Structure and Culture: A Critique of Stuart Hall[*]

Introduction

In what is, perhaps, already a classic account of recent developments and problems in 'cultural studies,' Stuart Hall articulated two 'paradigms,' a 'culturalist' strand deriving from the work of Raymond Williams and E.P Thompson and a 'structuralist' strand which owed first to Levi-Strauss and de Saussure and then to the work of Althusser.[1] The present essay considers the problems which Hall raises from the perspective of a self-conscious Deweyan naturalism.

Two Paradigms

Hall sees differences between Thompson and Williams, but for him, they share 'an experiential pull.'[2] As Hall writes: 'The experiential pull in this paradigm, and the emphasis on the creative and on historical agency, constitute the two elements in the humanism of the[ir] position[s]' (p. 26). Both writers reject 'literal readings' of the 'classical Marxist 'base/superstructure' metaphor, both reject 'vulgar materialism' and 'economic determinism.' For Williams, '[culture] is threaded through all social practices, and is the sum of their inter-relationship.' Thompson operates with 'a more "classical" distinction than Williams, between "social being' and "social consciousness (the term he infinitely prefers, from Marx, to the more fashionable "base and superstructure")' (p. 24). For Hall, (now quoting Thompson), 'the dialectical intercourse between social being and social consciousness--or between "culture" and "not culture"--is at the heart of any comprehension of the historical process within the Marxist tradition...'(p. 25).

And Hall finds a shared difficulty:

> Williams so totally absorbs 'definitions of experience' into our 'ways of living', and both into an indissoluble real material practice-in-general, as to obviate any distinction between 'culture'and 'not culture.'Thompson sometimes uses 'experience' in the more usual sense of consciousness, as the collective ways in which [people] 'handle', transmit or 'distort' their given conditions...; sometimes as the domain of the 'lived', the mid-term between 'conditions' and 'culture' ; and sometimes as the objective conditions themselves--against which particular modes of consciousness are counterposed. But, whatever the terms, both positions tend to read structures of relations in terms of how they are 'lived' or 'experienced'(p. 26).

It is thus that 'experience' is 'authenticating' and that 'in "experience", all the different practices intersect'(ibid.).

'Experience' and the role it plays is, thus, for Hall, the sharpest point of contrast between culturalist and structuralists. While for culturalists, experience was 'the ground--the terrain of "the lived"', structuralists insisted that experience 'could not, by definition, be the ground of anything, since one could only "live" and experience one's conditions in and through the categories, classifications and frameworks of the culture' (p. 29). But these categories were 'unconscious.' Thus Althusser: '...it is within this ideological unconsciousness that men succeed in altering the "lived" relation between them and the world and acquiring that new form of specific unconsciousness called 'consciousness' (quoted by Hall, p. 29). In this sense, then, '"experience" was conceived, not as an authenticating source but as an effect: not as reflection of the real but as an "imaginary relation"' (p. 29).

Hall finds, first, that the strengths and weaknesses of both positions derive from the weakness and strengths of the other, that, second, 'they have a centrality in the field which all the other contenders lack,'[3] but that, finally, neither will do 'as self-sufficient programs of study.' He offers that we need to 'think forwards from the best elements in the structuralist and culturalist enterprises, by way of some of the

---

[*] Presented at Conference on the Human Sciences, Oxford, England, August, 1992.

concepts elaborated in Gramsci's work' (p. 36).

Thinking Forward

I want also to 'think forwards' from these paradigms, but I take a different tack. We need to begin, I think, by cleaning up some confusions carried forward by Hall's sympathetic characterization of the two paradigms.

First, there is a critical distinction between 'culture' and 'not culture', but it is not, as Hall says, the distinction between 'social consciousness' and 'social being.' While 'social being' and 'social consciousness' also need to be distinguished, both are culturally constituted. 'Not culture' is unrepresented nature, the nature which exists independently of our representations, of which, as organic beings, we are part, and with which we transact--including here epistemologically. We can have no knowledge of nature which is not culturally constrained but at the same time our participation in nature is causally critical in everything we do, including our knowledge-practices. No naturalism could afford to ignore this.

