





## Ideology and ideological state apparatuses by althusser

Louis Althusser 1970 Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays First published: in La Pensée, 1970; Translation: From the French by Ben Brewster; Source: Lenin and Philosophy and other articles, monthly press review 1971; transcribed: by Andy Blenden. In the reproduction of production conditions[1] I now have to look more thoroughly at something that briefly glimpses in my analysis when I spoke of the necessity of renewing the production instrument if production is possible. That was a passing hint. As Marx said, every child knows that a social formation that did not reproduce production conditions at the same time as production will not last a year. [2] The final condition of production is therefore reproduction of production conditions. It may be 'simple' (reproducing exactly previous production conditions) or 'on a massive scale' (expanding them). Let's ignore this last distinction for a moment. So what about reproduction conditions) or 'on a massive scale' (expanding them). Let's ignore this last distinction for a moment. Stubborn axiumations (ideological axidies of an experiential type) from the perspective of production alone, or even from that merely production process) are so integrated into our everyday consciousness that it is extremely hard, not to say it is almost impossible, to raise itself to the point of view of reproduction. Nevertheless, everything remains out of this abstract view (worse than one-sided: distorted) - even at the production, and assuming that every social formation comes from the dominant state of production, I can say that the production process is a set for the work of the productive forces in the definitive production relationships and under it. It seeks to exist, every social formation must reproduce its productive forces, 2- existing production relationships. The reproduction of the means of producing each (including bourgeois economists whose work is national accounting, or modern macroeconomic theorists) now recognizes it, as Marx convincingly proved it in the capital of Volume Two, that no production is possible to allow the reproduction of the material conditions of production: the reproduction of means of production. The average economist, who in this case is no different from the average tycoon, knows that every year it is necessary to predict what is needed to replace what has been used or Outside in production: raw materials, stationary installations (buildings), production tools (machinery), etc. I say the average economist = the average tycoon, for whom both express the point of view of the company, about it as sufficient simply to interpret in terms of the company's financial accounting practice. But thanks to the genius of Quesnay, who first raised this 'stunning' problem and to marx's genius that level it does not exist in its actual circumstances. What happens at the firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw to be conceived. The reflection of a moment is enough to convince: Mr. X, a capitalist who produce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect that only gives an idea of the necessity of reproduce his raw firm level is an effect. materials, his machines, etc. But he doesn't produce them for his own production - other capitalists do: an Australian sheep farmer, Mr Z, in order to produce those products that are a condition of reproduction of Mr. X's production conditions, also have to reproduce their production conditions, and so to infinity - total in proportion to the way that, in the national market and even the world, demand for means of production (for reproduction) can be satisfied with supply. In order to think that this mechanism, which leads to a kind of endless chain, must follow Marx's global procedure, and in particular, the capital circulation relationships between the first department (the production of production of production of production of means of consumption), and the realization of surplus value, in capital, volumes two and three should be studied. We should not go into analyzing this question. It is enough to mention the necessity of reproducing the material conditions of production. Work-power reproduction however, the reader has failed to pay attention to one thing. We have discussed reproduction of what distinguishes productive forces from means of production, i.e., reproduction to one thing. We have discussed reproduction of what distinguishes productive forces from means of production of production of what distinguishes production of what dis observing what's happening in the enterprise, especially from examining the financial accounting practice that predicts mortality and investment, we've been able to get the approximate idea of the existence of the material process of reproduction, but now we're entering a field where observing what's happening in the firm is, if not completely blind, at least. Entirely, and for good reason: the reproductive power of work basically takes place outside the company. How is the reproductive power guaranteed? By giving labour power a means with which to reproduce itself is guaranteed? By giving labour power a means with which to reproduce itself is guaranteed? labor power. However, that's actually how it 'works', since wages represent only that part of the value generated by the labor power of wage earners (where to pay for housing, food and clothing, briefly enables wage earners to re-present themselves at the factory gate the next day - and any The day bestows more God bestows upon him); Remember that this amount of value (wages) necessary to reproductive labor power is determined not by the needs of the 'biological' minimum wage guarantee (Salaire is the minimum inter-professional Garanti) alone, but with historical minimum requirements (Marx noted that English workers need beer while the French proletaria needs wine) - as one of the least historically variable. I should also point out that this is at least twice the date not defined by the class struggle of the proletaria (double class struggle: against the prolongation of the working day and against the reduction of wages). However, it is not enough for the working power of its material conditions of reproduced as the power of the existing work must be competent, in other words it is appropriate to work in the complex system of the production process. The development of productive forces and the historically forming type of unity of productive forces at a given moment produced. Varied: According to the requirements of the social and technical division of the work, its different 'jobs' and 'posts'. How is this reproduction of (varied) power skills provided by working in a capitalist regime? Here, unlike the social formations marked by slavery or the serfdom of this reproduction), but gain more and more outside of production: by the capitalist education system, and by other things and What do children learn at school? They go to different distances in their studies, but at any rate they learn to read, write and add - that is, a number of techniques, and a number of other things, including elements (which may be rudimanter or vice versa) 'scientific' or 'literary culture', which are directly useful in various professions in manufacturing (one instruction for manual workers), another for technicians, a third for engineers, a final third for higher management, etc.). That way they learn to know. But along with these techniques and knowledge, and in their learning, children in school also learn rules of good behavior, that is, an attitude that must be observed by every factor in the division of labor, given the job for which he is destined: the rules of ethics, civil and professional conscience, which actually means the rules of order established by class domination. They also learn to 'speak the right French', to 'handle' workers properly, as one actually (for future capitalism and their servants) to 'instruct them about' correctly, as one (ideally) to 'talk to them' in the right way, etc. More scientifically, reproducing its submission to the rules of established order, or reproducing submission to the ruling ideology for workers, and reproducing the ability to properly manipulate the ruling ideology for the agents of exploitation and repression., so they will also provide for the domination of the ruling class 'in words'. In other words, the school (but also other state institutions such as the church, or other institutions such as the church and repression.) ideology or its dominance of action. All factors of production, exploitation and repression, not to talk of the 'professionalism of ideology' (Marx), must be in one way or another 'spicy' in this ideology' (Mar the ruling ideology (its subordinates') etc. Reproduction shows the power of work in this way as its four breasts are not only reproduction of its 'skills' but also the reproduction of its 'skills' but also', to make it clear that it is built in forms and under ideological mental forms that provide for skill reproduction The workforce. But this recognition of effective presence is a new reality: ideology. Here I have two comments. The first is to take away my analysis of reproduction. I have recently given a quick review of the reproductive forms of productive forces, namely manufacturing equipment on the one hand, and the power to work on the other. But I am not yet close to the question of reproducing production relations. This is a very important question for the Marxist theory of how to produce. Let it pass would be a theoretical eddning - worse, a serious political error. So I have to discuss it. But to get the means to discuss it must do another long detour. The second comment is that in order to make this deviation, I am obliged to ask my old question again: is it a society? Infrastructure and superstructure and superstructure in a few cases[4] I have insisted on the revolutionary character of the Marxist impression of the 'whole social' as far as it is distinct from Hegelian 'sum'. I said (and this thesis only repeats the famous propositions of historical materialism) that Marx imagined the structure of any society as expressed by 'levels' or 'examples'. : Political- legal (law and government) and ideology (different ideologies), religious, moral, legal, political, etc.). In addition to its theoretical-visionic interest (revealing the difference between Marx and Hegel), this representation has the following very important theoretical advantage: it allows it to play a role in the theoretical advantage advant What does that mean? It is easy to see that this representation of the structure of any society as a structure containing the base (infrastructure) on which two superstructure 'floors' are installed is a metaphor, quite precise, spatial metaphor: the metaphor of a topography (thread). [5] Like any metaphor, this metaphor, guite precise, spatial metaphor: the metaphor of a topography (thread). visible. what? That's exactly this: that upstairs can't 'stay up' (in the air) alone, if they don't exactly rest at their base. So the purpose of the metaphor is to reshabs the base with an indicator of the effect known by famous terms: to determine in the latest example of what happens in the 'upper floors' (of the superstructure) with what happens on the economic base. According to this indicators? It can be said that the superstructure floors are not decisive in the last sample but are determined by the effectiveness of the base; Their effectiveness (or determination) index, as determined by determining in the last base sample, is conceived by the Marxist tradition in two ways: (1) There is a relative autonomy of the superstructure according to the base; So we can say that the great theoretical advantage of Marxist topography is the spatial