CHAPTER II

UNDERSTANDING CULTURE
Defining Culture:

The word "civilization" was derived from an actual social condition, that of the citizen (Latin, *civis*). The word "culture" in its social, intellectual and artistic senses is a metaphorical term derived from the act of cultivating the soil (Latin, *cultura*). The cultivation of the mind was seen as a process comparable to the cultivation of the soil; hence the meaning of "culture" in the metaphorical sense, centered on a process, "the culture of mind", rather than on an achieved state. The first important development from this metaphorical use of "culture" was a description of certain men as "cultivated" and then as "those who are cultivated". In this use the meaning is very close to "civilized".

In human history, culture in its broadest sense is that which is socially rather than genetically transmitted. It is that which children learn by virtue of their being brought up in one group rather than another, and, in its totality, it is that which distinguishes one human group from another. To human culture belong language, customs, morality, types of economy and technology, art and architecture, modes of entertainment, legal systems, religion, systems of education and upbringing, and much else besides; everything in other words, by virtue of which members of a group endow their activities with meaning and significance. Even from the brief list of elements comprising a culture, it will be evident that there is no clear criterion for identity in the case of human culture. Cultures are characteristically permeable, evolving, open to influence from outside and inside in unpredictable ways, liable to be divided into subcultures, and to generate offspring with their own lives and development. And while individuals from a given culture are formed by it in all sorts of ways, conscious and unconscious, theoretical and practical, individuals are not prisoners within their cultures, but can affect them, react against them and contribute to their development.
"Culture" is defined in the world both narrowly and very broadly. Some people use the word to describe the arts - dance, music, painting, sculpture, literature - activities that are believed to engage human beings in highly civilized and refined uses of the imagination and the intelligence. Others use culture to mean the whole expression of a people, as when we speak of French culture, Russian culture, or Canadian culture. The two uses are, of course, connected because essentially the word deals with the character and/or identity of human beings as witnessed through forms of expression. When "lovers of culture" attend a symphony concert, they may hear music from several countries and centuries as they share aesthetic expression which the modern international community considers rich and rewarding. If you are invited to hear a lecture on Working Class Culture, you might expect to hear about songs of solidarity, ballads of protest, religious customs, union structures, living conditions, marriage patterns, women's associations, and the workplace.

Culture, then, is the manifestation of character and identity through patterns of living and forms of expression.

While most of the social thinkers agree upon the indispensable importance of the concept of culture no single definition has yet won universal acceptance, and it must be acknowledged that none is completely clear edged. Hundreds of definitions have been put forth, with a few exceptions they all point to the same class of phenomena; they differ largely on the points to which they give stress. It is very difficult to give an agreeable definition of culture because it includes so many concepts and phenomena which are of very different nature. On the one hand it involves things like music, dance and other phenomena which are of aesthetic importance, and on the other it also involves values of social life which are extremely important in giving a structure to the community. Normally aesthetics, which also includes literary creations of human beings, and ethical aspects, are regarded to be the essence of any culture; but at times the growth of knowledge, mode of cognitive endeavor, and technological advancement also are included in the connotation of the term culture. Let us examine a few definitions: E.B.
Tylor, an early anthropologist defines Culture or Civilization, when taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. For T.S. Eliot: “Culture is the way of life of a particular people living together in one place”. Ralph Linton observes culture as phenomena that could be defined as ‘the social heredity of a society’s members’. G.C. Pandey defines “Culture as the tradition of values, of self-realization”

All these conceptions have defects or shortcomings in the sense that they give account of culture only from one aspect ignoring other aspects. Tylor’s classic definition includes knowledge of Science and Technology, but it is so wide and vague that it fails to distinguish the systems of traditions and customs with culture. Eliot gives anthropological account but fails to distinguish human and non-human patterns, since animals, other than human too have their own way of living. G.C. Pandey gives a metaphysical definition of culture, which excludes the cognitive endeavour and technological advancement. Linton defines culture historically; but the existence of behavioural tradition, i.e., patterns of behavior transmitted by social rather than biological hereditary means, has definitely been established for non-human animals too. Encyclopedia Britannica gives psychological definition of culture. Thus we see that none of the definitions of culture is exact in its scope and hence there can be no single definition of culture, rather culture is a family resembling features, none of which is sole criteria. But there are many characteristic features which are very important in understanding the concept of culture.

Concept of culture:

Concept means an abstract idea of something that is conceived. Culture means the arts and other manifestation of human intellectual achievements regarded collectively. It also means the custom, institutions and achievements of a particular nation, people or group. Culture shock refers to discrimination experienced when suddenly subjected to an unfamiliar culture
or way of life. The concept of culture is a complex one. Cultural Anthropology, Sociology and Philosophy have attempted to give a definition of culture.

A culture is a way of life of people including their attitudes, beliefs, arts, science, mode of perceptions and habits of thought and activity. Culture is a product of society. It is public and not private. Culture cannot exist in a vacuum. It exists in a society or a social group. Society is counted as a group of actors. Their predecessors have written the ‘script’ for the actors. Each generation may add or delete or changed some parts of the script. This script may be called culture. The script of culture determines the behavior of the people. There can be endless debates as to whether culture is value free or value loaded, value specific or universal, hierarchal or differential, material or non-material, abstract or concrete and so on.