Thus, knowledge, like poverty, is a social product. That is, while it is surely true that 'experience' requires a massive system of meaning which has been historically, regionally and locally bequeathed, it also requires biologically evolved capacities to learn, and it requires our location in a mind-independent natural world. Social contructionists rightly reject the naive realism of standard empiricisms, but fail to notice that by denying a natural basis for belief and knowledge, they become incoherent. For example, 'red apples' may not exist in the mind-independent world, but if our shared biology and environment is irrelevant to fixing belief, how does one escape not merely epistemological nihilism, but solipsism? To be sure, this natural basis does not secure foundations for knowledge and, thus, it leaves room for alternative practices for fixing belief in the community which, each, become subject to criticism, immanent and practical.[4]

Or, alternatively, if the independently external world is not the basis of culture, how, short of some transcendental (usually platonist) solution does one explain language and communication?
Indeed, a naturalistic theory of culture must presuppose a naturalist theory of language (and meaning) which is neither supra-natural nor 'reducible' to 'material' events and processes.

There is, as far as we can see, only one such effort and it is found in the naturalism of Dewey and Mead. As Dewey summarized it: 'meanings are objective because they are modes of natural interaction'.[5] That is, 'meaning' is not 'in the head' and language is neither a system of signs (Saussure) nor a system of representations (semantic theories). Rooted in the animal capacity to modify responses in the light of acts of another ('the conversation of gestures'), for the human animal, vocal gestures become 'signs' when they are linked to regularities in conjoint action. It is thus that language is 'the tool of tools', 'intrinsically relational, anticipatory, predictive' (p. 146). As Dewey wrote:

> Spears, urns, baskets, snares may have originated accidentally in some consummatory consequence of natural events. But only repetition through concerted action accounts for their becoming institutionalized as tools, and this concert of action depends upon memoranda and communication (p. 147).

Similarly, a naturalistic theory of culture needs to take seriously Marx's observation that 'the first fact to be established is the physical organization of...individuals and their consequent relation to the rest of nature,' including what, in the German Ideology, Marx put aside, viz., 'the actual physical nature of [humans], and 'the natural conditions' in which we live, 'geological, orohydographical, climatic and so on.' As regards the former, there is, to take but one example, the devastatingly obvious fact that patriarchy has been sustained by exploiting some elementary biological facts about human reproduction. As regards the latter, there is the stunning propensity to provide ideological 'explanations' for practices which are straightforward responses to geographical facts. For example, native Americans, displaced into the Plains from east of the Mississippi, were unable to subsist as farmers and became bison hunters. A consequence was substantial changes in their culture, including their socio-political organization.

Attention to the natural basis of culture hints also at problems in the term 'experience' as the focus

of the differences in the two paradigms. There is the temptation, too frequently not resisted, to think of experience as something 'subjective,' disconnected from nature, and fundamentally cognitive. Thus, it is 'authenticating' because it is 'the domain of the ''lived'; or alternatively, it is a veil, keeping us from 'reality,' an 'imaginary relation.'

But first, as Dewey insisted, experience, properly understood, 'includes what [people] do and suffer, what they strive for, love, belief and endure, and how [they] act and are acted upon' (p. 18).[6] On this distinctly praxical view of 'experience,' subjectivity, and consciousness are not alternative terms for some unitary phenomenon but are, as Dewey say, 'eventual functions that emerge with complexly organized interactions, organic and social' (p. 162). 'Inner experience' presupposes the publically accessible experience of things, objects, events; consciousness is awareness of objects, of meanings actually perceived, and the non-conscious (or in Dewey, 'subconscious') extends well beyond mind to include all 'the immense multitude of immediate organic selections, rejections, welcomings, explusions, appropriations, withdrawals, shrinkings, expansions...' Suggestive of language used by Williams, these exist as 'feeling qualities, and have an enormous directive effect on our behavior' (p. 227).[7] Although the possibility is not ruled out, Dewey's 'subconsious' is not identical with a Freudian unconscious, a hidden realm of belief and purpose of the same structure as the realm of the conscious. And for this reason, it becomes available, not only or merely dialogically, but by attention to practice. Humans can be more or less reflective, more or less 'unthinking.' Indeed,

> The subconscious of a civilized adult reflects all the habits he has acquired...And in so far as these involve mal-coordinations, fixations and segregations (as they assuredly come to do in a very short time for those living in complex 'artificial' conditions), sensory appreciation is confused, perverted and falsified (p. 228).

It needs to be said that while this view seems to imply a critique of 'consciousness' more radical than that usually associated with emancipatory theory, it also suggests that emancipation is not a vicious circle, but a spiral: from reflection to modification of habit and practice to further reflection.