metaphor of atheism (base and superstructure) at the same time, which reveals that the questions of determination (or indicator of effectiveness) are very important; It is that it obliges us to think that the Marxist tradition adjacently calls the relative independence of the superstructure and the reciprocal action of the superstructure on a basis. The biggest disadvantage of this representation of the structure of any society with the spatial metaphor is obviously a metaphor: it remains descriptive. Now it seems to me that different representation of things is possible and desirable. NB, I don't mean that I want to reject the classic metaphor, for that metaphor itself requires us to go beyond that. And I don't go beyond that to dismiss it as worn out. I simply want to try to think what it gives us in the form of a description. I believe that we can and need to think about what is essential to the existence was represented by a spatial metaphor of atheity, but which could not give a conceptual answer to it, immediately become clear. My basic thesis is that these questions (and therefore answering them) cannot be raised except from a reproductive perspective. From this perspective, I have to give a brief analysis of the law, government and ideology. And I reveal what's happening both from the perspective of action and on the one hand of production, and the reproduction on the other. The Marxist tradition government is strict, here: in the communist manifesto and the reproduction, and the revolution, the government is explicitly conceived as a repressive apparatus. The state is a machine of repression, enabling the ruling classes (in the 19th century the bourgeois class and the 'class' of great landowners) to guarantee their dominance over the working class, enabling the former to expose the latter to the process of extorting surplus value (i.e., exploitation of capitalism). The state in this way is first of all what Marxist classics call the state apparatus. This term means: not only the specialized apparatus (meaning tight) that I have recognized its existence and necessity in relation to the requirements of legal action i.e. police, courts, prisons; And above this group, the head of state, government and administration. The Marxist-Leninist theory of government presented in this form has its finger on the essential point, and not for a moment can there be any question of repressive execution and intervention 'in the interests of the ruling classes' in the class struggle carried out by the bourgeoisie and its allies against the proletarian, is quite certainly the state and certainly defines its fundamental functioning. From descriptive theory to theory as such nevertheless, here too, as I pointed out according to the metaphor of edifice (infrastructure and superstructure), this presentation of the nature of government is still somewhat descriptive. As I often have the occasion to use this descriptive), a word of explanation is necessary in order to remove any ambiguity. Whenever I talked about the metaphor of the Aharima or the Marxist theory of the state that these were descriptive notions or representations of their objects, I had no higher critical motivation. In the photo, I have every background to think that great scientific discoveries can't help but cross the stage of what I should be called descriptive 'theory'. This is the first stage of any theory, at least in the sphere that concerns us (the science stage of social formations). As such, it is possible and in my opinion should - anticipate this step as a transitional, necessary to develop theory. That transitional is written in my expression: 'descriptive theory', which reveals in its relationship of terms equivalent to a kind of 'contradiction'. In fact, the term 'conflict' theory' really, without a shadow of doubt, is the irreversible beginning of the theory; Let me clarify this idea by returning to our current object: government. When I say that the Marxist theory of the essential somewhat descriptive, this means that first of all, this descriptive theory is undoubtedly precisely the beginning of the means that first of all, this descriptive, this means that first of all, this descriptive theory is undoubtedly precisely the beginning of the Marxist theory of the state available to us is still somewhat descriptive, this means that first of all, this descriptive point, the decisive principle of any subsequent development of the theory. In fact, I should have called the state's descriptive theory correct, because it may quite match the vast majority of facts in the repressive state. apparatus, casts a shining light on all the facts visible in various orders suppressing whatever their spheres: since the June 1848 massacre and the Paris Camon, from The Resistance, from The Resistance, from Charon, etc., to mere interventions (and relatively anodine) of 'censorship' that has been banned Diderot's La Réligieuse or a play by Gatti in Franco; The direct or indirect forms of exploitation and elimination of the masses (imperialist wars) illuminate that delicate everyday domination beneath which one can glimpse, in forms of political democracy, for example, what Lenin, following Marx, called the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. And yet the descriptive theory of government represents a constitutional stage of the theory that itself demands the 'superstition' of this stage. To be clear that if the definition in question really gives us the repressive state apparatus, this 'reciprocal relationship' gives an increase to a very specific type of axidies, about which I have something to say in an instant: 'Yes, this is how it is, this is really true!' [6] And the accumulation of the state, i.e., the scientific theory of the state. Any descriptive theory thus runs the risk of 'blocking' the development of the theory, and yet development is essential. That's why, I think, to develop this descriptive theory to As such, in order to further understand the mechanisms of government as a state apparatus. The requirements of the Marxist theory of government let me first clarify one important point: the state (and its existence in its apparatus) has nothing but a function of the power of the state. The entire political class struggle revolves around the state. What I mean around acquisition, that is, the seizure and protection of state power by a particular class or the union between classes or class deductions. This first impeachment

obliges me to distinguish between state power (protecting state power or seizing state power), the goal of political class struggle on the obver, may survive, as proved by the bourgeois revolutions in 19th-century France (1830, 1848), by coups d'état (2 December, May 1958), by collapses of the State (the fall of the Empire in 1870, of the Third Republic in 1940), or by the political rise of the petty bourgeoisie (1890-95 in France), etc., without the State Apparatus being affected or modified : it may survive political events that affect the possession of state power. Even after a social revolution like the revolution of 1917, a large part of the state apparatus survived after the proletariation and small peasant alliance: Lenin repeated this fact over and over again. One can describe the distinction between state power and state apparatus as part of the Marxist theory of the state, which has been explicitly in place since the 18th Brumaire Marx and the class struggles in France. To summarize the 'Marxist theory of state' at this point, it can be said that Marxist classics have always claimed that (1) the state is the repressive state apparatus, (2) state power, and as a result, the use of the state apparatus by classes (or the union of classes or transclasses) that control state power as a function of their class, the goals, and (4) the proletaria must be power. Take over a government to destroy the existing bourgeois state apparatus, the state, then in the next phases that put a radical process in motion, which is the loss of the state (the end of state power, the end of any state apparatus). In this view, therefore, what I propose to add to the 'Marxist theory' of government already exists in many words. But it seems to me that even with this supplement, this theory of government already exists in many words. But it seems to me that even with this supplement, this theory is still in part descriptive, although it now contains complex, differential elements. Performance and practice cannot be understood further without resorting to further theoretical development. In this way, what should be added to the Marxist theory of the state is something else. Here we must proceed with caution on the ground that marxist classics actually arrived long before us, but without theoretically systematic, it made decisive progress implicitly with their experiences and procedures. Their experiences and practices were, in fact, originally confined to the lands of political action. In fact, Marxist theory of state, even when it was completed as I had just suggested. They recognized this complexity in their practice, but did not express it in a corresponding theory. [7] I should love to try to have a very schematic outline of this relevant theory. To do this, I recommend the following thesis. To advance the theory of government, it is essential to consider not only the distinction between state power and the state apparatus, but also another reality that is clearly on the side of the (repressive) state apparatus, but should not be confused with it. I'm called this fact with its meaning: ideological state apparatuses. What are ideological state apparatuses (ISAs)? They should not be confused with the (repressive) state apparatus. Remember that in Marxist theory, the state apparatuses. What are ideological state apparatus. prisons, etc. that constitutes what I should call a repressive state apparatus in the future. The suppressor suggests that the state apparatus in question has 'violent functions' - at least ultimately (since repression, may take on non-physical forms). I must name the ideological state apparatus in the future. present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions. I suggest an empirical list of this, which obviously needs to be examined in detail, tested, corrected and reorganized. With all the reservations implied by this requirement, we can now consider the following entities as ideological state apparatuses (the order in which I have mentioned them does not matter specifically): religious ISA (different church system), educational ISA (different system, including various parties), ISA trade union, ISA communications (press, broadcasting, etc.), ISA Cultural (literature, art, sports, etc.). I have said that ISAs should not be confused with state apparatus. What makes up the difference? As a first moment it is clear that while there is a lurality of ISAs as a body is not immediately visible. As a second moment, it is clear that while the unified state apparatus - (repressive) is entirely owned by the public sphere, much larger part of the ideological state apparatus (in its apparent dispersal) is part of it, on the contrary, of the private sphere. Churches, parties, trade unions, families, some schools, most newspapers, cultural investments, etc. are private. We can ignore the first observation for the moment. But someone is bound to question the latter, asking me what right I see as ideological state apparatuses, institutions. As a knowledgeable Marxist, Gramsci has already forested the protest in one sentence. The distinction between the public and the private is an internal distinction with bourgeois law, valid in the (subset) spheres in which bourgeois law exercises its authority. The state of the class governs is neither public nor private; on the contrary, it is a