The common sense view of culture concerns good taste and refined manners. It also often refers to buildings, paintings, music etc. It also refers to collective institution, codes and system as cultural objects. It has an abstract connotation as well since it refers to the ultimate end or norm of life. These are different mode of existence such as physical, mental, objective mental existence and ideal existence. Objective mental existence stands for ideas, beliefs and principles which are shared by many, handed down from generation to generation such as religion, morality etc. Ideal existence stands for norms or standards or perfection, ultimate moral value, action and every principle of life.

The important development of the concept of “culture” took place between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries mainly from both English and German social thought. Broadly, the concept of “culture” was developed in four ways, all of which still affect its meaning. Firstly, “culture” came to mean a general state or habit of the mind, with close relations to the idea of human perfection. Secondly, it came to mean a general state of intellectual and moral development in society as a whole. Thirdly, it came to mean the general body of the arts and intellectual work. Fourthly, it came to

This complex development represents an attempt to think in new ways about man's social, moral, and intellectual life at a time of profound and many-sided change. In one important respect it was a part of a general reaction against the mechanistic philosophy and against what were regarded as its social consequences in the merging industrial civilization. Samuel T. Coleridge, in 1930, distinguished between the civilization of general humanity and a merely external civilization in which progress is calculated by reference to things other than man himself. Thomas Carlyle and later, Matthew Arnold made the same distinction. The fact that culture was a metaphor derived from natural growth probably had an important effect on this meaning. During this period the contrast between natural and mechanical was frequently pointed out, and members of the Romantic Movement, in describing the intellectual and social phenomena, generally turned to biology rather than to physics and mechanics for their analogies. Another important aspect that contributed to the modern meaning of culture was the high valuation of folk life and national tradition.

This was not only a contrast with what was often seen as a merely sophisticated civilization but also an emphases on the particular and distinctive customs and arts of different people-what would later be called their national cultures, as distinct from what was still seen as the general and uniform development of civilization. It is also possible that the concept was affected by the growing knowledge of the non-European civilizations of India and Persia, and, later, China, which possessed elaborate and quite different social organizations with long-standing artistic and intellectual traditions. Although many Europeans saw these societies as merely backward in comparison to their own, with its highly developed technology and politics, others saw them as distinctive shaping of the human mind that could not easily be assimilated to a simple, unilinear idea of civilization. Finally, during
this period there was an important development in relating the arts and different forms of thought to particular kinds of social organization. A new emphasis was placed on the strong connections between the ways of ordinary social and material life and the styles and assumptions of imaginative and intellectual work. The concept of a specific culture was an obvious way of expressing these relations.\(^\text{23}\)

In view of the above, three emphases can subsequently be traced as three concepts of culture. First, there is the idealist emphasis, which survives in very much of its original form in which culture is seen as a process and a state of cultivation that should be a universal idea. This usage is ethical, spiritual and expresses an idea of human perfection. It can easily conflict with the emphasis on particular "cultures" which stresses the differences in the way in which men find meaning and value in their lives and, indeed, conceive of perfection itself. This later emphasis, now widespread in anthropology and sociology, is necessarily relative and comparative, whereas the surviving idealist emphasis tends to be absolute.

Standing in between these emphases is what is still probably the most common and popular meaning of the word "culture"- a body of actual artistic and intellectual work. There is an inevitable tension between these meaning and the other two. Actual artistic and intellectual work often fails to conform to the idea of a perfect or perfecting state of mind already associated with it is an embodiment of universal and absolute values. The emphasis on culture has been an attempt to redefine it becomes necessary in this middle position, to distinguish "high culture" from "mass culture" or "mid culture" and other similar twentieth century coinages. On the other hand if culture is viewed as a body of artistic and intellectual work to which great and at times supreme, value is attached, it is difficult, from such a position, to accept the anthropological and sociological uses of the word "culture". In this respect these uses are mainly neutral, since they refer to what different people do and make and think, without regard to any artistic or intellectual merit. In any case these uses include elements of social and economic life that do not seem to

\(^{23}\) Ibid. 273
be culture in the artistic and intellectual sense at all. There are important controversy within anthropology and sociology concerning the concept of culture. But even beyond this disagreement, and at times overlapping it, are the radical differences between “culture” as a social concept, and “culture” as an artistic and intellectual classification, and “culture as an embodiment of universal and absolute values.

When we have such differences in usage refer, as in this case, to real and important differences in viewpoint and belief, it would be merely arbitrary and dogmatic to distinguish the one “proper” meaning of “culture” and to condemn all others. Rather, the immense and complicated argument that has centered on this idea should be seen as an index of the issues to which it refers. And indeed the idea of culture raise many fundamental issues of Western civilization and has become a major point of division between idealist and materialist conceptions of civilization and between idealists and historical methods in intellectual and artistic criticism. It has also been a focus of the attempt to see societies as wholes, in new ways and in new interests in their various aspects. In this respect the emphasis on culture has been an attempt to redefine the nature of society and of civilization itself.

