
UNIT 4 HISTORY, IDEOLOGY AND SOCIETY

Structure

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Ideology in History
- 4.3 Meaning of Ideology
- 4.4 Some Later Writers
- 4.5 Summary
- 4.6 Exercises
- 4.7 Suggested Readings

4.1 INTRODUCTION

An ideology consists of a system of views, beliefs and ideas. It may render support for a socio-economic formation (along with its political position and alignments) by corroborating the latter's legitimacy in terms of some acceptable norms, cultural preferences and/or theoretical understanding of society and human living. Necessarily, the scope of an ideological position spreads over a wide range of human social appraisals and their choices about economic relations, ethical norms, religious faith, aesthetic appreciation, philosophical thought and political judgment. The question of support should not be taken only as encouragement for some *status quo*. An ideology may be linked to supporting a social order which is yet to emerge in actual reality. Indeed, any visionary aspiration for a major social change can form the core of an appropriate ideological thrust. An ideology can then be conservative, or radical, or even a mixture of those contrary trends. Thus, history abounds in examples of several conflicting ideologies in the same society, some bent on defending the *status quo*, and others striving for reforms or even a revolutionary social transformation to change the prevailing order of things. The important point is that ideologies contain and maintain visions of history and **create certain predispositions in interpreting history**.

4.2 IDEOLOGY IN HISTORY

History embraces past, present, and future. The future is yet to happen. It is real only in the sense of being what the interested people may envisage through their understanding of the past and the present. Such understanding of different persons and groups may be quite variable. Time past and time present are both perhaps present in time future. Any human society in historical process is not fully known on the evidence alone of what has actually happened. It calls for a perception of what is yet to happen and remains unknown from what is already known. The ideological elements have their important role in a historical account to commingle all those dimensions.

An example from ancient Greece may be taken to focus on the point in question. Thucydides, a citizen of Athens in the fourth and fifth centuries B.C., wrote a history of *The Peloponnesian War*. The cities at war were Athens and Sparta. Athens was a democratic state (but the slaves were precluded from all rights and the city was full of slaves at the peak of her liberty) and, from the 6th century B.C. onwards, had been passing through changes bearing on democratic advance, maritime extensions and naval power. In addition to expanding trade, maritime superiority led to the rise and growth

of an Athenian empire. All this could account for far-reaching changes in the ways of Athenian life and thought. On the contrary, Sparta was subject to oligarchic rule and extremely conservative in its attitude to economic activity and social design of living, their sanctions and prohibitions.

Though an Athenian, Thucydides was an anti-democrat and had little sympathy for the changes in Athens breaking away from her old moorings. In several places of *The Peloponnesian War*, Thucydides made descriptions and comments which betrayed his oligarchic sympathies. Also the coverage of the subject as planned by him concluded with the defeat of Athens in 404 B.C. While such an end could be used to demonstrate the weaknesses of the democratic systems, the actual course of events in the subsequent year moved in a different direction. Even with their largely diminished manpower, the Athenian democrats rallied back and defeated the oligarchic forces which were ruling Athens with the support of a Spartan garrison stationed in the city. No doubt the clash of interests between the democrats and the oligarchs had its links with variable economic interests. On the whole, however, the sway of particular moral principles, the conflicting points of view evoked by different beliefs and cultural preferences had considerable influence in the choice of sides in Greek history. This is where we do find an element of ideological import in the history written by Thucydides.

The 'middle ages' appear to be a handy label to denote the period dividing the Greco-Roman antiquity in Europe from its modern times. This stage of history was characterised by the feudal society and economy. The hierarchy of the feudal landlords, their different levels, the church with its clerical arrangements, and the toiling peasantry mostly bound to serfdom, required that the relatively lower strata would be obliged to render some specified service to the king, the noblesse and the clergy. The typical forms of division among the people according to their status and the legal place were known as social estates (e.g. the nobles and the gentry constituting the higher estates; the peasants, petty artisans and tradesmen belonging to the lower estates). The dominant form of social existence among the peasant workers was known as serfdom. For the allotment of land received from the lord, the serfs were subject to the compulsion of unpaid labour service on the lord's lands. Accordingly, the arrangement was based on labour rent. The feudal system passed through several forms of rent payment (viz. labour, kind, money) over time. It had its own dynamic phase (10th – 12th centuries) of expansion and improvements. Eventually, however, the rise of the bourgeoisie along with the tendencies of more and more independent production units coming to existence and expansion of trade led to the collapse of the feudal system. The role of peasant revolts was crucial in the process of abolition of feudalism.