We can turn to the distinction between 'social consciousness' and 'social being.' If the foregoing is sound (or nearly so), 'social consciousness' is either a redundancy (perhaps worth making) or a misleading expression for those aspects of culture of which people are aware. It is a redundancy because consciousness is necessarily awareness of what is 'social'-- shared, common, conjoint. In this sense, then, it refers to the dominating or hegemonic culture of a group or nation, to their fundamental frames of reference and belief systems. It is misleading because it suggests a politically available awareness, an awareness, perhaps, of our interdependencies and the sources of shared problems, what Dewey called 'the public'. This, not incidentally, is the basis of what Marxists call 'class consciousness'. But as Dewey and Marxists saw, it is just this sort of consciousness which is generally lacking in mass society.

The point of the distinction between 'social consciousness' and 'social being' is, however, clear enough. We need to distinguish what people are aware of from their conditions, conditions of which they are not necessarily or even usually aware (conscious). This distinction, available to both paradigms though misleadingly, if not wrongly, articulated, is the key to the idea that social science is not neutral and can be emancipatory. But 'social being' is not 'not culture' (even if it includes, necessarily, what is 'not culture.' The problem to be faced by cultural studies is not whether critical conditions of social being are cultural (unless, as below, culture is used in some special, restricted sense), but how they are to be theorized and how they relate to individuals and individual activity.

Rejecting Dualism

In the present view, both paradigms (as formulated by Hall) tempt a ontological tension between a dualism of 'consciousness' and 'conditions'-- or more generally (and classically), between 'idealism' and 'materialism. Since this tension is precarious, one side of it tends to collapse into the other. For 'culturalists,' since the 'intersection of consciousness and conditions' is 'experience,' it becomes the 'ground'; but divorced

from nature, 'conditions' then tend to evaporate. For 'structuralists,' since 'men and women are placed and positioned in relations which constitute them as agents,' and their 'subjectivity' is but a surface reflection of deep structures, agents become merely 'bearers' of structures.[8] But how to avoid these collapses?

To begin, we can consider Hall's remark that the structuralists 'remind us that, unless the dialectic really can be held...between both halves of the proposition--that "men make history...on the basis of conditions which are not of their making"--the result will inevitably be a naive humanism, with its necessary consequence: a voluntarist and populist political practice' (p. 30).

One problem is Hall's (not uncharacteristic) use of 'dialectic' in this context.[9] Although they are frequently confounded, there are two characteristic formulations. In the first there are 'structures' and there are 'individuals' standing in a relation of reciprocal efficient causality. Thus, existing structures cause people to be what they are; but through their intentional acts, an unintended effect is the reproduction of transformation of structure--history.[10] With less attention to change (and without the term 'dialectic), this is also the basic posture of Parsonian inspired mainstream sociology. Causality is the right category here, but it cannot relate 'structures' and 'individuals' because structure does not exist independently of activity. Social structures, unlike (say) a magnetic field, cannot make anything happen.

The other formulation was explicitly offered by Peter Berger and his associates. For this view, 'social structure is not characterizable as a thing able to stand on its own, apart from the human activity that produced it' but, on the other hand, once created, social structure 'is encountered by the individual [both] as an alien facticity [and]...as a coercive instrumentality.'[11] This view explicitly draws on the Hegelian (and Marxist) idea that society is 'objectivation' or 'externalization' of human 'subjectivity' and may or may not be alienated. A great deal of critical literature has been devoted to issues of reification and alienation in this context, but surprisingly little attention to the assumption that individuals and society are 'two moments of the same process.'

This formulation tries to avoid the dualistic mechanical causal language of the previous conception. But it suffers from a symmetrical difficulty, viz., the process is not dialectical, but causal.

The solution, proposed by Bhaskar and, in closely parallel terms, by Giddens, has it that (in my formulation), social structure pre-exists for individuals, but is incarnate in human activity. In Bhaskars formulation, as regards every activity, there is a material as well as efficient cause. The material cause is the ensemble of <u>given</u> objects with which people work--the legacy of previous work by people. In addition to material objects, these 'objects' include sentences and ideas, naturalistically understood, and socially available, but not necessarily discursively available, norms and rules. But included, as well, are the places or positions of persons in existing social relations. These are defined by their concrete interactions, but as with norms and rules, they are not necessarily part of their awareness. Taken together, these 'objects' constitute 'culture', or 'forms of life.'[12] The efficient cause is the agency of persons. Indeed, aside from natural events, hurricanes and the like, everything that happens in society is produced by persons.[13] But this strong emphasis on agency does not issue in a voluntaristic idealism because, in contrast to the 'dialectical' view, structures are never 'created'. As incarnate in activity, they are always reproduced and transformed.