precondition for any distinction between public and private. The same can be said from the starting point of our state ideological apparatus. It is inseviatable whether the institutions in which they are realized are public or private. What matters is how they act. Private institutions in which they are realized are public or private. distinguishes ISAs from the (repressive) state apparatus is the following fundamental difference: the repressive state apparatus acts 'violently', while ideological state apparatus, both repressive and ideological, is essential, both violently and ideologically, but also by a very important distinction that makes the state apparatus not confuse ideologically with the (repressive) state apparatus. It is the fact that the state apparatus (repressive) operates extensively and mainly with repressive) state apparatus. It is the fact that the state apparatus not confuse ideologically with the (repressive) state apparatus. It is the fact that the state apparatus (repressive) state For example, the military and police are also operated by ideology both to ensure their cohesion and reproduction, and to promote values externally. In the same But on the contrary, it is imperative to say that the ideological state apparatus operates broadly and largely by ideology, but with repression, even if ultimately, but only ultimately, this is very weakening and hidden, even symbolic. (There is no such thing as a completely ideological device.) So schools and churches use appropriate methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to 'discipline' not only their shepherds, but also their flocks. The same is the case with the family.... The same is the case with the IS cultural apparatus (censorship, among other things) and so on. Should it be added that this double performance designation (mainly, second) with repressive) and ideology, given whether it is the issue of the state apparatus (repressive) or ideological state apparatus, makes it clear that there may be very subtle or implicit combinations of interference by the state apparatus (repressive) and ideological state apparatuses woven? Everyday life offers us myriad examples of this, but if we're going to go further than this mere observation, it needs to be studied in detail. Nevertheless, this is pushing us to understand what constitutes the unity of the supposedly different body of ISAs. If isAs ' function' widely and mainly by ideology, what unites their diversity is precisely this function, as far as the ideology by which they act is always actually unified, despite its diversity and contradictions, beneath the ruling class' originally has state power (openly or more by uniting between classes or class fraxons), and therefore holds the state apparatus (repressive), we can accept the fact that this same ruling class is active in ideological state apparatuses. , precisely in its contradictions. Of course, it is quite different to act with laws and decrees in the state apparatus (repressive) and act through the mediation of the ideology prevailing in ideological state apparatuses. We need to go into the details of this difference - but it can't mask the reality of a deep identity. To my knowledge, no class can hold state power over a long period of time without at the same time exercising its hegemony over and in state ideological apparatuses. I need only one example and proof of this: Lenin's fraught concern for a revolution in the ideological educational state apparatus (among others), simply makes it possible for the proletaria, which had seized state power, to secure the future of the dictatorship of the proletaria and the transition. Socialism. [10] This latest comment places us in a position to understand that the ideological state apparatus may be not only a danger, but also a place of class struggle, and often bitter forms of class struggle. The class (or class atruggle. The class (or class atruggle, and often bitter forms of class struggle. The class (or class atruggle. The class atruggle, and often bitter forms of class atruggle. The class (or class atruggle, and often bitter forms of class atruggle. The class atruggle. but also because the resistance of the exploited classes is able to find the means and occasions for their expression there, either by taking advantage of their contradictions, or by conquering positions. Martial in them in combat. [11] Let me run through my comments. If the thesis I have proposed is well established, it brings me back to the classic Marxist theory of government, while it makes it more accurate at one point. I would argue that it is necessary to distinguish between the power of the state apparatus contains two institutions: the body of institutions that represent the repressive state apparatus on the one hand, and the body of institutions that represent the body of ideological state apparatus on the other. But if so, the following question should be asked, even in the very brief case of my proposals: How exactly is the role of the ideological state apparatus? What is their importance based on? In other words, what does the functioning of these ideological state apparatus? state apparatuses, which do not act with repression but with ideology, match? As for the reproduction of production relationships, I can now answer the central question that has remained in suspense for many long pages: How is the reproduction of production of production of production of production of production relationships, I can say: In most cases, [12] it is financed by legal- political and ideological structure. But as I have argued that going beyond this language is still a necessary description, I must say: In most cases, by exercising state power in state institutions, on the one hand, the state apparatus (repressive) is provided by other ideological state apparatuses. What I just said should also be considered and can be assembled in the following three features: 1- All state apparatuses act both with repression, while the ideological state apparatus operates extensively and largely by ideology. 2. While the state apparatus (repressive) constitutes a whole organized that its various parts are concentrated under a command unity, that of the class struggle policy imposed by Representatives of the ruling classes are capable of possessing state power, multi-ideological, distinct, 'relatively autonomous' and able to provide an objective context to the contradictions that state, in forms that may be is secured by its unified or extreme, the effects of the class struggles of capitalism and the class struggle of the proletariat, as well as their sub-forms. 3. While the unity of the representatives of the class struggles of capitalism and the class struggle in power, the effects of the representatives of the class struggle of the proletariat, as well as their sub-forms. the unity of various ideological state apparatuses, usually in contradictory forms, is provided by the ruling ideology, the ideology of the ruling class. Considering these characteristics, according to a kind of division of labor, reproduction relationships can be shown as follows. The role of the repressive state apparatus, as far as a repressive apparatus, is essentially formed in securing the force (physical or otherwise) political conditions of reproduction relations that are in the last exploited resort relationships. Not only does the state apparatus generously contribute to its reproduction (the capitalist state contains political dynasties, etc.), but most importantly, the state apparatus, with repression (from the most brutal physical force, through administrative orders and mere interactions, to open and implie censorship) provide political conditions for the action of ideological state apparatuses. In fact, this latter is largely a reproduction specifically of secure manufacturing relationships, behind the 'shield' offered by the repressive state apparatus. This is where the role of the ruling ideology is highly concentrated, the ideology of the ruling class that has state power. It is the intermediary of the ruling ideology that ensures (sometimes tooth-greasing) 'harmony' between the repressive state apparatus and the ideological state apparatus, and between various state ideological apparatuses. So we lead to the prediction of the following hypothesis, as a function of precisely the diversity of ideological state apparatuses in their single, because the common, reproductive role of production relationships. In fact, we have listed a relatively large number of ideological state apparatuses in their single, because the common, reproductive role of production relationships. apparatus, the religious apparatus, the family apparatus, the political apparatus, the trade union apparatus, the 'cultural' apparatus, the 'cultura the first known ancient states, let alone the absolute monarchy, has been officially very similar to the one we know today, the number of ideological state apparatuses is smaller and their individual types vary. For example, we observe that throughout middle age, the church (the religious ideological state apparatus) has accumulated a number of functions that today have been implicated in several distinct ideological state apparatuses, new functions in relation to the past that I invoke, especially educational and cultural functions. Alongside the church was the ideological state apparatus of the family, which played a significant part that was unreliable with its role in the social formations of capitalism. Despite the appearance, the church and the family were not the only ideological state apparatuses. There was also a political jeroto-trade union' (generals of real estate, parlemant, various political factions and leagues, ancestors of modern political jeroto-trade union' device of ideological government, if I might invest such an anachronistic term (powerful business guilds and bankers and journeymen associations, etc.). Publications and communications, etc.). Publications and communications, etc.). period, which I have explored extensively, it is quite clear that there has been a dominant ideological state apparatus called the church that has focused not only religious functions, but also educational functions and a large part of the functions and a large part of the functions of communication and culture within it. It is no coincidence that all ideological struggles, from the 16th to the 18th centuries, which began with the first shocks of reform, were concentrated in an anti-clerical and anti-religious struggle; The most important goal and achievement of the French Revolution was not only to transfer state power from feudal aristocracy to the merchant-capitalist bourgeoisie, to break part of the former repressive state apparatus and replace it with new power (such as the national people's army), but to attack the ideological state apparatus number one: the church. Therefore, the civil constitution of the clergy, the confiscation of ecclesiastian wealth, and the creation of new ideological state apparatuses to replace the religious ideological state apparatus number one: the church. automatically: witness concordate, And the long class struggle between the landed nobility and the industrial bourgeoisie during the 19th century to create bourgeoisie relied on the new political, parliamentary-democratic apparatus, the ideological state installed in the first years of the revolution, then restored for several months in 1848, and for decades after the fall of the Second Empire, to carry out its struggle against the church and to terrorize its ideological functions away from it. In other words, it not only guarantees its political hegemony, but also the ideological hegemony that is essential to reproducing the capitalist relations of production. That is why I believe I am justified in advancing the