The feudal order had its own ideology of self-defence and legitimation. A system of ideas and beliefs did emerge to glorify the interests and actions of the ruling forces. For example, the idea of chivalry associated with the feudal knights placed a large premium on their role as protectors of the weak and defenders of the Christian faith. No unbiased views and observations would however bear out the truth of such an estimate of medieval knights. Indeed, much of the content of medieval ideology was derived from a concept of God ordaining that the prime over of life and of human history is located outside the world. It follows that human destinies are invariably determined by the will of God. For the believers in God as such, what really matters in history is not the transitory greatness of empires, but salvation or damnation in a world to come.

A meaningful aspect of this kind of other-worldliness was noted by Karl Mannheim, 'As long as the clerically and feudally organised mediaeval order was able to locate its paradise outside of society, in some other-worldly sphere which transcended history and dulled its revolutionary edge, the idea of paradise was still an integral part of mediaeval society. Not until certain social groups embodied their wish-images into their actual

conduct and tried to realize them, did these ideologies become utopian' (*Ideology and Utopia*, Ch. IV).

In large parts of Europe, particularly in its western countries, the middle ages were superseded by the beginning and development of capitalism. It was a historical transition ranging over four centuries which were distinguished by an unprecedented advance of science, and far reaching technological-cum-organisational changes in material production. As for the corresponding changes in human thought and values, we should take note of the religious movement of Reformation (16th Century) starting in Germany and the Renaissance developing primarily in Italy and then in Elizabethan England. The rise of humanist culture and a series of important scientific discoveries accounted for the main features of the Renaissance philosophical thought. Humanism placed a large premium on freedom of the individual, opposed religious asceticism and vindicated man's right to pleasure and satisfaction of earthly desires and requirements. Some of the most prominent humanists were Petrarch, Dante, Boccaccio, Leonardo da Vinci, Bruno, Copernicus, Shakespeare and Francis Bacon. In the Renaissance sense, humanism conceived of God as approving all those views propagated from its position. The negative feature of this kind of humanism was its distance from the working people and their issues of suffering and distress. Thus in the class context, it could at best be an ideology of the nascent bourgeoisie of Europe in those days.

The religious *Reformation* had a similar bias. Pitted against the principles of Catholicism and the Papacy, it facilitated the emergence of secular, national states. Martin Luther (1483-1546), an eminent and also the earliest leader of the *Reformation*, denied that the church and the clergy could be mediators between man and God. But he could neither be positive in his views on the positions helping the material interests of German burghers, nor support the ideas of early burghers, nor promote the ideas of early bourgeois humanism. Luther supported the ruling classes during the Peasant War (1525). Marx's comment in this connection is noteworthy, 'Luther has conquered slavery based on belief in god only, by substituting for it slavery based on conviction'.

The position of John Calvin (1509-1564) was different. He held that in response to one's 'calling', the committed person could prove his worth for God's grace. No other means of salvation are available since, like Luther, Calvin also rules out the scope of clerical mediation between man and God. It follows that the quantity and quality of work in this world remains the only route of human salvation. Asceticism in spending was considered to be an attribute that would aid saving and accumulation. This is how the Calvinist ethic of *Reformation* comes to fit in with the requirements of capitalism in history. Marx Weber (1864-1930), the well-known German sociologist, distinguished for his studies in the relation of Protestant ethic to capitalism, observed, 'Asceticism was in turn influenced in its development and its character by the totality of social conditions, especially economic. The modern man is, in general, even with the best will, unable to give religious ideas a significance for culture and national character which they deserve. But it is, of course, not my aim to substitute for a one-sided materialistic an equally one-sided spiritualistic causal interpretation of culture and history'. (*The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Ch V). The most important aspect of such formulations about the reciprocity between economic religious and the extensive cultural spheres relates the ideological pulls and pushes of the participants in the process of history.

