement as to the definition of the word ideology. One can, however, discern both a strict and a loose way of using it. In the loose sense of the word, ideology may mean any kind of action-oriented theory or any attempt to approach politics in the light of a system of ideas. Ideology in the stricter sense stays fairly close to Destutt de Tracy’s original conception and may be identified by many characteristics. It contains an explanatory theory of a more or less comprehensive kind about human experience and the external world; it sets out a program, in generalized and abstract terms, of social and political organization; it conceives the realization of this program as entailing a struggle; it seeks not merely to persuade but to recruit loyal adherents, demanding what is sometimes called commitment. Ideology can also address a wide public but may tend to confer some special role of leadership on intellectuals.

Ideologies, in fact, are sometimes spoken of as if they belonged to the same logical category as religions. Both are assuredly in a certain sense “total” systems, concerned at the same time with questions of truth and questions of conduct; but the differences between ideologies and religions are perhaps more important than the similarities. A religious theory of reality is constructed in terms of a divine order and is seldom, like that of the ideologist, centred on this world alone. A religion may present a vision of a just society, but it cannot easily have a practical political program. The emphasis of
religion is on faith and worship, and its appeal is to inwardness; but, its aim is the redemption or purification of the human spirit. An ideology speaks to the group, the nation, or the class. Some religions acknowledge their debt to revelation, whereas ideology always believes, however mistakenly, that it lives by reason alone. Both, in fact, demand commitment, but it may be doubted whether commitment has ever been a marked feature of those religions into which a believer is inducted in infancy. The Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli is a precursor of modern ideologists. Historians who speak of him only as an immoralist overlook the extent to which Machiavelli was a man with an ideal - a republican ideal. Rousseau recognized this when he spoke of The Prince as a “handbook for republicans.” Machiavelli’s dream was to see revived in modern Italy a republic as glorious as that of ancient Rome, and he suggested that it could be achieved only by means of a revolution that had the strength of will to liquidate its enemies. Machiavelli was the first to link ideology with terror, but he was too much of a political scientist to enact the role of the ideologue.

Seventeenth-century England occupies an important place in the history of ideology. Although there were then no fully fledged ideologies in the strict sense of the term, political theory, like politics itself, began to acquire certain ideological characteristics. The swift movement of revolutionary forces throughout the 17th century created a demand for theories to explain and justify the radical action that was often taken. This growth of abstract theory in the 17th century, and the increasing tendency to construct systems and discuss politics in terms of principles, mark the emergence of the ideological style. In political conversation, generally it was accompanied by a growing use of concepts such as right and liberty - ideals in terms of which actual policies were judged. The use of the word ideology in the pejorative sense of false consciousness is found not only in the writings of Marx himself, but in those of other exponents of what has come to be known as the sociology of knowledge, including the German sociologists Max Weber and Karl Mannheim. Few such writers are wholly consistent in their use of the term, but what is characteristic of their approach is their method of regarding idea systems as the outcome or expression of certain interests. In calling such idea systems ideologies, they are treating them as things whose true nature is concealed; they consider the task of sociological research to be the unveiling of what Mannheim called the “life conditions which produce ideologies.”

From this perspective, the economic science of Adam Smith, for example, is not to be understood as an independent intellectual construction or to be judged in terms of its truth, consistency, or
clarity; rather, it is to be seen as the expression of bourgeois interests, as part of the ideology of capitalism. The sociology of knowledge in its more recent formulations has sought support in Freudian psychology (notably in borrowing from Freud the concepts of the unconscious and of rationalization), in order to suggest that ideologies are the unconscious rationalizations of class interests. This refinement has enabled sociologists of knowledge to rid their theory of the disagreeable and unscientific element of bald accusation; they no longer have to brand Adam Smith as a deliberate champion of the bourgeois ethos, but can see him now as simply the unconscious spokesman of capitalism. At the same time, these sociologists of knowledge have argued that Freudian psychology is itself no less a form of ideology than is Adam Smith's economics, for Freud's method of psychoanalysis is essentially a technique for adjusting rebellious minds to the demands and constraints of the bourgeois society.