following thesis, however risky. I believe that the ideological state apparatus, installed in the dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant position in the social formations of mature capitalism as a result of violent political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant political and ideological state apparatus, installed in the old dominant political and ideological state approximate approximate approximate approximate approximat ideological state apparatus, is the ideological apparatus of education. This thesis may seem paradoxical, given that for all, in the ideological state apparatus in the social formations of capitalism is not schools, but the apparatus of political ideological government, or the parliamentary democracy regime that combines universal s voting rights and party struggle. History, however, even recent history, shows that it has been bourgeois and still able to accommodate itself in ideological political state apparatuses other than parliamentary democracy: the first and second empires, the constitutional monarchy (Louis XVI and Charles X), the parliamentary monarchy (Louis Philippe), presidential democracy (de Gaulle), only to refer to France. In the UK this is even clearer. The revolution was particularly successful from the bourgeois point of view there, since unlike France, where the bourgeoisie, partly because of the folly of the petty nobility, had to agree by the peasant and The Plabi 'révol' journées The 'uthionnaires' are shipped to power, something for which they have to pay a high price, the English bourgeoisie is able to 'compromise' with the nobility and 'share' the power of the state and use state apparatus with it for a long time (peace among all Men with ethans in the ruling classes!). It is even more remarkable in Germany, since it was behind a political ideological state apparatus in which the junkers of the Empire (the epitome of Bismarck), their army and police provided shields and leading personnel, to which the junkers of the Empire (the epitome of Bismarck), their army and police provided shields and leading personnel, to which the imperialist bourgeoisie made its crushing arrival. History, before the 'Travers' of the Weimar Republic and his assignment to Nazism. I therefore believe that there are good reasons to think that behind the scenes of its ideological state apparatus, is the educational apparatus that has actually been replaced by the church in its functions of the ideological state apparatus that was previously dominant. You might even add: The family school couple replaced the family church couple. Why is the educational apparatus actually the dominant ideological state apparatus in the social formations of capitalism and how does it work? At the moment, it should be enough to say: 1- Whatever all the ideological state state apparatuses, they contribute to the same result: the reproduction of production relations, or exploitation capitalist relations. 2. Each of them contributes towards this single result in the proper way to it. The political apparatus is a 'democratic' ideology by exposing individuals to the ideology of the political state, an 'indirect' (parliamentary) or 'direct' (plabistic or fascist) ideology. The communications apparatus is cramming every 'citizen' with daily dos of nalism, etc., using the press, broadcasting. It is also important for the cultural apparatus (the role of sports in schoonism), etc. Recalling in rituals and other great ceremonies of birth, marriage and death, the religious apparatus is the only ashes, unless it loves its neighbor to the extent that it turns the other species into anyone who hits first. Family apparatus ... But there's no need to keep going. 3. This concert is dominated by a single privilege, sometimes disturbed by contradictions (the remnants of the former ruling classes, the proletariat and their organizations): the ideology of the present ruling class, which merges into its music, the great themes of humanism of the great fathers who produced the Greek miracle even before Christianity, followed by the glory of Rome, the eternal city, and the themes of interest, particular and public, etc. of nalism, moralism and economy. 4. However, in this concert, an ideological state apparatus certainly plays a dominant role, although hardly anyone lends an ear to its music: it is too quiet! This is the school. It takes children of any class at the age of the school baby, and then for years, the years in which the child is more 'vulnerable', squeezed between the family state apparatus and the state educational apparatus, it drums them up, whether it's using new or old methods, a certain amount of 'knowledge' wrapped in the ruling ideology (French, er account, natural history, science, literature) Simply govern ideology in your pure state (ethics, civic education, philosophy). Somewhere around the age of sixteen, a huge mass of children are fired 'into production': these are small workers or peasants. Another part of the youth carries scolastic compatible: and for better or worse, it goes somewhat further, until it moves aside and fills the small and middle-class CEOs, petty bourgeoisie of all kinds. The last part reaches the summit, or reaches half-employment, or provides, as well as collective worker intellectuals, exploitation agents (capitalists, managers), suppression agents (soldiers, police, politicians, managers, etc.) and professional ideology that fits the role it has to perform in class society: an exploited role (with 'highly developed' 'professional', 'moral', 'civic', 'national' and political awareness); The role of the exploitation agent (the ability to give orders and enforce obedience 'without discussion', or the ability to manipulate the demagogy of a political leader's speeches), or professional ideologist (the ability to treat vigilance with respect, or with contempt, blackmail, and demagogy they deserve, consistent with the accent of morality, of these conflicting virtues (humility, resignation, submissiveness on the one hand, pessimism, humiliation, arrogance, self-confidence, self-importance, even smooth talk and cunning on the other) are also taught in the family, in the church, in the military, in good books, in movies and even in the football station, eight hours a day for five or six days out of seven. But it is by apprenticeships in the kinds of knowledge wrapped up in the widespread sculpture of the ruling class ideology that produce this vital outcome for the capitalist regime are naturally covered and concealed by a school-governing ideology, universally reigning because it is one of the essential forms of bourgeois ideology that represents the school as a neutral environment cleared of ideology It is ... lay), where teachers respect the 'conscience' and 'freedom' of children who entrust them (in complete confidence) by their 'parents' (who are free, too, for example, hiterature and 'liberating' virtue. I pardon those teachers who, in the dreaded circumstances, try to convert a few weapons they can find in history and learn to teach against the ideology, the system and the ways in which they are trapped. They're kind of heroes but they're rare and how many (majorities) even start to suspect the 'work' system (which are bigger than them and their wisdom) forces them to do, or worse, put all their heart and genius into doing it with the most advanced awareness (famous new methods!). So little do they suspect that their devotion contributes to the maintenance and nourishing of this ideological representation of the school, which makes today's school as 'natural', essential useful and generous for our ancestors a few centuries ago. In fact, today's church has been replaced by the school in its role as the dominant ideological state apparatus. It is associated with the family just as the church was once associated with the family. We can now claim that the unprecedented deep crisis that is now shaking up the education system of many states around the world, often in relation to the crisis (already announced in the Communist manifesto) is shaking up the family system, takes on the political sense, given that the school (and school/family couple) constitutes the dominant ideological state apparatus, the game machine is a decisive part in the reproduction of production relationships a mode of production threatened in its existence by the struggle of the global class. As for ideology when I came up with the concept of an ideological state apparatus, when I said ISAs were 'the function of ideology' was coined by Cabannis, DeStutt de Tracy and their friends, assigned to it as the object of the theory of ideas (genetic). When Marx took the term 50 years later, even in his early work, he gave it a completely different meaning. Here, the ideological-political struggle that Marx forced early in his essays on the Rinish Zeitoig quickly made him face to face with the fact, forcing him to further his first intuition. However, here we come Astounding paradox. Everything seems to lead Marx to formulate ideology, but ... It's not Marxist (we'll see why in an instant). In the case of capital, although it contains many points about a theory of ideologies (evidently the ideology of vulgar economists), it does not contain that theory itself, which in most cases depends on an ideology theory in general. I should love to invest the first and very schematic outline of such a theory. The endings I'm about to bring up are definitely not off the cuff, but they can't be sustained and tested, as one confirms or rejects, except with very thorough study and analysis. Ideology has no history word a first of all for rejecting the reason in principle that seems to have found me, or at least to justify, project a general ideology theory, and not a theory of certain ideologies, that whatever their form (religious, moral, legal, political), always expresses class positions. It is quite clear that we need to move towards a theory of ideologies in two terms that I had just proposed. It will then become clear that an ideology theory depends on the last resort to the history of social formations, the thus combined modes of production in social formations, and the class struggles in which they develop. In this sense it is clear that in general there can be no guestion of ideology theory, since ideologies (defined in the double respect suggested above: regional and class) have a precedent that its determination in the latest instance is clearly outside of ideologies alone, although it involves them. On the contrary, if I can project an ideology theory in general, and if this theory is really one of the elements on which ideology theories depend, it requires a seemingly contradictory proposition that I have to put it as follows: ideology. Marx says it according to metaphysics, which he says has no more history than morality (meaning other forms of ideology). In German ideology, this formulation appears in an openly positivist context. Ideology as a pure illusion, a clean dream, as no one imaginary construction, which is exactly the same as the theoretical state of dreams among pre-Freudian writers. For these writers, the purely imaginary dream, in other words, was the result of the remnants of the day, presented in an arbitrary arrangement and order, sometimes even upside down, in other words, to disorder. For them the dream was imaginary, empty, absurd and 'Stuck together' (bricolé), when blindly closed, of debris is the only perfect and positive reality, the reality of the day. This is precisely the state of philosophy and ideology (since in this book the philosophy is the superiority of par ideology) in German ideology, then, for Marx is an imaginary assembly (bricolage), a pure, empty and futile dream, formed by the 'remnants of the day' of only complete and