The rise of economic individualism and *laissez faire* accounted for a new balance of relations between religion, state, and civil society. The principal strength of a new leadership for the capitalist transition and its social goals obtained in the redemption of private property and its uses from the political and religious obligations of the feudal order and its ecclesiastical authority wielded by the church. Thus, along with its economic

prominence, the challenge of the bourgeoisie had to work itself through manifold levels of religious beliefs and attitudes, priorities of value judgment and numerous other aspects of human social living and culture. All this would be incumbent on the nascent capitalist forces in the process of achieving their social hegemony.

The ideological contributions of the Renaissance and the Reformation have already been noted. What comes next in European history's chronology of the transformation of society and ideas is the Enlightenment, a major event of intellectual history beginning roughly after the Glorious Revolution in England in 1688 and ending with the French Revolution a century later. Diderot, Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Adam Smith, Goethe, Schiller and many other thinkers of abiding importance were among the followers of the philosophy of Enlightenment. They proceeded from the first assumption that enlightened individual consciousness would have a decisive role in the elimination of social wrongs and vices. Their aim was to spread ideas of goodness, liberty, justice and scientific knowledge. Despite their differences, the common points could be taken as a materialist view of human beings, relentless optimism about man's progress through education and some utilitarian notions about society and ethics.

The linkage of the Enlightenment philosophies with the ethos of capitalism is revealed as we take account of their main principles of social life and organisation. Such common denominators of the Enlightenment thought are autonomy of individuals, freedom, the equality of all men, the universality of law, inviolability of contract, toleration and the right to private property. It is noteworthy that the aforesaid elements are essential for a system of market exchange. The idealised social norms of the Enlightenment then imply an all-round accreditation of capitalism.

4.3 MEANING OF IDEOLOGY

Probably, the word 'ideology' was first used in France by rationalist philosophers to indicate what was then understood as the philosophy of the human mind. In English usage, ideology conveyed the meaning of the science of ideas. The analytical emphasis on scientific social ideas had an important role in the promotion of the Enlightenment philosophies which largely contributed to the making of the French Revolution of 1789. This revolution faced numerous difficulties in achieving popular sovereignty. By the end of the following decade, there occurred the *coup d'état* of Napoleon Bonaparte (Napoleon – I), who criticised the Enlightenment philosophers for diffusing metaphysics and a critical failure to adapt their socio-political ideas 'to a knowledge of the human heart and the lessons of history'. Napoleon's attack imparted to ideology a sense of having unreal, impractical and even fanatical tendencies.

Napoleon blamed the ideologues, for they misled the people by elevating them to a sovereignty which the same people were incapable of application. He berated the principles of enlightenment as ideology. An element of rationalisation becomes a feature of ideology. It is not rationalisation in the sense of direct action to improve something, nor in the sense of finding appropriate theoretical principles to explain some empirical observations. The ideologues' support for popular sovereignty must have been based on their views about the people and their capacity. Napoleon's critique implies that the ideologues considered people more as what they would like them to be, and less as what those people were in actual reality. This is a kind of rationalisation influencing the habit of mind inclined to promote ideologies.

In an important sense, Napoleon's emphasis on 'knowledge of the human heart and the lessons of history' also had an ideological nuance opposed to the position of the Enlightenment thinkers. This is a case of conflict between democratic and

undemocratic sanctions about the nature of political power. Not that Napoleon's pleas for singular one-man authority could justify itself on any historical criterion of universal excellence. He had to be a creature of pure and simple pragmatism. In some circumstances, pragmatism may serve as the way out of an immediate problem. But even pragmatism cannot rid itself of a rather mundane ideological dictum enjoining that 'nothing succeeds like success'. As we have already noted, every ideology grows either in support or in opposition to an existing social order, its economy, politics, and culture. The variable patterns of cognitive and moral beliefs embedded in different ideologies can then have a vital influence on the historical processes of action, reaction and change.

Let us note the two different senses in which the term ideology has been used in the evolution of human thought about history and society. It may mean a set of ideas belonging to any particular society. Such ideas are likely to differ from one class to another, reflecting separate class interests, which can be antagonistic or conciliatory. This is how an ideology comes to have the label of being 'bourgeois' or 'proletarian' and so on and so forth. An ideology of a class cannot but have the tendency of justifying the particular interests thereof. The usual manner of such justification consists in projecting that the promotion of particular interests, under consideration, conforms to the general well being of the entire society.