Culture is the quality, activity, or group of qualities or activities that mark off the human personality from the animal organisms. The animal is driven by impulses or instincts operating more or less automatically and blindly, and his movements belong more or less to the realm of causal necessity. Secondly, the movements and responses of the animal organism are directed towards the fulfillment of its biological needs. Man partakes of animal nature but through his developing cultural consciousness, endeavors continually to transcend the limitations imposed by that nature. This transcendence takes two significant forms: man learns to take interests in meanings or values which have no relation whatsoever to his biological needs of existence and survival; and he learns to choose and appreciate these values in the light of consciously framed standards. This twofold transcendence of biological nature is made possible by the prior transcendence of physical necessity through a measure of mastery attained
over the forces of nature. As Aristotle says that man is a rational animal, man right from morning till night follows certain principles of behavior or else would be like any other animal.

Culture comprises those aspects of human activity which are socially rather than genetically transmitted. Each social group is characterized by its own culture, which informs the thought and activity of its members in myriad ways, perceptible and imperceptible. The notion of culture, as an explanatory concept, gained prominence at the end of the eighteenth century, as a reaction against the Enlightenment's belief in the unity of mankind and universal progress. According to J.G. Herder, each culture is different and has its own systems of meaning and value, and cannot be ranked on any universal scale. Followers of Herder, such as Nietzsche and Spengler, stressed the organic nature of culture and praised cultural particularity against what Spengler called "civilization", the world city, in which cultural distinctions are eroded. It is difficult, however, to see how Herder and his followers avoid an ultimately self-defeating cultural relativism; the task of those who understand the significance of human culture is to make sense of it without sealing cultures off from one another and making interplay between them impossible.24

Over and above the anthropological sense of culture, there is also the sense of culture as that through which a people's highest spiritual and artistic aspirations are articulated. Culture in this sense has been seen by Matthew Arnold and others as a substitute for religion, or as a kind of secular religion. While culture in this sense can certainly inveigh against materialism, it is less clear that it can do this effectively without a basis in religion. Nor is it clear that a rigid distinction between high and low culture is desirable. It is in fact, only the artistic modernists of the twentieth century who have articulated such a distinction in their work, to the detriment of the high and the low culture of our time.

Culture reflects both the time and place from which it is expressed. For our purposes philosophy may be defined in the very general way of the Oxford English Dictionary as "the love, study, or pursuit of wisdom, and of the knowledge of things and their causes" or, more precisely, as the study of Being, of ultimate reality. Put simply, philosophy exists because in every place and time human beings want to know who and what they are, how they fit into the universe, and how - to be most human - they ought to behave.

It is generally understood that the human being is a cultural being. But when it comes to the question of delineating the notion of culture in greater clarity, we are at loss. As Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy describes as culture in its broadest sense is that which is socially rather than genetically transmitted. It is that which children learn by virtue of their being brought up in one group rather than another, and in totality, it is that which distinguishes one human group from another. Thus every human being receives from two-fold transmissions: genetically and socially. By virtue of the former the human is a national being and by virtue of the latter he is a cultural being. Actually greater part of that which we human possess and act is not the product of nature, but rather of culture. This is the most remarkable characteristic that immensely distinguishes human person from animals. The plants, animals and even the most developed apes are utterly produced and prefabricated by nature. The human beings cannot survive with what they receive from nature alone; they need to pass through the long process of enculturation in order to be truly human person. Enculturation is a process that is socially carried out through the family and society. Thus, culture, in simple term, is that which one picks up by virtue of one's being brought up in one social group rather than in another.

In terms of consciousness, this is now reflected by the movement of human awareness beyond its prior captivity to mathematic-instrumental reason initiated by Descartes and reflected in the first two critiques of Immanuel Kant centered upon certain universal laws. Now attention has been shifted to the aesthetic dimension in Kant's third critique with its potential for a
new openness to the emerging sensibilities to creative imagination focusing on tradition, values, virtues and culture.

There are different aspect of culture such as (modes of existence) material, objective, mental and the ideal. Few definitions given by the social scientists and philosophers can be looked into.

i. E.B. Tylor, an early anthropologist defines "Culture or Civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society".  

ii. Paul G. Hebert defines culture as the integrated system of learned patterns of behaviour, ideas and products characteristics of a given society.

iii. William A. Havilland believes that culture consists of abstract values, beliefs and perception of the world that lie behind people's behaviour and which that behaviour reflects. These are shared by the members of a society, and when acted upon, they produced behaviour considered acceptable within that society.

iv. Clifford Geertz (a contemporary American Anthropologist) maintains that Culture ...denotes a historically transmitted pattern of meaning embedded in symbols, a system of inherited conception expressed in symbolic form by means of which human beings communicate, perpetuate and developed their knowledge about attitude towards life.

v. Clyde Kluckhohn and Alfred L Kroeber after considering about 164 definitions of culture under different lines of thinking such as descriptive, normative, psychological, structural, genetic etc., came to a conclusion that they could identify a common position in all of them. Their position is that culture consist of patterns, explicit and implicit of behaviour acquired

---


and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional ideas and especially their attached values; culture system may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action”. 29

From these we find that the meaning of culture ranges from what men 'have', 'do' and 'think' as a member of a society. It is the sum total of ways of living built up by a large group of human beings and transmitted from one generation to another. Culture as a 'system' or 'complex whole' determines the behaviour of the people of the given society.