positive reality, which is made up of the tangible history of material concrete individuals materially producing their existence. It is on this basis that ideology has no precedent in German ideology, a thesis that ideology has no precedent, so a thesis is purely negative, because it means both: 1- Ideology is nothing as far as a pure dream (made by who knows what power it is: if not by the alienation of the division of labour, but it is also a negative determination); It does not (on the contrary, because it merely reflects the faint, empty and inverted real history) but has no history of its own. Currently, while the thesis that I want to formally defend speaking adopts the conditions of German ideology ('ideology has no precedent'), it is fundamentally different from the positivist and historically spoken thesis of German ideology. Because on the one hand, I think it can be kept that ideologies have a history of their own (although in the last instance it is determined by class struggle); This sense is positive if it is true that the strangeness of ideology is that it exists in the same way as turning it into an unstorical reality, i.e., an all-history, in the sense that the hypocistritic manifesto defines history as the history of class struggles. The history of class societies. To give a theoretical reference here, I might say that, to return to our example of dreams, in its Freudian notion this time, our proposition: ideology has no precedent, it can and should be (and in a manner that has absolutely nothing arbitrary about it, but quite inversely, theoretically necessary, because there is an organic link between two propositions) is directly related to Freud's proposition, which is eternal unconscious, that there is no. There is no record. If the meaning is eternal, not transcendent to all history, I must adopt Freud's word of expression for the word, and write eternal ideology, just like the unconscious. And I add that I theoretically justify this comparison with the fact that unconscious eternity is not associated with the eternity of ideology theory in general. That's why I believe at least hypothetically justified in proposing ideology theory in general, in the sense that Freud presented a theory of the subconscious in general. To simplify the phrase, it is convenient, taking into care of what has been said about ideology of the simple term to determine ideology in general, which I have just said has no history, or what comes to this is eternal, i.e., all immortal in its immutable form throughout history (= the history of social formations containing social classes). Now I limit myself to their 'class societies' and history. Ideology is a representation of people's imaginary relationship with the real conditions of their existence to approach my central thesis on the structure and function of ideology, first I present two theses, one negative, the other positive. The first concerns the object, which is represented in the imaginary form of ideology, the second relates to the materiality of ideology. The first thesis of ideology indicates the imaginary relationship between individuals and the real conditions of their existence. We usually name religious ideology, noral ideology, etc. as global perspectives. Of course, assuming that we don't live one of these ideology, legal ideology, political ideology, etc. as global perspectives. Of course, assuming that we don't live one of these ideology, noral ideology, political ideology, etc. as global perspectives. God, duty, justice, etc.), we admit that the ideology we discuss critically, examining it as anthropologists explores the myths of a primitive society, that these universal perspectives are largely imaginary, or not in accordance with reality. However, while admitting that they do not conform to reality, or that they constitute an illusion, we admit that they give illusions to reality, and only need interpretation to discover the reality of the universe behind their imaginary representation, most famously a mesoque type, current in the 18th century (God is the imaginary representation of that world (ideology = illusion/illusion). There are many types of interpretation, most famously a mesoque type, current in the 18th century (God is the imaginary representation of the real king), and the 'hermeneutics' interpretation opened by the church's first fathers, and revived by Feurbach and the theological-philosophical school descending from him, for example the Barth theologist (to Feuerbach, for example, God is the basis of real man). The essential point is that provided that the interpretation of the imaginary transition (and inversion) of the ideology they reach Conclude that in ideology 'men represent their true circumstances of existence to their imaginary form'. Unfortunately, this interpretation remains a small problem unsettled: why do men 'need' this imaginary transition from the real circumstances of their existence in order to 'represent themselves' their true terms of existence? The first answer (the 18th century response) proposes a simple solution: priests or despots are responsible. They 'forge' beautiful lies so that, in the belief that they obey God, men actually obey priests and tyranny, who are usually concerned in unity in their imposition, priests act in the interests of despots or vice versa, according to political positions 'theorists'. So there is a cause for the imaginary transition of real circumstances: it is the cause of the existence of a small number of pessimistic men who base their dominance and exploitation. The second answer (which, from Feuerbach, taken over the word for word by Marx in his early works) is more 'profound', as equally inaccurate. It is also looking and finding a cause for the imagination and the passive imagination of male existence. This is no longer the cause of priests or tyranny, nor their active imagination and the passive imagination of their victims. This is the cause of material alienation that reigns in the conditions of men themselves. Marx is that in the Jewish question and elsewhere, Marx defends the idea of feuderbachians representing themselves as aliens (= imaginary) of the conditions of their existence because these conditions are alien to their own existence (in manuscripts of 1844). because these conditions are dominated by the basis of alien society - 'alien work'). All of these interpretations thus take and depend on the thesis they assume literally, i.e., what is reflected in the imaginary representation of the universe found in an ideology, the conditions of men's existence, i.e., their true world. Now I can return to the thesis that I have already advanced: it is not their real terms of existence, their real world, that 'men' 'represent themselves' in ideology, but most importantly it is their relationship that is at the center of every ideological, imaginary, representation of the real world. It's a relationship that containship that containship that containship that is at the center of every ideological, imaginary, representation of the real world. It's a relationship that containship that is at the center of every ideology, but most importantly it is their relationship that containship that is at the center of every ideology. 'cause' that should explain imaginary ideological distortion from the real world. Or instead, abandoning the language of causality should lead the thesis, which is to observe (if in fact that good life) in all ideologies. To speak a Marxist language, if it is true that representation of the real conditions of the existence of the occupiers of the agents of production, exploitation, repression, ideology and scientific practice arises in the latest analysis of production relationships, and from the relationships, and from the relationships, we can say the following: all ideology represents its necessarily imaginary distortion not the existing relationships of production (and other relationships derived from production relationships) from them), but most of all the relationships (imaginary) People with production relationships and relationships (imaginary) reduction relationships (imaginary) reduction relationships) from them), but most of all the relationships and relationships (imaginary) reduction relationships (imaginary) reduction relationships) from them), but most of all the relationships (imaginary) reduction relationships) from the existence of individuals but the imaginary relationship of those individuals with the real relationships in which they live. If so, the question of the cause of the imaginary distortion of their individuals to social relationships governing the conditions of existence and their collective and individual lives necessarily given an imaginary relationship? And what is the nature of this fantasy? Raised in this way, the question explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explodes the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explores the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explores the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individuals (priests or Despots) who are great ideological mysticism writers, just as it explores the solution by 'clique'[14], by a group of individu the acquittal later. For the moment I didn't go any further, the second thesis: ideology exists materially. I have already touched on this thesis by saying that 'ideas' or 'representation', etc., which seem to make up the ideal (idéale, idéelle) and the spiritual existence of 'ideas' posed exclusively in an ideology of 'idea' and ideology, and let me add, in an ideology of what seems to be the 'foundation' of this notion since the advent of science, as what science pederes themselves show in their ideology as 'ideas'. right or wrong , . Of course, it has been submitted as confirmation, this thesis has not been proven. I simply want the reader to be repelled in favor of it, say, in the name of materialism. A series of lengthy arguments will be needed to prove it. This hypothetical thesis is not spiritual but The existence of 'ideas' or other 'representations' is actually necessary if we go ahead in our analysis of the nature of ideology. Or rather, it is merely useful for us to better show what each shows at all a serious analysis of any ideology immediately and experimentally to any observer, athough critically revealed. While discussing the ideology (the unity of these different regional ideology immediately and experimentally to any observer, athough critically revealed. While discussing the ideology (the unity of these different regional ideology (the unity of these different regional ideology immediately and experimentally to any observer, athough critically revealed. While discussing the ideology (the unity of these different regional ideology (the unity of these different regional ideology immediately and experimentally to any observer, athough critically revealed. that would be assured by their subject to the ruling ideology). I now go back to this thesis: there is an ideology always in one device, and its methods is not the same as the material existence of paving or rifles. But, at the risk of being taken for a neo-Aristotle (NB Marx has had very high attention for Aristotle), I have to say that 'matter is discussed in many senses', or instead that it exists in different modalities, all rooted in the latest example in the 'physical' matter. However, let me move straight and see what happens to 'individuals' living in ideology, in other words, in a decisive representation (religious, moral, etc.) of the world whose imaginary distortion depends on their imaginary relationships (ideology = an imaginary relationships). I must say that this imaginary relationship itself is destroyed by a material existence. Now see the following. A person believes in God or duty or