The other usage of the term ideology is pejorative. It means a delusion born of false observation and inference, the sense in which Napoleon sharply criticised the ideologies of popular sovereignty. The critique implied a kind of distinction between knowledge based on sensible experience and ideology. In their early writings, criticising the mode and content of Hegelian idealism, Marx and Engels applied the term ideology in this sense. They had the same critical approach while exposing the limitations of Ludwig Feuerbach's materialism. Marx's critiques of the Hegelian philosophies of the *State* (1843) and *Right* (1843-44) and his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (1844) made no explicit mention of ideology. The emphasis was on the inversions of Hegel. For example, the true relationship of thought to being is that being is subject and thought the predicate; Hegel sets thought as the subject and being as the predicate.

The Hegelian inversions led to innumerable ambiguities and erratic conclusions. To cite a few of them, Hegel's apotheosis of an authoritarian absolute state did not fit in with his stated course of history as the progress towards consciousness of freedom. Further Hegel's idea of God creating man entails an inversion of the same kind. Ludwig Feuerbach, himself a radical Hegelian, rightly argued in his book *The Essence of Christianity* (1814) that God is a creation of man in his own image, invoking the human ideals of knowledge, will and love endowed with infinite power. In connection with this theme, Marx analysed the nature of religion, tracing its roots in the contradictions and sufferings of the real world: 'Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.' (*Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Introduction*).

In his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (1844), Marx no longer travelled only in the world of philosophy. His criticism then extends to the economic relations obtaining in a capitalist society. This was Marx's first analysis of alienated labour and its severe contradictions in the domain of private capitalist property. Also, some significant points were made on the motives of greed and envy working as serious obstacles to human redemption from the bondage of alienation.

Another important text planned and prepared by Marx and Engels during 1845-46 was not published during their lifetime. It (*The German Ideology*) appeared for the first time in Moscow in 1932. In his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of*

Political Economy (1859), Marx referred to the then unpublished manuscript to *The German Ideology* in the following words :

‘We resolved to work out together the opposition of our view to the ideological view of German Philosophy, in fact to settle accounts with our previous philosophical conscience. The resolve was carried out in the form of criticism of post-Hegelian philosophy. The manuscript, two large octavo volumes, had long reached its place of publication in Westphalia when we received the news that altered circumstances did not allow of its being printed. We abandoned the manuscript to the gnawing criticism of the mice all the more willingly since we had achieved our main purpose – self-clarification.’

Marx and Engels started as radical Hegelians. This clarifies their move ‘to settle accounts with our previous philosophical conscience’. Confirming their departure from Hegelian idealism, *The German Ideology* presents the first Marxian statement of historical evolution through different stages conditioned by the nexus of productive forces and production relations. Indeed, the focus of observation shifts from ideas to practical human – sensuous activity. Marx observed in his eighth thesis on Feuerbach, ‘All social life is essentially practical. All the mysteries which urge theory into mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice’. (*Theses on Feuerbach, 1845*). He was also critical of all materialism incapable of understanding the object as sensuous human activity, as practice.

The term ideology appears in the very title of the book. The inversion that is involved relates to treating consciousness as prior to material reality. Marx holds that the critical human problems are rooted in real social contradictions. It is utterly misleading to trace their origin in mistaken ideas. The book’s preface had an amusing story from Marx to prove the point :

‘Once upon a time an honest fellow had the idea that men were drowned in water only because they were possessed with the idea of gravity. If they were to knock this idea out of their heads, say by stating it to be a superstition, a religious idea, they would be sublimely proof against any danger from water. His whole life long he fought against the illusion of gravity, of whose harmful results all statistics brought him new and manifold evidence. The honest fellow was the type of new revolutionary philosophers in Germany.’

