Ideology and Western Marxism in the 1960s-1980s
-the Marxist’s use of ideology:
※(Pete Hollindale: a customary error is to make the wrong implicit analogy, by treating ideology as if it were a political policy, when in fact it is a climate of belief.
(Reprint in Peter Hunt’s Literature for Children: Contemporary Criticism, 1992:37)
-If we succumb to ideology we live in an illusory world – what Marxism describes as a state of false consciousness.

Althusser(1918-90)’s Ideology
◎ definition: a “representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence” (See Burtens’s Literary Theory p. 117 btm)

◎How is ideology able to hide authentic reality from us?
#1: Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. That is, ideology distorts our view of our true “condition of existence”.
#2: connect ideology with its social sources: Ideology works through so-called “ideological State apparatuses”, which, although they may have their own sub-ideology, are all subject to the ruling ideology.
-Ideology has a material existence in the sense that it embodies in all sorts of material practices.
-The subject acts insofar as he is acted upon by the following system. That is, while we believe that we are acting out of free will, we are in reality “acted by the … system”.

◎Where does ideology come from and how has it acquired its immense influence?
Althusser draws on the writings of Lacan. Aware of that deep lack – although we cannot name it – and yearning for completion we turn to ideology, the more so because it constantly “hails and interpellates” (addresses) us as “concrete subjects” – as if we are complete already.

In so doing, it may “interpellate” us in the different social roles that we play, or, the different “subject positions” that we occupy.

The way ideology addresses us creates that subject position for us, yet simultaneously that position is already familiar to us because it is part of what we know.

Ideology convinces us that we are whole and real, that we are the “concrete subjects” we want to be. No wonder we see whatever ideology makes us see as natural, as belonging to the natural, harmonious order of things.

Modified concept of ideology

-**Antonio Gramsci** (1891-1937) hegemony (writing in the 1930s)
  - hegemony: the domination of a set of ruling beliefs and values through “consent” rather than through “coercive power”.
  - the power of ideology leads to “[t]he ‘spontaneous’ consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group”.
  - Under hegemonic conditions the majority – usually a large majority – of a nation’s citizens has to effectively internalized what the rulers want them to believe that they genuinely think that they are voicing their own opinion, but there is always room for dissent.

- **Raymond Williams** (1921-1988)
  - hegemony and counterhegemonic tendencies struggle with each other in a literature and culture that are constantly in motion.

- **Michel Foucault** (1926-84)
  - Panopticon: Foucault’s metaphor for this new sort of social regulation
  - the “major effect” of the Panopticon:
    to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of
which they themselves are the bearers. (*Discipline and Punish*, 1975: 201)

**Power and discourse (Cf. Althusser's ideology)**

- A discourse is a loose structure of interconnected assumptions that makes knowledge possible. A discourse is “a series of sentences or propositions” and that it “can be defined as a large group of statements that belong to a single system of formation” – a so-called discursive formation. Foucault: “I shall be able to speak of clinical discourse, economic discourse, the discourse of natural history, psychiatric discourse”  
  
  (Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1972): 107-8)

If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse.  
  
  (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 1980:119)

- Power works through discourse and discursive formation.

The exploration of ideology in children’s literature studies of late 1980s to early 1990s

- 1985: Sutherland’s essay on political ideologies in lit. for children (appeared in *Children’s Literature in Education*)  
  … To promulgate one’s values by sending a potentially influential book into public arenas already bristling with divergent, competing, and sometimes violently opposed ideologies is a political act. Seen in this light, the author’s views are the author’s politics. …


  the book treats “the linguistic constitution of fantasy and realism as discoursal modes” (Stephens 1992:243)

**John Stephens**

- Why discuss the ideology in children’s fictions, see the quote on p.1; p.3-4; p.5; p.8  
- the aspect of discourse Stephens emphasizes in this book:
  - language as a system of signification – what is commonly referred to as discourse – is endemically and pervasively imbued with ideology  
  - the aspect of discourse Stephens concerns: not to encompass discourse as social practice…, but the more specific discourse of narrative fiction produced for
children aged between infancy and early adolescence.

- p.43

● the relation between discourse and ideology as illustrated in Figure 1. (pp.1-2)
  - the term “inscribed”: refer to the presence of ideology within discourse.
  - the discourse of a narrative fiction yields up both a story and a significance
  - how the concept of reader response distracts attention from the operation of ideology within texts (p. 4, p. 10)

© the summary of Chapter 1 contents (p.6)

CHAPTER ONE: LANGUAGE, DISCOURSE AND NARRATIVE FICTION

● Ideology and language (p.8; pp. 10-11)
● A summary of Peter Hollindale’s article (pp. 9-11)
● Stephens’s definitions of Discourse: linguistics and narratological (p.11-12)

Narrative discourse and children’s literature

● a narrative consists of 3 interlocked components: the discourse(p.17, 18), a story(p.17, 18), a significance (p.12)
● the interaction of top-down (p.29) and bottom-up (p.29) interpretation;
  the interaction of micro-discourses and macro-discourses (p.14)

Example: Leon Garfield’s The Writing on the Wall
  the discrepancy between discourse-order and story-order (p.19)

● the difference between top-down/bottom-up approach (a poststructuralist concept) to reading and the reading for langue/parole (a Structuralist concept) (p.16)
● discoursal modes: narrative, descriptive, argumentative (pp.19-20)
● narrative processes (Figure 1.1: the narrative transactions; pp. 20-26)
  *implied readers in Charles Perrault’s “The Little Red Riding Hood”
  - dominating narration, effaced narration
  ◎ Point of View: perceptual point of view (p.27)
  conceptua l point of view (p.27)

◎ the representation of speech
  examination of inquit-tags (p.33)
  - apply the principle of pragmatics
  - examine the ways in which interrelationships are represented in fiction
    (operations of power in unequal relationships, the representation of turn-taking) (p.34)

  *inquit-tags in Brothers Grimm’s “Hansel and Gretel”

H.P. Grice (1975) and his four conversational maxims (p.36)

◎ Closure and Significance (p.41)
  - the significance of closure at story level
-aesthetically
-thematically
*the ending of Lois Lowry's The Giver