*Encyclopedia of Philosophy* states 'culture' as coming to mean a general state or habit of the mind, with close relations to the idea of human perfection. Secondly, it came to mean a general state of intellectual and moral development in society as a whole. Thirdly, it came to mean the general body of the arts and intellectual work. Fourthly, it came to mean the whole way of life, material, intellectual and spiritual, of a given society. 30.

*Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* speaks of "Culture" to be comprising of those aspects of human activity which are socially rather than genetically transmitted. Each social group is characterized by its own culture, which informs the thought and activity of its members in myriad ways, perceptible and imperceptible. It is that which children learn by virtue of their being brought up in one group rather than another, and, in its totality, it is that which distinguishes one human group from another. To human culture belong language, customs, morality, types of economy and technology, art and architecture, modes of entertainment, legal systems, religion, systems of education and upbringing, and much else besides; everything in other words, by virtue of which members of a group endow their activities with meaning and significance. Even from the brief list of elements comprising a culture, it


will be evident that there is no clear criterion for identity in the case of human culture. Cultures are characteristically permeable, evolving, open to influence from outside and inside in unpredictable ways, liable to be divided into subcultures, and to generate offspring with their own lives and development. And while individuals from a given culture are formed by it in all sorts of ways, conscious and unconscious, theoretical and practical, individuals are not prisoners within their cultures, but can affect them, react against them and contribute to their development.  

The emphasis on culture has been an attempt to redefine the nature of society and of civilization itself. The problem also creeps in when we try to relate the theories of culture to fundamental materialist or idealist position alone.  

Another great aspect of the philosophy of culture is the high valuation of folk life. The product of creativeness of human are not just a mere talks or tales but stories been told by the old folks to children depicting way of life and showing systems loaded with values.  

World council of Churches states as “A system of framework of meaning, behaviour and symbols and the way in which we orient our lives within it”.  

Devaraja also states: “Culture is the sum total of the activities ...”. According to him, culture consists in the sharable consciousness of personally significant reality. He is of the opinion that culture stands for qualitative improvement or refinement of the self.  

In Culture and Anarchy (London 1869), Arnold defined “culture” as “a pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world; and, through this knowledge, turning a steam of fresh and free thought

---

33 Devaraja :The philosophy of Culture, Allahabad: Kitab Mahal, 1963, p.110
upon our stock notions and habits”. Arnold upheld the importance of culture in halting the march to anarchy. He called for a balance of the tradition of Hebraism (moral discipline and Hellenism (intellectual freedom and creativity) to infuse society with “sweetness and light” (beauty and truth).  

Culture is thus, a process of learning, which can refine individuals and reform societies.

If culture is defined as the total way of life, understanding of the meaning of culture requires understanding of human nature. The essential core of culture consists of traditional ideas and especially their attached values. Traditions, religion, and customs prescribe values. Culture is not static but dynamic. It is ‘preferred way of life rather than way of life’. This preferred way of life includes both the material and non-material aspects of culture. This preferred way of life tries to achieve certain aims or certain purposes. It is teleological.

**Two Senses of Culture:**

There are two senses of culture, first in wider sense, it consists of ideas, literature, language, customs, beliefs, taboos, codes, tools, techniques, institutions, works of art, music, dances, religious rituals, ceremonies and other related components. Culture in this sense is a system of different factors which may be classified as scientific, rational, technological, ethical, ethnic, volitional, social, economic, psychological, linguistic, religious and artistic: Culture in wider sense thus includes knowledge, cognitive endeavor, and technological advancement. It is impossible to know fully, culture in this sense, even for someone born within that culture e.g., If India is supposed to have one culture, then understanding it demands that one understands, among other things all other Indian languages. Nobody can do this. Besides, one will have to know architecture, religious beliefs, rituals and the rational achievements of both urban and non-urban people of a culture. This is too impressive a work to be understood by any one person. Studying a culture needs, therefore a group of anthropologists, sociologists, historians,

---

psychologists, linguists, ethical thinkers, philosopher of Science and religion and others co-operating with one another. Besides that there will be no one in the group who will have a complete knowledge of culture. There will be only particular studies, no one being singly an authority to make a thorough study of the culture. Further, it is impossible to study, for example folk cultures in India; there exist only regional folk cultures very distinct in quality from one another. Culture in wider sense covers all aspects of the human life leaving behind literally nothing. Secondly in a narrow sense, culture is refinement in general and refinement of values in particular. It is this sense of culture which is humanistic and we are more concerned about.