Similarly, 'socialization' (internalization) or the idea that structures constitute 'subjects' is mistaken. And this for two reasons. First, as before, it is individuals who rear (teach, indoctrinate, etc.) individuals <u>with</u> rules, norms, resources. Second, the individuals reared are not passive materials but themselves active agents using rules, norms, resources, which are available to them. As Bhaskar argued, the 'dialectical' view encourages not only a 'voluntaristic idealism with respect to our understanding of social structure', but 'a mechanistic determinism with respect to our understanding of people,' a problem widespread in both in mainstream sociology and much Marxism.

<u>Some Criticisms</u>

A number of criticisms have been raised against this line of 'solution.' One is connected to the idea, noted earlier, that 'social being' is 'not culture.' The motivation for saying this seems to stem from the

assumption that elements of culture, typically, norms and rules, are not 'objective, material circumstances external to participating agents.'[14] Presumably, 'culture' is 'in the head,' not 'external.' For example, Porpora, whose criticism is directed mainly at Giddens, holds that 'we are talking about the difference between a concept of social structure as an objective reality and a concept of structure as an intersubjective reality' (p. 202). Similarly, Layder holds that 'since Bhaskar conflates a potentially objectivist notion of social relation with the orthodox empiricist conception of social relationship, his ability to address questions about the structural distribution of conditions of action is thwarted...' (Layder, p. 122). Layder identifies the critical ontological premise: 'It would be better,' he writes, 'to say that structures are concept and activity connected (rather than dependent)' (p. 128). Indeed, he also sees what is implicit in other 'objectivist' criticisms of Bhaskar and Giddens. His formulation, he writes, 'attempts to theorize the links between objective constraints and subjective experience...' (p. 160).[15]

It is not difficult to see how the confusions discussed above lead to this explicit dualism. Thus, 'experience' collapses into 'subjective' or 'consciousness', 'activity and concept dependent' collapses into 'dependent upon the actor's consciousness'; 'intersubjective' collapses into 'relation of two subjectivies', and 'social relation' collapses into rules, which to be rules, need at least to be tacitly acknowledged by 'subjects'. That is, once one accepts the essentially Cartesian framework for experience, one must choose between either an idealism or an ontological dualism. Bhaskar's reading of Marx and my reading of Dewey (above) deny the Cartesian premise.

This is not to say that there are not differences in the very similar approaches to social structure of Bhaskar and Giddens. But these regard as much interest as formulation. Bhaskar hopes to give 'a firmer ontological grounding and to place more emphasis on the pre-existence of social forms' than does Giddens. For Bhaskar, rightly, 'structuration' might be less misleadingly termed 'restructuration'.[16] But apart from formulation, it is hardly clear that he can provide a firmer grounding--consistent with his acknowledgement that structure is activity and concept dependent. On the other hand, why is a firmer ground needed?

Indeed, from the vantage of 'poststructuralist' perspectives and in marked contrast to the 'objectivists,' the structuration perspective effectively subordinates 'the dependence of structure on practice' to 'the dependence of practice on structure'.[17] That is, from this vantage, it is but a structuralism in disguise!

In Ashley's view, a collapse of one into the other is quite inevitable since there is for him, 'a radical undecidability' between the two dependencies. That is, social theory can 'privilege' either the dependence of structure on practice or the dependence of practice on structure, but it cannot join them.

His argument against the structuration effort to do this is anything but clear, but it may help to make the effort to see it. For Ashley, there is a double move. First, the structurationist 'narrative' dichotomizes, on the one hand, 'the structure of a social totality whose form theory represents and whose continuity theory narrates' and, on the other hand, 'the utter contingency and arbitrariness of history' (p. 277). This 'utter contingency and arbitrariness' must be 'subordinated to structure if theoretical narrative is to be sustained.' Second, 'knowing agents' are located 'at the frontier of this already established opposition: as beings who, behind their backs, are constituted in reflection of the structure of the social totality and who, looking forward, find narrative significance only insofar as they administer historical contingency and bend it to the reproduction of the structure that constitutes them' (ibid.). Thus, the 'dependence of structure on practice' is mere 'supplement'--'a way of rendering a structuralist account complete in the face of contingent events that threaten to escape or undo a structure's supposed hegemony in the determination of what history means'(ibid.).