In the subsequent theoretical writings of Marx we find little or no use of the term ideology. No doubt, the major books of this genre are *Grundrisse* (1857-58), *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), and *Capital* (vol.1, 1867). Further, a detailed analysis of the historical evolution of economic thought was contained in the three volumes of the *Theories of Surplus Value* (1861-63) which have their own significance and help us to assess the relativity of economic thought in reference to the different stages of capitalist development in Europe, especially that of England and France. Again, Marx expressed his reactions to many events happening in contemporary Europe and commented on the omissions and commissions affecting the strategies opposed to capitalism e.g., *A Critique of the Gotha Programme* (1875). In this critique we get a glimpse of some Marxian ideas about the course of historical transition from capitalism to socialism, the distributive and executive problems bearing upon the elementary and the advanced stages of socialism. The advanced stage ushers in the arrival of communism, which features a classless society capable of fulfilling all the needs of each and every person, thus ensuring complete and effective freedom for the entire people. As for the collapse of capitalism, Marx focuses on the growing contradictions between capitalist private property, its tendencies of ever-growing

accumulation along with scientific advance of productive forces and the insatiable urge of capital to maximize profits at the expense of the proletariat. It is through these antinomies of the process of capitalist expansion that the capital-labour production relation becomes a fetter on the advance of productive forces. Marx sets forth the logic of socialist revolution as follows: 'The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.' (*Capital vol. I, ch. 32*).

We have noted already that the use of the word ideology is extremely rare in Marx's later texts. Of the two senses of ideology, the strictly negative one had also been taken as synonymous with false consciousness in some writings of Engels. Even in its negative uses, ideology referred to distortions with a view to veiling some contradictions in reality. While capitalism abounds in contradictions and brings severe distress to the exploited, the bourgeois ideology, in Marx's words, presents the system as the 'very Eden of the innate rights of man. There alone rule, Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham'. And so, the synonymy of ideology and false consciousness may be misleading without appropriate specification of the contraries which are being concealed.

Moreover, in his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), Marx observed that 'The distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic – in short ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out'. Such ideological forms neither express false consciousness, nor are they pure delusious. Marx is taking account of an entire cultural complex and its manifold dimensions. Lenin made exactly the same use of the term ideology and often specified the class that was associated with a system of ideas (e.g. bourgeois ideology, proletarian ideology). Antonio Gramsci, a leading Italian Marxist of the early twentieth century, often cited the above-noted passage of Marx in order to strengthen his arguments about the importance of the ideological dimensions of social hegemony.

The importance of ideological forms in any social order can also be linked to Marx's conceptualisation of the base and superstructure as a clue to our understanding the relation of a society's sphere of economic activity to its manifestations of social living in law, religion, arts, philosophy and politics. Marx's point is that the sum total of production relations at the economic base constitutes the economic structure of society. This is the real foundations on which rises a legal and political structure and to which corresponds definite forms of social consciousness and their expressions.

The particular metaphor of base and superstructure carries a suggestion of economic determinism. Marx, however, does not stress the necessity of any one-way relation of causality proceeding from the economic sphere to the domain of ideology marked by its creative diversity. There remains scope for reciprocal influence between material and spiritual production. The superstructures of ideas must not be conceived as a mere passive reflection of the state and forms of material production. Marx cites examples of legal and aesthetic production not quite reducible to the corresponding stage of material production, e.g. the survival of elements of Roman private law in the stage of capitalist production; the heights attained by Greek art and literature amidst a rather undeveloped state of material productions.

4.4 SOME LATER WRITERS

In our approach to the meaning of ideology, we have used the elements of Marxian thought in some details. The dynamics of history tend to be vitally influenced by the relative capacities of the conflicting classes to maintain their leadership in the sphere of social production. We have noted that, for Marx, the conflict between the growing productive forces and the existing relations of production matures into a revolution that brings about a new society under a new class leadership. Marx's evidence and proof of such a theory of historical change were by and large confined to the capitalist transition.

The next stage of history will coincide with the arrival of socialism. This will come through the worldwide revolution waged by the proletariat against the capitalist order. Since the proletariat moves by stages towards a classless society, there will be no further need for ideological defense and deceptions in the interests of a dominant ruling class. This is the usual reply of the Marxists to the comment that as a protagonist of the proletariat and its class interests, the Marxian theory cannot but have its own ideological elements.