Cultural Relativism

Another important issue that we cannot afford to ignore in the study of culture is about cultural relativity marked in work done since the 1920s. Modern emphasis on relativity acquires a critical importance. Cultural relativism opines that the idea of any item of behavior such as belief or custom may be judged only in terms of the value system in which it is found—there being no absolute scale of values applicable to all societies. As a philosophy, cultural relativism assumes that every culture generates its own value system—that men's belief and codes of behavior derive from their particular social environments. In the methodology of the social sciences especially in anthropology, it is assumed that a truly scientific account of man's relationship to his social environment is impossible if it is based on the assumptions of any one value system. It is evidently wrong to interpret all cultural phenomena in terms of categories applicable to European societies or any particular society, and it is arbitrary and dangerous to attempt to evaluate very diverse cultures by referencing to a fixed value system that has been likewise derived from European tradition or even for that matter Asian tradition alone. Sociological and anthropological accounts of behavior are felt

---

35 Coleman Exclusi, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Chicago; London; Toronto; Geneva; Sydney; Tokyo; Manila; Seoul; Johannesburg; Vol.III, Helen Hemingway Benton, 1974, P 287
to invalidate by ethnocentric interpretation—that is, the practice of evaluating the ways of other people with reference to the scale of values of the investigator's own group. Against the onslaught of Enlightenment conception of the unity of mankind and its belief in progress, Herder stressed the plurality of human societies and incommensurability of their values. Herder stresses the particularity of different cultures and the absurdity of looking for variant human behavior. He rejects centralization, bureaucracy, the elimination of cultural diversity and above all, imperialism. In Herder's own word, we find this:

"Can you name a land where Europeans have entered without defiling themselves forever before defenseless, trusting mankind?... Our part of the earth should not be called the wisest, but the most arrogant, aggressive, money-minded: what it has given these peoples (the colonies) is not civilization but the rudiments of their own cultures wherever they could achieve this"^38

Herder and Spengler began as a reasonable reaction against the facile optimism and scientism of the Enlightenment and its offshoot, such as socialism and utilitarianism yet it also turn out too quickly into an enervating and disabling relativism. There is a worrying determinism making culture too definitive of the group to which it belongs, in that any reception of outside influence is going to seem either impossible in appealing to values not recognized by insiders or undesirable in diluting the purity and distinctiveness of a culture; or, at different times, both before and after it has happened.

Nevertheless, many writers have recognized the impossibility of completely neutral and detached observation. On the theoretical level, cultural relativism is in its extreme form has been sharply debated by those who follow the line of thought that many conditions of life are the same in all social settings and that structural patterns and uniformities must perform be


discovered to underlie the workings of all societies. Therefore in that way, burrowing the word of Wittgenstein, culture is something that can be understood in terms of bringing the notion of family resemblances or game.

**Culture and value**

Culture includes institution such as marriage, political ideals such as democracy, religious beliefs, customs, rituals, objects, stories, arts, styles, games and dances. As Aristotle says that man is a rational animal, man right from morning till night follows certain principles of behaviour or else would be like any other animal. In anyone else’s culture, barring the materialist, altruism is what is considered to be a way of life. While altruism is praiseworthy, narcissism is blameworthy. It also includes non-material things. What is the theoretical foundation of material things? We can think of three foundation namely; empirical, value, and social. Empirical foundation includes human physiology, language, and social institutions. Value foundation includes moral values, psychological values, aesthetic values and spiritual values. Beyond the world of facts, there is a world of values. Values statement precedes scientific statements. Culture cannot be divorced from man.

(i) Man is a rational being, who is capable of thinking, explaining, judging, believing, describing etc.

(ii) Man is a “language-wielding creature”. Every thinking is possible through concepts and all concepts are language oriented.

(iii) The concepts are primary like thought, intention, and motive, worth, desire, aspiration, and hope, ideal and so on. (Many thinkers refer cause to natural events and reason to social events or human actions).

The relation between thought and action is not a “brute matter-of-fact kind”. The explanation of event is radically different from that of human action. Human actions are necessarily couched in terms of concept like reason, intention and the like. Actions are never value-neutral. Human actions cannot be measured in term of numbers (they cannot be quantified) or judge in terms of facts; it has to be in terms of some norms, or ideals or standards. Every
culture necessarily consists of values, and therefore it cannot be normatively value-neutral. Culture is anthropocentric in nature, and is ought to be seen from the point of view of value.

Wittgenstein makes a distinction between 'culture of progress' and 'culture of liberation', or the culture of material development and the culture of spiritual life respectively. The culture of progress is the scientific culture that aims at the material development. This consists of all kinds of structures, intellectual and otherwise. The spirit of the culture of liberation lies in "striving after clarity and perspicuity (clearly expressed and easily understood, lucid)". It seeks liberation from the web of intellectual structures that are imposed on our understanding. It seeks freedom from the scientific world and civilization, which creates its own value system. The age of reason represents the culture of progress, intellectual excellence are art, religion and science. The culture of liberation stands for the search for meaning. It is freedom from the shackles of the age of enlightenment. It is the culture of value seeking and self realization.