The passage seems to me to be filled with confusions. First, the dichotomy is a fiction of Ashley's dualism, prompted one suspects by his strong anti-realism. In the structuration view, there is no structured hegemony determining 'what history means'. For example, there is no notion of emancipation defined by a universal telos to history. Nor is history, as he would have it, 'a boundless text of countless texts,' in which 'theoretical discourse,' 'like any other practice, participates in the arbitrary structuring of subjectivity and objectivity and that, at the same time, owes its significance and power to this arbitrary structuring' (p. 278).

From the structuration perspective, 'theoretical narrative' is sustainable because it can defend a naturalistic metaphysics of existences which exhibit continuity and change, contingency and necessity, or in Dewey's more general ontological terms, 'stability and precariousness'.[18] Second, as already argued, 'knowing agents' are not 'constituted in reflection of the structure of the social totality'; they do not 'administer historical contingency' nor do they 'bend it to the reproduction of structure.' There is historical contingency exactly because structure depends upon what people do and because what they will do is never foreclosed or determined in advance.

But Ashley's concerns do apply to a great deal of social theory including, perhaps, Dipesh Chakrabarty's recent outstanding effort to rethink the relation of 'culture' and 'condition'. I conclude by sketching this analysis in order to illustrate some critical features of the foregoing.

Rethinking Working Class History[19]

Chakrabarty sees, rightly, that Marxist labor histories, 'cast in the mold of an emanicipatory narrative', strain under a dilemma. Either, reductively and universalistically, workers all over the world, irrespective of their specific cultural pasts, experience "capitalist production" in the same way...' or, if the particular cultural heritage of the European West is 'privileged' a la Thompson, then, what of labor movements elsewhere? The challenge posed by his study of Bengali jute-workers is then, 'How do we pose the problem of culture and consciousness, and retain a notion of "working class politics" (i.e., emancipatory politics) without giving ground to either the exceptionalist or the universalist argument in labor history?'(p. 225). Chakrabarty's book succeeds brilliantly in re-posing the problem of culture and consciousness, but I am afraid that, consistent with his argument, he fails to retain the notion of an emancipatory working class politics.

Although Chakrabarty's account is rich in detail, the theoretical issues are fairly straightforward. Briefly, Marx builds assumptions regarding culture-- 'the politics of "equal rights"'-- into his account in Capital. These assumptions simply do not obtain in India. Accordingly, (and quite apart from the critical facts of colonialism), we can hardly expect that capitalism in India would take the same form as, presumably, it did when Marx was writing about England. Moreover, because of this cultural difference, it is not surprising that 'class consciousness' did not emerge among Indian jute workers.

This is, I think, entirely correct. To see this requires a brief excursion into Capital. Chakrabarty argues that 'Marx places the question of subjectivity right at the heart of his category "capital" when he posits the conflict between "real labour" and "abstract labour" as one of its central contradictions' (p. 225). 'Real labour' (or much better, 'concrete' or 'useful' labour) refers to labour power 'as it exists in the personality of the labourer'(p. 225). Concrete labour power, of course, is heterogeneous. 'Abstract' labour power, on the other hand, presupposes that labour power is a commodity and this means that it has an exchange value, as any other commodity. It is, ceteris paribus, purchased for what is worth and when put to work, produces value.

It is important to see here that one has a capitalist social relation whenever there is free wage labour which is exploited in production. But (and here Chakrabarty is not as clear as he might me), wage workers are proletarians only if their labour power is experienced as a commodity in Marx's carefully discriminated sense. This is not, to be sure, a 'subjective' phenomenon. It is as 'objective' and real as anything can be. Indeed, given the conditions outlined by Marx, it is quite inevitable. That is, the entire analysis of fetishism is meant to show how it is possible--and necessary--that workers actively and uncoercively reproduce a system in which they are exploited. But the conditions for this are not merely juridical, the wage-form, but, as Chakrabarty says, that labourers live in accordance with norms defining 'formal freedom', and 'equality before the law'--rights, as Thompson argued, which were the rights of 'a free-born Englishman'--'as Paine had left him or as the Methodists had moulded him' (p. 221). It was thus that Marx believed that England, a society 'where the notion of human equality has already acquired the fixity of popular prejudice,' was the best place to decipher the logic of capitalism.