Again, the point about the determination of consciousness by social being must not indicate a connection similar to what is meant by the statement that a fall in temperature turns water into ice. It is Marx's own statement that while the economic conditions of production may be ascertained with the precision of natural science, the ideological forms are subject to all the complications of social consciousness trying to grapple with its surrounding reality at different levels. Karl Mannheim (1893-1947), the German sociologist, wrote in his book *Ideology and Utopia* (First German edition 1929, English translation 1936) that ideologies are mental fiction used to conceal the real nature of a particular society. On the contrary, utopias are wishful dreams that inspire the opposition against vested interests. Thus, Mannheim made a meaningful distinction between pro- and anti-*status quo* ideologies.

Class consciousness is an extremely important element of Marx's theory of social change. George Lukacs (1885-1971), a notable Marxist thinker and activist, made many important contributions in writing over a large area of subjects ranging from aesthetics and literary criticism to philosophy, sociology and politics. His book *History and Class Consciousness* (1923) proved extremely controversial among the communist establishments of those days. However, it had great influence over a large section of the radical non-conformist intelligentsia in many countries. Lukacs' analysis of class consciousness was distinct for its critiques of 'economism' and 'scientism'. It emphasised that the proletarian revolution would not emerge merely from the economic contradictions of capitalism, nor from any scientific laws of historical change without the constant consciousness and action of the working people. Moreover, in considering the revolutionary roles of workers' councils, Lukacs stressed the need for the proletarian practice of self-government through a conscious social agency.

Louis Althusser's (1918-1990) interpretation of the Marxist, as available in his *Reading Capital* (1970) and *For Marx* (1969), focuses on 'mature' Marx with his framework of interlocking combinations of political, economic, ideological, and theoretical structures and practices which, in their totality, can come to determine social forces and their actions. Althusser includes ideology (in addition to the economy and polity) among the main instances of history as structured social formations. An ideology then contains the meaning of the relations lived by men in a society.

Antonio Gramsci's (1891-1937) concept of hegemonic power as not merely dependent on coercion, but also 'directing' by the token of consent obtained from the governed, may endow an ideology with some new significance. Gramsci distinguished between

historically organic ideologies and those which were purely arbitrary. To the extent that ideologies are historically necessary, they 'organise' human masses, and create the terrain on which men move and acquire consciousness of their position and struggles. The organic ideologies have a 'psychological' validity of considerable influence on the processes of history.

Ideologies are often inseparable from socio-political theories and their projects throughout the twentieth century. It is almost impossible to conceive of a human society, which is without a supporting ideology and, on the other hand, which is entirely free from any critical questions about its goals and their achievements. This is where the path of history and the vision of history will continue to be involved in the rise and fall of ideologies.

4.5 SUMMARY

The term ideology is often used in two different ways. In one sense, it is a set of ideas, views and beliefs which sustains an individual or a social order. It may be used to maintain the *status quo*; but it may also be used to oppose the system. There may be various ideologies, sometimes antagonistic to each other in a given social system. It may also differ according to classes. Various social, economic and political systems in history have been sustained by certain dominant ideologies.

In another sense, ideology is also interpreted as false consciousness as opposed to the real, scientific knowledge of the world. In this sense, it is used to mislead people and influence them to support the *status quo*.

4.6 EXERCISES

- 1) What do you understand by the term 'ideology'? Discuss the various usages of the term.
- 2) What role has the ideology played in influencing the course of history?

4.7 SUGGESTED READINGS

Tom Bottomore *et al* (ed.), *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought* (entry on "Ideology by Jorge Larraín)

David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* vol. 7 & 8, "Ideology by Edward Shils and "Ideology and the Social System" by Harry M. Johnson.

John Plamentaz, *Ideology*.

T.Z. Lavine, *From Socrates to Sartre the Philosophic Quest*, Parts 4 & 5.

Robin Blackburn (ed.), *Ideology in Social Sciences*.

Karl Lowith, *Meaning in History*.

Istvan Meszaros (ed.), *Aspects of History and Class Consciousness*.

R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*.

Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*.

E.P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory & Other Essays* (the last essay bearing the title of the book).

Martin Selinger, *The Marxist Conception of Ideology*.

Sholmo Avineri, *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*.