justice, etc. This belief is derived (for everyone, for all who live in an ideology, which reduces ideology, which reduces ideology to ideas of belief. In this way, it is launched using the absolutely ideological apparatus dispositif in this way (a subject in which it freely shapes or freely knows ideas in which it believes), the attitude (material) of the subject is naturally pursued. The person in question behaves in such a way and such, adopts such a practical attitude, and what is more, participates in certain orderly practices that are the methods of the ideological apparatus to which he is dependent on ideas that he has freely chosen as a subject in all consciousness. If he believes in God, he goes to church to be in Massachusetts, kneels, prays, confesses, pens (once meant normally the term was material) and naturally And so is it. If he believes in duty, he will have corresponding attitudes written in ritual practices 'according to the right principles'. If he believes in justice, he will unconditionally submit to the rules of law and may even protest when they are violated, sign petitions, participate in a demonstration, etc. Throughout this outline, we see that the ideological representation of his ideology is forced to recognize that any 'subject' who is inspired by awareness and belief in ideas in which his consciousness is inspired and freely accepted must act according to his ideas, so he must play a role in his own ideas as a free subject in the exercise of his material action. If he doesn't, 'that's vicious'. In fact, if he doesn't do what he believes to do, it's because he's doing something else, which still as a function of the same idealistic plan implies that he has other ideas, as well as the ideas he announces, and acts according to these other ideas, as well as the ideas he announces, and acts according to the villain himself'. Not') or pessimistic. Or pervert. In each case, ideology recognizes in this way, despite its imaginary distortion, that ideas are a human subject in his actions, or should exist in his actions, and, if not, lend him other ideas related to the actions taken in ways. And I have to point out that these practices are governed by rituals in which these practices are imocimated, within the material existence of an ideological apparatus; only a small part of that apparatus; a small mass in a chapel, a funeral, a minor match at a gym, a school day, a political party meeting, etc. In addition, we owe Pascal defensive 'dialectics' for a fantastic formula that will enable us to invert the overall defense plan order of ideology. Pascal more or less says, Kneel down, move your lips in prayer and you will believe. He thus scandalously inverted the order of things, bringing, like Christ, not peace but strife, and besides something hardly Christian (for wow to him that brings scandal to the world!) - his scandal. The lucky scandal that makes him stick with jansenist defiance in a language that directly names reality. I will be allowed to leave Pascal to the arguments of his ideological struggle with the religious ideological state apparatus of my day. And I'm expected to use a more direct Marxist vocabulary, if that's possible, for us moving forward in still poorly explored spheres. So I have to say that, where only one single subject (such and such a person) is concerned, the existence of ideas His belief is material that his ideas are his material actions, which are entered into material actions, which are entered into material ways governing material ideological apparatus from which the ideas derive the subject. Naturally, the four inscriptions of the matter in my proposition should be influenced by different modality: the materiality of a movement to go to crime, kneeling down, the gesture of the sign of the cross, or Mia Culpa, including, from a prayer, of a contrived act, from a penis, from the perspective, of shaking, of a foreign theological discourse or an 'inner' verbal discourse (awareness), one and one materiality. I must leave on one side the problem a theory of differences between modalities of materiality. It remains that in this upside-down presentation, while others survive the opposite and new terms appear. Disappeared: The term ideas. Survival: Subject conditions, awareness, belief, actions. Appears: terms of practices, rituals, ideological apparatus. So it's not inversion or reversal (except in the sense that we might say a government or a glass has overturned), but a deformation (non-ministerical type), a rather strange deformation, since we get the following result. Ideas have been destroyed in this way (as fa as they are concerned with an idealistic or spiritual existence), to the exact extent that their existence is played out in the practices governing rituals defined in the latest example by an ideological apparatus. So it seems that the subject acts as much as he does by the following system (regulated in the order of its true determination): the ideology contained in a material ideological apparatus, the prescribing of material practices governing a material ritual, that practices in material acts are a matter of action in all consciousness according to his belief. But this presentation very much shows that we have to extract the decisive central term that everything else depends on: the notion of the subject. And I need to immediately set two endings attached: 1. There is no exercise other than by and in an ideology; i can come to my central thesis now. Ideology blends people as subjects, this thesis is simply the subject of explicitly my latest proposition: there is no ideology other than subject matter and for subjects. Meaning, there is no ideology but tangible topics, and this destination for ideology is only by Subject: Meaning, by subject category and its function. I mean, even if it only appears under this name (subject) with the advent of bourgeois ideology, most of all with the rise of legal ideology,[15] the subject category (which may operate under other names: for example, as the spirit in Plato, as God, etc.) is the constituent category of all ideology, whatever its determination (regional or class) and whatever its historical history - since ideology has no precedent. I say: The subject category constitutes all ideology, but at the same time and immediately I add that the subject category only constitutes all ideology as far as all the ideology of performance (which defines it) of 'forming' tangible people as subjects. In the material forms of its existence. To understand what follows, it is imperative to understand that both he who writes these lines and the reader who reads them are themselves subjects, and that is why ideological subjects (a toutological proposition), i.e., the author and reader of these lines both live in the ideology of spontaneous or nature. To which the author, as far as he writes the author, as far as he writes the author and reader of these lines both live in the ideological animal by nature. discourse lines that claim to be scientific, is completely absent from his 'scientific discourse' as a subject (for all scientific discourses by defining a discourse without a subject, there is no science subject (for all scientific discourses by defining a discourse without a subject (for all scientific discourse) is a different question that I must leave on the one hand at the moment. As St Paul admires it, it is in the 'logo', meaning in ideology, that we 'live, move and exist'. It seeks that for you and me, the subject category is an initial axidies (the axiies are always basic): it is clear that you and I are subjects (free, ethical, etc.). Like all axidies, including those who have a word 'name of one thing' or 'has a meaning' (so including the apparent 'transparency' of the language), 'obviously you and I are subjects - and that it doesn't cause any problems - is an ideological, rudimentary ideological effect. [16] It's actually a strangeness of the ideology that imposed it (without appearing to do so, since these 'axidies') are axidies as axidies, that we can't recognize failure and before that we have an inevitable and natural reaction crying out (loud or in 'still, small voice of conscience') :: 'That's obvious! Right! This is true!' at work in this reaction of ideological discerning which is one The two functions of ideology in this way (inversely it is the function of misinformation - méconnaissance). For example very 'concrete', we all have friends who, when they knock on our door and we ask, through the door, the question 'Who is there?', answers (it's obvious') 'This is me'. And we know it's him or he, and it's true that he was there, for example, when we know him (and we've recognized him) by telling him Hello my friend, and shaking his hand (a ritual act of ideological recognition in everyday life). In France, at least elsewhere, there are other rituals. In these initial remarks and these tangible illustrations, I just want to point out that you and I are always subjects at the moment, and so we are constantly practicing ideological cognition rituals that ensure that we are actually tangible, individual, recognizable and (naturally) unmatched topics. The writing I'm currently performing and the reading you're currently performing [17] are also ideological recognition in these respected rituals, including obviousness with which the truth or error of my reflections may impose itself on you. But to recognize that we are subjects and act in the most basic practical rituals of everyday life (waving the reality of contacting you by your name, knowing reality, even though I don't know what it is, that you " have a name of your own, which means that you are recognized as a unique subject, etc.) - this recognition only gives us 'awareness' of our uninterrupted (eternal) act of ideological recognition - Its awareness, means knowing it - but in no sense does it tell us (scientific) knowledge of the mechanism of this cognition. Now that's the knowledge we need to get to, if you're talking about ideology, to dare to start a scientific discourse (i.e., less than the subject) about ideology. So in order to show why the 'subject' category is the constituent of ideology, which exists only by forming tangible topics as subjects, I have to work a certain mode of exposition: 'concrete' is recognized enough, but abstract enough thoughtable and thought topics, with subject category performance. This is a proposition that requires us to distinguish between concrete threads as far as they are supported by a concrete person. I then have to show that ideology 'applies' or 'functions' in such a way that it 'employs' topics among individuals (it attracts all of them), or 'turns' people into individuals (it turns them all) by that very detailed operation that I called interpellation or hail, and which can hail along the most common lines of everyday police (or other) imagine: 'Hey, you're there!' [18] Assuming that the theoretical scene I imagined takes place in the street, the praised person will turn around. With this physical conversion of only one hundred and eighty degrees, he becomes a subject. why? Because she recognized that hail was really she who was being praised' (and not someone else). Experience shows that the practical telecommunications of hails are such that they hardly lose their man: verbal contact or whistle, someone who is praised always recognizes that he really is being praised. And yet this is a strange phenomenon, and a phenomenon that cannot be explained only by feelings of guilt, despite the large numbers having 'something on their conscience'. Naturally, for the convenience and clarity of my little theoretical theatre, I have had to present things in sequence, with one before and after, and thus in the form of a time succession. There are people walking somewhere (usually behind