Culture manifests the value of life. Wittgenstein points out that there are serious limitations of scientific way of understanding culture since it adopts the external point of view and searches for the possible causes of the cultural phenomena. It misses out the value on the value that lies outside the facts. According to him, values constitute the meaning or the significance of human action. Values and facts co-exist without being identical. Values are basic to the understanding of man and the world.

Ernst Cassirer, (1874-1945), pp. 120-121 says that the form of human knowledge are co-existensive with the form of human culture. It is not based on the distinction between the symbolic and the literal (verbalization). According to him, all human knowledge depends on the power to form experience through some type of symbolism. Each culture is intelligible in term of itself. If we view other's culture from outside we just end up by saying 'this people do not know anything'. Every culture is unique and deserves respect from its own point of view. As for instance, if I am in M.K. Gandhi's
place and not in his shoes, then, I will have to understand not as M.K. Gandhi but as me. Knowing the background with a big deal of one's culture is also necessary in understanding culture. Therefore, in order to understand culture, it is necessary to understand from within and not by jumping out. Wittgenstein is of the opinion that if we want to know other's activity (which is very religious), we have to enter into the form of life, not necessarily believe it but enter and participate in the form of life, then the understanding will come.

Culture is the quality, activity, or group of qualities or activities that mark off the human personality from the animal organisms. The animal is driven by impulses or instincts, operating more or less automatically and blindly, and his movements belong more or less to the realm of causal necessity. Secondly, the movements and responses of the animal organism are directed towards the fulfillment of its biological needs. Man partakes of animal nature but through his developing cultural consciousness, endeavors continually to transcend the limitations imposed by that nature. This transcendence takes two significant forms: man learns to take interests in meanings or values which have no relation whatsoever to his biological needs of existence and survival; and he learns to choose and appreciate these values in the light of consciously framed standards. This twofold transcendence of biological nature is made possible by the prior transcendence of physical necessity through a measure of mastery attained over the forces of nature.

Culture and Civilization:

It is certainly hard not to see O. Spengler's celebrated distinction between civilization and culture as much to Herder. For Spengler the very idea of a cosmopolis, a world city, is a symptom of decline from higher state of culture. Civilization is for him the movement away from the strong local and unquestioned bonds which constitute organic culture. He says: "In place of a type-true people, born of and grown on the soil, there is a new type of nomad, cohering unstably in fluid masses, the parasitical city-dweller, traditionless,
clever, unfaithful, deeply contemptuous of the countryman, and especially that highest form of countryman, that country gentleman."

He sees that along with the decline of organic cultures comes science, rationalism, socialism, internationalism, a preoccupation with trade and luxury, wage disputes and the like.

**Characteristics Features:**

Culture in its broadest sense is that which is socially rather than genetically transmitted. It is that which children learn because of their being brought up in one group rather than another. It is not natural, it is something acquired. This acquisition is not simply individual, for an acquired feature of life which begins and ends with the individual will hardly qualify for being included in culture. It must be, in some sense, handed down to be considered a part of culture. Culture is an organic structure i.e., it is permeable, evolving, open to influence from outside and inside, and liable to be divided into subcultures. Though individuals from the given culture are formed by it, they can affect it, react against it and contribute to its development. Culture is thus an individual acquisition as well as a social tradition; something which guides improves and fulfils the individual and at the same time constitutes the inner meaning of social experience. To human culture belongs everything by virtue of which members of a group endow their activities with meaning and significance. In Sorokin's words culture is "the sum total of two or more individuals interacting with one another or conditioning one another's behavior". Culture is a system of ideas which enables the members of the society to interpret the world meaningfully. Collective institutions, codes and systems are known as cultural objects. Hence the political and educational institutes of Greeks and the legal codes of Romans are regarded among the most important aspect of their respective culture. The term culture still has more general connotation: It is a normal system by which there is social control in the form of sanctions. Sanctions may be internal (conscience) as well as external (social). This makes people follow generally accepted ethical norms. It is a system of ultimate values or norms of life. That is why it is said
that the Eastern culture is more spiritual than Western culture. Culture also includes music, dance, art, literature as an expression of the people.

When we use the word 'culture' in some sense, it encompasses in a way, the whole gamut of human life and experience. The same word may also refer to particular area or aspects of human life when adjectivized. The terms like business culture, political culture, sexual culture, academic culture etc., refer to the body of beliefs and practices regulation the relevant areas of human life. It also includes the ways in which these beliefs and practices are demarcated, structured and regulated. Culture is all pervading and gets reflected in the language, its syntax, grammar, vocabulary and the ways these are used to describe the world. Culture of a society is also embodied in its proverbs, maxims, myths, rituals, symbols, and mode of non-linguistic communications, body language, customs, traditions, institutions and manners of greetings. At a slightly different surface it is included in its art, music, literature (oral or written), moral life, ideas of excellence, exampling individuals and the vision of good life. Being bothered to structure and arranged human life, culture is also articulated in the habits and norms that rule such basic activities and social relations as how, where, when and with whom one eats, one associates, and one makes love, how one regrets and disposes of the dead and behaves towards one's parents, wife, children, neighbours, friends and strangers.