The entire logic of nineteenth century factory discipline and the logic of proletarian self-emancipation follows from the emergence of this culturally constituted proletarian. Thus, for example, authority, like concrete labour, is depersonalized, and ideally 'rational' in the sense that it is 'economical.' Similarly, the organization of workers takes the form of voluntary associations which embody representative institutions. Finally, and critically, in their collective struggle against the capitalist, they de-mystify the contradiction of their lived experience; their active participation in sustaining an exploitative system--passivity and reformism--is converted into a movement to overcome it.

I underlined 'proletarians' exactly to emphasize the difference between 'wage labourer' and 'proletariat' in the sense of Volume I, Capital. In Chakrabarty's analysis, the jute workers of Bengali were certainly wage labourers, but they were not proletariat. But if this is correct, the implications need to pressed. More generally while there is the high abstraction, capitalism, concretely, there are only capitalisms, differing as least as much as there are differences in cultures (and historical experience). In all of them, there is, as Marx taught us, exploitation, and in all, there are classes. But there need not be proletarians.[20] Indeed, as Bernstein and then Lenin saw, by the end of the nineteenth century, the assumptions of Manifesto had already become a burden to Marxism. We ought now be ready to acknowledge that concrete, conjunctural analysis requires sensitivity to profound specific cultural differences, problems, and possibilities in the political economies of contemporary societies, both in capitalisms and in those societies making efforts to construct some third way. And we ought now also be ready to acknowledge that history is full of surprises.

Peter T. Manicas
Liberal Studies/Department of Sociology
University of Hawaii at Manoa

ENDNOTES

1. Stuart Hall, 'Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms,' Media, Culture and Society' (1980),reprinted in T. Bennett et al, Culture, History and Social Process (The Open University Press, 1981). Quotations are from the reprinted essay.

2. The differences, in my view, are critical. Williams's view of culture stems from his understanding of Marx's philosophical naturalism. He is therefore not tempted by either dualism or 'dialectical' solutions to dualisms. See below.

3. Hall sketches three alternatives: The first, via Lacan, is a 'radical recentering of virtually the whole of Cultural Studies around the terms "discourse" and "the subject."' It is the typical "post-modernist" approach. The second alternative returns to a more 'classical' political economy approach to culture. Like Parsonians, it separates the two domains. The third, then, is the path marked by Foucault. By virtue of its emphasis on the concrete it has had, Hall rightly says, 'an exceedingly positive effect' (p. 35) Yet, 'Foucault's example is positive only if his general epistemological position is not swallowed whole' --the typical pitfall of his legions of epigones. A good example, perhaps, is Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

4. See my 'Naturalizing Epistemology: Reconstructing Philosophy,' in John Stuhr (ed.), Philosophy and the Reconstruction of Culture: Pragmatic Essays After Dewey (Albany: State University Press of New York, 1992).

5. John Dewey, Experience and Nature, The Later Works, 1925-1953, Vol. 1 (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Press, 1981), p. 149.

6. It is probably too late to try to recover this older (pre-Cartesian) sense of 'experience' and thus, if our interest is as it should be, viz., to emphasize activity as praxis, it is likely better to dispense with the term 'experience' altogether.Instead of being trapped into a one-sided emphasis on 'experience' as meaning, we can concentrate on action as praxis, as Giddens writes, 'the involvement of actors with the practical realization of interests, including the material transformation of nature through human activity.'

7. See Roy Bhaskar, Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation (London: Verso, 1986), p. 127 where, following Williams, he notes, that philosophers and sociologists have depreciated the affective domain of 'feelings, meanings and memories' in favor of 'the (more macho?) cognitive and/or conative realms.'

8. These are familiar criticism of Thompson and Althusser. If there are other problems associated with his work, Williams is least tempted by a dualism of 'consciousness' and 'condition.' Williams' cultural theory is, in fact, very close to Dewey's.

9. Roy Bhaskar's account of 'dialectic' in Bottomore et al A Dictionary of Marxist Thought (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1983) is unsurpassed. What is distinctive:

> ... is not Marx's so called 'dialectical' definitions or deviations, but his dialectical explanations, in which opposing forces, tendencies, or principles are explained in terms of a common causal condition or existence, and critiques, in which inadequate theories, phenomenon etc. are explained in terms of their historical conditions... (p. 126).