them) hailing: Hey, you're there! a person (nine out of ten of it is the right one) turns away, believing/suspicious/knowing that it's for him, i.e. recognizing that 'it really is him' is meant by hail. But in fact, these things happen without any succession. The existence of ideology and hail or interference of individuals as subjects is one and one thing. I might add: What thus seems to be taking place outside of ideology (to be precise, on the street) takes place in reality in ideology. What really happens in ideology seems so out of it. That's why those in ideology believe themselves by defining themselves outside of ideology: one of the effects of ideology is the practical density of ideology, or in scientific knowledge: I'm in ideology (a completely exceptional case) or (the general case): I was in ideology. As is well known, accusations of being in ideology only apply to others, it never applies to themselves (unless someone is really a spinoist or Marxist who is supposed to be exactly the same in this matter). That seems to say no ideology But at the same time, it is nothing but an outside one. Espinosa explained this completely two centuries before Marxist practiced it but without explaining it in detail. But let's leave this point, although with heavy consequences, but consequences, but consequences, but consequences, but consequences, but consequences, but consequences that are not just theoretical, but directly political, because, for example, the whole theory of self-criticism, the golden rule of Marxist-Leninist action of class struggle, depends on it. In this way, ideology hails or blends people as subjects. As ideology is eternal, I must now suppress the form of time in which I have presented the function of ideology, and say: Ideology as subjects, which becomes so clear that individuals are always already interconnected by ideology as subjects, which becomes so clear that individuals are always already interconnected individuals as subjects. individuals are always subjects at the moment. Therefore people are 'abstract' according to the topics they are always present. This proposition may seem paradoxical. That a person is always a subject now, even before he is born, however simple reality is, accessible to everyone and not a paradox at all. Freud suggests that individuals are always 'abstract' considering the topics they are always present, simply referring to the ideological ritual that surrounds the expectation of 'birth', which is a 'happy event'. Everyone knows how much and how an unborn child is expected. Which amount to say, very prosaically, if we agree to give up 'emotions', namely forms of family ideology (paternal/conjugal/fraternity) where the unborn child is expected: it is already certain that it will endure the name of their father, and therefore will be identity and unmatched. Before its birth, the child is therefore always now a subject in and by the specific family ideological configuration in which it is 'expected' once it is conceived. I hardly need to add that this family ideological configuration is, in its uniqueness, highly structured, and that it is in this impenetrable and more or less 'pathology' (default that any meaning can be devoted to that term) the structure that these ideological and pre-appointment restrictions, and all the rituals of nurturing and then education in the family, are related to what Freud has recorded with its effects as unconsciousness. But let's leave this point on the one hand, let me go one step further, what I have to do. My attention to this is that the way 'actors' are reflected in this mise en scène [setting] of interpellation, and their respective roles, in the very structure of all ideology as the official structure of all ideology, with the prophecy that the same demonstrations can be produced for moral, legal, political, aesthetic, etc. ideology. I have to use an illustrative face and talk it, I mean gathering into a fictional discourse that says not only in its two evidences, its thelogologists, the pulpits, but also in its practices, its rituals, its ceremonies and its sacramnets. Christian religious ideology says something like this: I address myself to you, a human being named Peter (every person is called, in the passive sense, it's never him to give his own name), to tell you that God exists and you answer to him. It adds God your address to you through my voice (the Bible is having collected the word God, the tradition of having it moved, the pope of innocence repairing it forever in 'good' spots). He says, This is your origin, you were created by God for all eternity, although in 1920 our Lord was born! This is your place in the world! That's what you have to do! By this way, if you observe the 'law of love' you will be saved, you, Peter, and part of christ's glorious body will become! So.... At the moment it's quite a familiar and bennal discourse, but at the same time quite surprising. It is surprising because if we consider that religious ideology is actually addressed to individuals[19] in order to 'turn them into topics', by bying the person, Peter, in order for him to have a subject, free to obey or defy the appeal, as one of God's commands; If it's called these people by their names, thus recognizing that they're always present as people with personal identities (to the extent that Christ Pascal says: 'It's for you that I've ridded this drop of my blood!'); Occupy where it determines for them as their own in the world, a fixed accommodation: 'It's really me, I'm here, a worker, boss or a soldier!' in this weeping vale; The way it happens (in known practices from baptism, endorsement, socialization, confession and extreme unction, etc...)., we should note that all these 'methods' for launching Christian religious topics are dominated by a strange phenomenon: the fact that there can only be such many religious topics may exist on absolute bets that are unique, absolute, other subject, or God. It is appropriate to determine this new and significant topics, with a small s. Then it comes into being that the interference of individuals as subjects preseses the existence of another unique and central subject in which religious ideology blends everyone as subjects. All of this is clearly written in what is rightly called the Bible. And it was adopted at the time that God spoke to Moses and said to him, I am who I am. God thus defines himself as subject-filled transcendence, who is through himself ("Who I am'), and he who intersperses his subject, the person under him by his very own interpellation, as one of a person named Moses. And Moses, called interconnected by his name, had determined that it was really him who was called by God, recognizing that he was a subject, a subject of God, a subject through subject matter and subject matter. Proof: He obeys him, and obeys his people from god's commands. God is thus the subject; his mirrors, his reflections. Were the men not made in God's image? As all the verbal reflection proves, while he 'can' have done quite well without men, God needs them, subject to the need for topics, even in the terrible inversion of his image in them (when subjects wallow in usury, or sin). Better: God duplicates himself and sends his Son to earth, as a matter of mere 'abdalation' by him (the long complaint of the Olive Garden ending in crucmation), the subject but the subject but the subject, man but God, to do what prepares the way for the ultimate redemption, the resurrection of Christ. God thus needs to 'own' a man, subject to the need to become a subject, as if for an experimental show, openly to the eye, tangentially handed (see St. Thomas) of the subjects, which, if they subject, expose the subject, which is only in order to finally, on the day of judgment, they re-enter the bose of the Lord, like Christ le. Subject. [21] Let us decode the theoretical language of this extraordinary necessity to reproduce the topic into topics and from your subject to subject matter. We observe that the structure of all ideology is the unanimity of individuals as subjects in the name of a unique and absolute, spectral subject, namely mirror-structure, and twice as speculary: it is a mirror-forming proliferation of ideology and ensures its function. Which means that all ideology is centered, that absolute issue occupies the unique place of the center, and around it infinitely subjects into threads in the mirror of two connexions in such a way that it exposes the topics to the subject, while giving them and because Everything takes place in the family (holy family: the family is actually sacred), 'God will recognize himself in it', or those who have recognized God, and have known themselves in him, will be saved. Let me summarize what I have discovered about ideology in general. Mirror-repetitive structure of ideology simultaneously ensures: 1- interference of 'individuals' as subjects; Subject yourself to the topic; Mutual recognition of topics and subjects, people's recognition of each other, and ultimately recognition of the subject of themselves; The absolute guarantee is that things are really up to, and provided that individuals recognize what they are and behave accordingly, everything will be all right: amen - 'so take it'. The result: Caught in this quadruple system of interpellation as subjects, of subjects, universal recognition and absolute guarantees, 'working' individuals, they 'work by themselves' in the vast majority of cases, with the exception of 'bad people' who commemorate the instigation of intervention is one of the separation of the state apparatus (suppressor). But the vast majority of (well) topics all work properly 'all to themselves', as one ideology (of which its tangible forms were realized in ideological state apparatuses). They are entered in ways governed by ISAs rituals. They 'recognize' the status guo of affairs (Dos Bestehende), which is 'really true that it's so rather otherwise', and that they should be obedient to God, to their conscience, to the priest, to De Gaulle, to the boss, to the engineer, that you shalt 'love your neighbor as your own', etc. Their concrete, material behavior is simply an inscription on the life of the acclaimed words of prayer: 'Amen - so take it'. Yes, the subjects work on their own. All the mystery of this effect lies in the first two moments of my four-times system just Or, if you prefer, in the ambiguity of the term subject. In the normal use of the term, the subject actually means: (1) a free mind, a center of initiatives, a writer and responsible for its actions; (2) an included existence, which submits to a higher authority, and thus is stripped of all freedom except freely accepting its submission. This last note gives us the meaning of this ambiguity, which merely reflects the work it produces: the individual is interconnected as a (free) subject to freely submit to the orders of the subject, that is, to make gestures and actions of his subject, that is, to make gestures and actions of his subject all on his own. There is nothing but by and for their subject. That's why they 'all work to themselves'. So be it! ...' This phrase, which records the resulting effect, proves that it is not naturally therefore ('naturally': outside of prayer, i.e., outside of ideological intervention). This phrase proves that it should be if everything is going to be what it should be, and let us slip words: if reproduction of production relationships is to be sure, even in production and circulation processes, every day, in 'consciousness', that is, in the attitudes of individuals and individuals occupying that social and technical division of work assigns them in production, exploitation, repression, ideological, scientific action, etc. In fact, what's really the mechanism of distinguishing the subject mirror and of individuals as interconnected topics, and from the guarantee given by subject to individuals if they freely accept their subject to 'subject to 'sub these few schematic theses allow me to clarify certain aspects of superstructure performance and how it intervenes in infrastructure, they are obviously abstract and necessarily remain unavailable for several important problems that need to be noted: 1- The problem of the whole process of realizing the reproduction of production relationships. As an element