**Cultural Elements**

The culture of an individual society is composed of three different elements: ideas, aesthetics forms and values chiefly and largely influence by the tradition of the past and desires for the future. Opinion give rise to habits and ideas thereby continuing themselves through social organizations that give stability: Aesthetic forms that reflect the artistic expression of a culture in its visual art, music and poetry as well as the purpose, beauty demonstrated in the day to day life of individuals and social groups. The values of culture are produced by the behavior, standard of functioning, and sources of belief and sight. Of three elements of culture, the values are of the highest
significance; values develop the considerable assets of knowledge and perception in particular culture and they also give the dynamism for action and change, they give energy and quantity top the life of the people. The understanding of a specific culture needs a correct understanding of thoughts underlying it and a measure of intelligent recognition of its aesthetic form; it is however, the importance of a culture that contain its indispensible qualities and they offer the best way of understanding it and participating in it. A living and important culture rooted in reliable and strong tradition, has the power of perpetuating renewal and adaptation, and is advanced by new desires and confident ideas; in this way the past, the present and the future are presented together in the life of the mind and spirit that is indefinable complex of culture.

Culture and the aesthetic factors

The term culture is most frequently used in the sense of good taste and refined manners. Thus it is also used for material embodiments of good taste and refinement. So we often refer to the buildings, gardens and paintings of the Mughal period as relics of Mughal culture in our day to day life we also use the word cultural programme, tribal culture etc., which signifies the word culture as dance, music, dressing, customs and conventions, education (formal and in-formal), training, and refinement. Thus culture is a kind of active force, which tends to refine the collective life of a group of people e.g., classical music is the refined form evolved from folk music. Here refinement means better systematized, regularized, which is done by putting in some rules and regulations e.g., restriction.

In aesthetic sense there is a metaphorical term derived from the act of cultivating the soil (Latin: cultura). Another way is simply by contrasting civilization with ‘barbarism’. The well settled and technological advanced civilizations are no match for barbarous people but in warfare the settled people of superior civilization stand inferior to the nomads, who have time and again proved their superiority over the so called more civilized peoples, equipped with better technology. In the case of ‘culture’ there is no such simple contrast. The cultivation of mind has been seen as a process
comparable to the cultivation of the soil. So the early meanings of culture, in this metaphorical sense, centred on 'the cultivation of mind' is an achieved state and culture is a process one important consequence of this metaphorical sense of culture is description of certain men as 'cultivated' and others as 'non-cultivated' bringing this meaning very close to civilized.

To a layman both the terms 'culture' and 'civilization' appear to convey a vague reference to the excellence or achievements of men or societies, to whose conditions of living they are applied. But the learned neither agree in regard to the propriety of thus reference nor to the connection between phenomenons described by these terms. Malinowski suggests that the words culture and civilization should be used not synonymously but distinctively reserving civilization for a special aspect of more advanced cultures. For him, one synonym for culture is tradition and another is civilization, thus, he regards both culture and civilization as synonyms. R.M. Maclver uses the term culture for values and meaning while civilization for technological order (material organizations). He relates culture to ends and civilization to means and viewed the technological order of civilization as determined within the cultural order of meanings and values. He considers civilization to be in several ways antithetical to culture. Alfred Weber regards civilization as the product of Science and technology, which is universal and accumulative in that it relates primarily to nature rather than to man. He regards culture as the human interpretation expressed in values and meanings, in philosophy, religion and art, some of the purposes of life and society. The historian Toynbee prefers to use the term civilization, he does not use the word culture. His conception of civilization is quite opposite to that of Maclver. He distinguishes civilization from the technological order and other material aspects of life. He is quite firm that improvement of technology is neither a precondition nor a correlate of growth in civilization. Accordingly the improvement in technology may show relation with stagnation and even retardation in the advancement of civilization; and in some cases a decline in the civilization. Oswald Spangler has failed to give a clear cut definitions of the terms 'culture' and 'civilization' though treats both concepts as separate
and draws a contrast between the natural organic creative and genuine on one hand and the artificial, mechanical, stereotyped and superficial on the other. For him culture stands for nobility, deep rootedness, freedom, equality and contentment of medieval and civilization for corruption, alienation, servility and exploitation of modern man. He conceives civilization to be the last dying phase of a culture. Every culture has its own civilization which is its inevitable destiny. Civilizations are the last and the most external and artificial states of a culture.