10. For Engels, remarkably, this amounted to discovering 'the historical causes which transform themselves into...motives in the brains of the actors' (Ludwig Feuerbach and the Outcome of Classical German Philosohy, New York: International Publishers, 1935), p. 59).

11. P. Berger and S. Pullberg, 'Reification and the Sociological Critique of Consciousness,' New Left Review (1966), quoted from Bhaskar, 'On the Possibility of Social Scientific Knowledge and the Limits of Naturalism,' Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 8 (1978), p. 11.

12. This is, substantially, William's view and is an older view. Worth mention, perhaps, most recent (non-naturalistic?) conceptions of culture conceived it far more narrowly, in terms of 'mentalities', 'symbolic codes', 'texts', and 'discourses' that are effectively, if not explicitly autonmous. As Roy d'Andrade has remarked: 'When I was graduate student, one imagined people in a culture; ten years later culture was all in their heads' ('A Colloquy of Cultural Theorists', in Richard A. Schweder and Robert A. LeVine (eds.), Culture Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 7).

13. That is, structures do not themselves have causal properties. Poverty is a cause of one-on-one crime in the sense that people who lack resources which give them access to what they have learned to value find criminal activity, e.g., selling drugs, more attractive and those who have other alternatives.

14. Douglas Porpora, 'Four Concepts of Social Structure,' Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior 19 (June 1989), p. 202. See also T. Benton, 'Some Comments on Roy Bhaskar's 'The Possibility of Naturalism,' Radical Philosophy 27 (1981); A. Callinicos, 'Anthony Giddens: A Contemporary Critique,' Theory and Society 14 (1985); Derek Layder, The Realist Image in Social Science (New York: St. Martins; Press, 1990).

15. In addition to those mentioned, one might mention John B. Thompson's sympathetic review. He argues that, contrary to Giddens, the key features of Marx's account of capitalism 'cannot be treated as so many "rules" that workers follow when they turn up at factory gates, as if every worker who accepted a job had an implicit (albeit partial) knowledge of Marx's Capital,' and that he 'tends to equate social structure with practical knowledge and hence to elide the distinction between an analysis of structural conditions...and a mere summary of what actors already know in knowing "how to go on"...' ('The Theory of Structuration,' in David Held and John B. Thompson (eds.), Social Theory of Modern Society: Anthony Giddens and his Critics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 69).

16. Roy Bhaskar, Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation (London: Verso, 1986), p. 213.

17. Richard K. Ashley, 'Living on the Border Lines: Man, Poststructualism, and War,' in J. Der Derian and M. Shapiro (eds.), International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics (Lexington: Heath, 1989), p. 272.

18. See Ralph W. Sleeper, The Necessity of Pragmatism (New Haven: Yale, 1986).

19. Dipesh Chakrabarty, Rethinking Working Class History: Bengal 1890-1940 (Princeton: Princeton

University Press, 1989).

20. For contemporary proletarians, a partial penetration of the condition may very well work against them. Thus, in his brilliant study of genuinely proletarian youth, Willis argues:

> The lads' indifference to the particular form of work they enter, their assumption of the meaningless of work not what kind of "right attitude" they take to it, and their general sense of the similarity of all work as it faces them, is the form of a cultural penetration of their real conditions of existence as members of class (136).

These are, however, but partial penetrations and by no means are they sufficient to make these youths into politically active radicals. Willis argues that these penetrations may be seen as a rejection of conventionally constituted individualism. But individualism is not defeated in itself, but 'for its part in the school masque where mental work is associated with unjustified authority, with qualifications whose promise is illusory' (146). The upshot is the reverse polarization of the manual/mental labor distinction and the consequence rejection of all that school might offer. But, argues Willis, this re-valuation of manual labor depends upon sexism: 'Manual labor is associated with the social superiority of masculinity, and mental labor with the social inferiority of femininity' (148). Indeed, 'we may say that where the principle of general abstract labor has emptied work of significance from the inside, a transformed patriarchy has filled it with significance from the outside...The brutality of the working situation is partially re-interpreted into a heroic exercise of manly confrontation with the task' (150). To be sure, this youthful re-evaluation need not be permanent. It suffices that it last long enough to effectively trap them forever.