Critics of the sociology of knowledge have argued that if all philosophy is ideology, then the sociology of knowledge must itself be an ideology like any other idea system and equally devoid of independent validity; that if all seeming truth is veiled rationalization of interest, then the sociology of knowledge cannot be true. It has been suggested that, although Weber and Mannheim inspired most of the work that has been done by sociologists of knowledge, their own writings may be exempted from this criticism, on the ground that neither of them put forward a consistent or unambiguous theory of ideology. Both used the word ideology in different ways at different times. Weber was in part concerned to reverse Marx's theory that all idea systems are products of economic structures, by demonstrating conversely that some economic structures are the product of idea systems; Protestantism, for example, generated capitalism and not capitalism produced Protestantism. Mannheim, on the other hand, tried to restore in a more elaborate form Marx's suggestion that ideologies are the product of social structure. But Mannheim's analysis may have been obscured by his proposal that the word ideology should be reserved for idea systems that are more or less conservative, and the word utopia for idea systems of a more revolutionary nature. Mannheim did not, however, remain faithful to this stipulative definition, even in his book entitled *Ideology and Utopia*. On the other hand, Mannheim was well aware of the implication of the doctrine that all idea systems have a class basis and a class bias. As a way out of the dilemma, he envisaged the possibility of a classless class of intellectuals capable of thinking independently by virtue of its independence from any class interest or affiliation. Such a detached group might hope to acquire knowledge that was not ideology. This vision of a small elite of superior minds rising above the myths of
ordinary society seemed to some readers to put Mannheim closer to Plato than to Marx and to cast new doubts on the claim of the sociology of knowledge to be a science.

If some theorists emphasize the kinship between ideology and various forms of religious enthusiasm, others stress the connection between ideology and what they call rationalism, or the attempt to understand politics in terms of abstract ideas rather than of lived experience. Some theorists are suspicious of those who think they know about politics because they have read many books; they believe that politics can be learned only by an apprenticeship to politics itself. Such people, as Locke, are not unsympathetic to political theories, but they argue that their value resides in the facts that are derived from experience. Michael Oakeshott in England has described Locke's theory of political liberty as an “abridgment” of the Englishman's traditional understanding of liberty, and has suggested that once such a conception is uprooted from the tradition that has given it meaning, it becomes a rationalistic doctrine or metaphysical abstraction. Whereas Oakeshott has seen ideology as a form of rationalism, Edward Shils, a U.S. political scientist, has seen it more as a product of, among other things, romanticism with an extremist character. His argument is that romanticism has fed into and swollen the seas of ideological politics by its cult of the ideal and by its scorn for the actual, especially its scorn for what is mediated by calculation and compromise. Since civil politics demands both compromise and contrivance and calls for a prudent self-restraint and responsible caution, he suggests that civil politics is bound to be repugnant to romanticism. Hence Shils concludes that the romantic spirit is naturally driven toward ideological politics.

In the light of what has been mentioned above, it can be concluded that ideology still has the quality of fluctuation; the more you define it, the more complex it gets. This conflict between Hegelian conceptualizations and Marxist re-conceptualizations of ideology shows that ideology is not limited to one concept or definition, it goes further to involve other cultural fields. In other words, we cannot simply say that ideology is a set of ideas adopted by a group of people, because it is necessary to diagnose the nature and the reality of these ideas, then we can know the nature of that ideology. The best way to understand this concept is by applying it to politics, economics, culture, society and literature. Ideology can be found in every literary text. Writers, critics, politicians, and historians are responsible for the radical changes in society. Their perceptions depend on the kind of ideology they use in their texts or speeches. For this reason, ideology will continue to dominate society and its members, as long as it remains as part and parcel of the general structure of the social,
political, educational and cultural systems of society. This is because of the fact that ideology is inseparable from those factors that go into the making of the consciousness of people in a particular society; in other words, there is no ideology without ideologists who theorize about the nature and general build up of ideology. Whether this ideology is the result of false consciousness, as Hegel understands it, or the instrument of social reproduction, as Marx argues, the best way to understand the concept of ideology is to apply it to politics, economics, culture, society and literature to see all its various aspects.
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