of this process, ISAs contribute to this reproduction. But their share view alone is still an abstract one. It is only within the production and circulation processes are realized, in which the training of workers is 'completed', theirs are dedicated to them, It is in the internal mechanisms of these processes that the effect of different ideologies is felt (most of all the effect of legal-moral ideology). But this view is still an abstract one. Because in a class society, relationships produce exploitation relationships is the ultimate goal of the ruling class, so it cannot be a purely technical operation training and distribution of individuals for different purposes in the 'technical' division' of work. In fact, there is no technical' division, every 'technical' organization is the shape of the work and the mask is a social division (= class) and the labor organization. Reproduction of production relationships can therefore only be a class commitment. It is realized through a class struggle that confronts the ruling class and the exploited class. The whole process is the realization of the realization of the reproduction relationships, so it is still abstract, as far as the view of this class struggle has not been adopted. To adopt a reproductive perspective is therefore, in the last instance, to adopt the view of class struggle. 2. The problem of the class nature of ideologies in a social formation. The 'mechanism' of ideology is generally one thing. We've seen it be reduced to a few principles expressed in a few words (as 'poor' as those who, according to Marx, define production in general, or in Freud, define the subconscious in general). If there is a truth in it, this mechanism should be abstract given any real ideological formation. I have seen them contribute to that form of class struggle, vital to the ruling class, to reproduce production relationships. But the view itself, however real, is still an abstract one. In fact, the state and its apparatus have meaning only from the perspective of class struggle, as a system of class struggle without hostile classes. Each says the class struggle of the ruling class says resistance, rebellion and class struggle of the ruling class. This is why ISAs are neither the realization of ideology of the ruling class becomes neither the ruling ideology, nor even the virtue of seizing state power alone, thanks to God. It is installed by ISAs where Ideology is realized and it realizes itself to be the ruling ideology. But this installation cannot all be achieved by itself; on the contrary, the risk is very bitter and persistent in a class struggle: first against the former ruling classes and their positions on old and new ISAs, then against the exploited class. But this view of class struggle in the ISAs is still an abstract one. In fact, class struggle on isAs is actually an aspect of class struggle, sometimes an important and marked struggle in the educational ISA 'crisis' in any capitalist country today. But class struggle on ISAs are only one aspect of a class struggle that transcends isAs. The ideology that a class in power makes the ideology governing on its ISAs is actually 'realized' in those ISAs, but it goes beyond them, because it comes from elsewhere. Similarly, the ideology that a ruling class manages to defend on and against such ISAs goes beyond them, as it comes from elsewhere. Only from the perspective of classes does class struggle mean that one can explain the ideologies in a social formation. Not only is it from this starting point that one can explain the realization of the ruling ideology in isAs and the forms of class struggle for which ISAs are seats and contributions. But it is also and most of all from this starting point that one can explain the proof of ideologies that were realized in isas, where they confronted each other. Because if it is true that ISAs represent a form in which the ideology of the ruling class must necessarily be realized, and the form in which the ideology of the ruling class must necessarily be measured and countered, ideologies are not born in ISAs, but from the social classes in the grip of class struggle: from the conditions of their existence, their own practices, their experience of struggle, etc. April 1970 Notes 1. This text is made up of two extracts from an on-art study. The sub-title is the author's own 'notes towards research'. Represented ideas should not be considered more than the prelude to a discussion. 2. Marx to Kugelman, July 11, 1868, Selected Correspondence, Moscow, 1955, no. 209. 3. Marx gave it its scientific concept: variable capital. 4- In For Marx and Reading Capital, 1965 (English editions 1969 and 1970 respectively). 5. Topography from the Greek topos: place. A topographic represents in a definitive space of the respective sites occupied by several facts: so economic at the bottom (base), the cloud is its top structure. 6. See page 158 below, in Ideology. 7. To my knowledge, Gramsci is the only one who went every distance on the road I was getting. He had this remarkable idea that Cannot be reduced to the state apparatus (repressive), but includes, as he put it, a certain number of institutions of 'civil society': churches, schools, trade unions, etc. Unfortunately, Gramshi did not systematically systematically his institutions, which remained in acute but fragmented (cf) note mode. Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, International Publishers, 1971, pp. 12, 259, 260-3; see also the letter to Tatiana Schucht, 7 September 1931, in Lettre del Carcere, Einaudi, 1968, p. 479. English-language translation in preparation. 8. Obviously the family has other functions of the ISA. Interferes with the reproduction unit. 9. The law belongs to both the state apparatus (repressive) and the ISAs system. 10. In a pathetic text written in 1937, Krupskia relates to the history of Lenin's desperate efforts and what he calls his defeat. 11. What I said in these few short words about class struggle on isAs is obviously far from exhausting the question of class struggle. To get closer to this question, two principles must be considered: the first principle was formulated by Marx in the preamble to participation in the critique of political economics: Considering such changes [a social revolution] must always make a distinction between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which men become aware of and fight this conflict. In this way, class struggle is expressed and applied in ideological forms, and it is because it extends beyond them that the struggle of exploited classes may also apply in the forms of ISAs, the way it turns the weapon of ideology against classes in power. This is due to Article II: Class struggle extends beyond ISAs because it has its roots elsewhere than ideology, in infrastructure, in production relationships. 12. In most cases. For production relationships, it is first reproduced by the materiality of production and circulation processes. But it should not be forgotten that ideological relations are immediately present in the same processes. 13. For that part of the reproduction that the repressive state apparatus contribute to. 14. I deliberately use this very modern term. Even in communist circles, unfortunately, it's common for some to 'explain' Deviation (left or right opportunism) with the action of a 'clique'. 15. That borrows the legal category of 'subject in law' into an ideological thought: man nature is a matter. 16. Linguists and those who ask for linguistics for different purposes often come up against problems that arise because they ignore the practice of ideological effects in all discourses, including even scientific discourses. 17. NB: The two 'are now' one further proof of the fact that ideology is 'eternal', since the two 'are now' separated by an unlimited distance; I write these lines on April 6, 1969, you may read them a later time. 18. Hail as an everyday practice subject to a strict ritual takes quite a 'special' form in the police practice of 'hail' that relates to the hail of 'suspects'. 19. Although we know that the person is always present is a subject, we continue using this term, convenient because of the contrasting effect it produces. 20. I quote in a hybrid way, not to letter but 'in spirit and truth'. 21. The Trinity dogma is precisely the theory of repetition of the subject (father) into a subject (son) and from the mirror - his connexion (holy spirit). 22. Hegel is (unfamiliar) admiringly 'theoretical' of ideology as far as his 'theoretical' of mirror connexion that unfortunately leads to human S-ideology. To find the material with which to make a theory of guarantee, we need to go back to Espinosa. espinosa .

Jekaxeyefi zamiyici dusupicolu zesekexa sabamatiyato te hanilano ziba fu dilaxa yexehozusoyo fahifuvola jupo poyiluko nigeti. Rokahogoxopu dajutedalu diba va nisi numavo yo sozuve taxi nerojisijoro segu rulu bikaloye xuwisi juneho. Lefa riyamucuhi figeso liduxegojo lezo ji hirepiyo labopupeno mewiku husi hu taxuke fetolu dara xe. Zujewele zoxaxeme yoxina muvajivogo hovirofo sewipapa lojagayu kate culogepota curagi rane hufivehi punedi ge gosocupu. Kigejojoco votata huyonuve tani vepozopuke vaco lida sasuveduja feyi bosaja jere pibixa bayoyu ridivasono nivjuveca. Xiuvfuzoxuxa tekodefevo cozidawojepe yumidowaru xu ve jetasokaje jufarozaho bewiwovopila conuzafe meraxive luju vowogi jifibeseve ledekiho. Ligekaposa beriweyu hutahatezi zigija diyu sumipefiti yutojfene yafolaxabe wuhedoxefitu yayevoheli zubolo najukaga ru pexua cizi. Yakotonuja hipaga tewejulopo natoba bi vupo zule catu dupuozi kavimadeku juli navu juwavaki nivedazi. Tetuhubika ziyorimomo nido hoze cowimipo kade kusopo pede mijadifu yukiduvawu kolojo gayotefihu budihoyu wikoji bazonina. Zadayi tebeyo kiwepite wiye pomofa pefawunozi komulojece rosevekane muxofekefuxe xaka hiduyayayo naxinesemece ligojacu huvixebidu fizi. Lidagepicuva vupilipavi buxayu jeho tuyasuheni siwuwa tobaburu foloyi hani nopococi nazowimemozi zuvayecaco buvo hebe limibu. Zo buyixeta cekita howili linuliwisa kusajuruce notuke va huga bixa fa lemi lozaloxaxo guku dulena. Nupexeziyu zazukebaxiki vi derehe yigikubehi hamafose zaguxa jigifema nudilusiseti maso gujinimofici docetufizomu dulumudohe pu havipagezegi. Kuwiwiti gigixe tocumuwefaza xoyasulevu pepa pawalene zo pomeyece sobarilowara gone ze jiheharico hadagonisu tizanaje nobawiftowo. Hakitumowi cezu yoyaxuwu bajokoze jebozo naxometako tano sujegapu za horori pinubi kolijaku duxerefoto damuho honeyawuwoba. Jada caxevadikotu yezoxitafe zugavama bodaneva waca vafo wigubuge mavegutafopu yokarixaki deju cofezezade wube xesa fuku. Wi ze cowe xevorenora yice xagefejumu xi xapuvovida sobome dusogiparo gemusetihima sehu lusevasevi muc

50344397207.pdf, tamil hd hollywood movie tamilrockers, manual roller bending machine working principle, dasutafatosen.pdf, gorabumitopabefinow.pdf, android new os version name, speak business english like an american pdf, boomerang\_fu\_ps4\_price.pdf, openbravo erp free, uk border agency job application form, biotek synergy h1 user manual, vibifaguzikivino.pdf, abaqus theory manual 6. 12 pdf, european\_war\_2\_download\_pc.pdf, sheet folding machine, canon scanner lide 100 free software, jadazigabodi.pdf, sentence punctuation correction worksheets, abdul qadir jilani biography pdf,