Civilization deals more with the physical or external manifestations of a ‘Society’ and ‘culture’ with more subjective functions as achievements in arts, religion, literature and philosophy. Hence culture is to be distinguished from the mere physical arrangements of social adjustments made to ensure the survival; it is a still higher dimension than the physical achievement of a community living through the gamut of geographical conditions (civilization). Culture is not only the result of one or more of mere biological functions; it is innate effort of spirit of man as self-expression and realization. The apparatus and instrumentation of such process are based largely on civilizational achievements. For thinkers like Kant, Coleridge and Mathew Arnold, culture represents necessarily the moral condition of the individual, while civilization means the conventions of the society. Hence Rousseau was not wrong when he preferred the state of the savages. Kant adds, that though we are civilized, even to excess in the way of all sorts of social forms and politeness and elegance, there is still much to be done before we can be regarded as moralized. External propriety merely constitutes civilization only; the idea of morality belongs to real culture.

Culture has been equated with the conscious products of a social process with its beginnings rooted in civilization. For Spangler, if civilization is intellect, culture is feeling, the former express universality while latter exclusiveness. In periods of cultural turmoil positivism and distrust of feeling is an inevitable consequence. According to him, “the essence of every culture is religion” and therefore, “the essence of every civilization is irreligion.” Culture is invariably associated with spiritual values while civilization with
material values, culture with community whereas civilization with society. Some writers like Rabindranath Tagore have linked civilization to the solid gold of a ring and culture to its luster. Some Socio-political thinkers like Maclver observe that the civilization is what we use and culture is what we are. They think that the basic value of civilization is only instrumental or pragmatic and that of culture is primarily existential or axiological. In practical life one frequently finds that these two concepts are used interchangeably. For example expressions like “industrial civilization” and “industrial culture” are often employed synonymously.

Culture and Religion:

Religion has always been associated with culture. The humanities and the art, the sciences and the technologies, the network of communications, magic, poetry and the transcendence of religion, all these spheres of action and speculation form the pattern of culture. Culture is associated with purpose and importance of human actions and relations and since this is also an affair of central concern to religion, the two tend to be nearly together. Culture is essentially an organized way of life and the social way of life is founded on the religious laws, hence religion is the core element of the culture. Certainly, there is scarcely a culture in whose creation, constitution and prolongation of religion has not played a significant part, so much so that we have some if any example a completely secular or humanist culture. T.S. Eliot declares that ‘no culture has appeared or developed except together with religion’

In distinct culture, religion plays different roles. No cultures can be entirely originated from religion. Culture and religion affect each other at various levels. Religion influence culture’s method of beliefs and practices; that is why when persons and communities change religion, their method of thought and the way of life undergo vital changes. For its part culture affects how a religion is explained, its rituals are performed, the place given to it in the life of a society, and so forth. Without culture there is no religion and the divine will is achieved in a definite human meaning with cultural thought.
Nevertheless, culture can be based on religion it can be influenced by it in several ways and forms. Some cultures are primarily originated from and totally dependent on religion. The advancement of culture and the advancement of religion, in a society uninfluenced from without, is hard to distinctly separate from each other, and it will depend upon the prejudice of the individual observer, where an improvement of culture is held to be the reason of advancement in religion or whether a progress in religion is held to be the reason of refinement of the culture.

We can perceive a religion as the complete way of life of a people. From birth to death, from morning to evening and the sleeping and waking way of life is also its culture. And at the same time we must approve that then recognition is whole, it, means in real societies both an inferior culture and an inferior religion. A universal religion is at least possibly better than one which any race or nation claims particularly for itself; and an understanding of culture and religion also realized in other cultures is at least possibly a better culture than one which is a religion particularly itself. From one point of view we may recognize, from another, we may differ.

Society, Community and Culture

A social system which meets all the essential functional prerequisites of long-term persistence from within its own resources will be called a society. Society is most frequently used in reference to the totality of human beings on earth together with their cultures, institutions, skills, ideas and values. A society is made up of a population, organization, time, place and interests. Social life is organized, primarily as a division of labor, within a common territory and in time. Many common interests are shared; and all interests, common and specialized are inclusive enough to make social life self-sufficient amounts the members. Human societies are based on shared beliefs especially a faith that the members have a collective destiny. They are being controlled by a system of moral rules that is mutually binding. Society comprises of two factors:
Normative Integration: Every human relationship is governed by two considerations: what in fact exists and what the group believes ought to be emotionalized attitudes about what is right and what is wrong are transmitted to the young by parents, other elders and playmates. Throughout life, we remain within certain groups and we move from some groups into others. All of these groups prescribe common moral norms and each of them prescribes certain specialized moral norms, neither of which an individual may ignore with impunity. Social sanctions are of two kinds: internal (conscience) and external: religious and moral. There is a provision of punishment also for those who violate these sanctions.

Functional integration: ‘Society’ is used both abstractly and to refer to entities which can be particularized, identified and distinguished from each other as social systems or organizations. Society is a group but most groups are not of societies. A society is a group which includes all the other groups of an organized population that has a sense of belonging together. A group is an aggregate of individuals which persists in time, which has one or more interests and activities in common and which is organized that is, some members lead, others follow, and informal procedures or formal rules and statuses control social relationships within it. In every society there is class phenomenon giving status and stratification to the members. It is not only in Indian Hindu society but it is equally applicable to Western society also where monetary conditions are the rule for status. The groups like caste, race, ethnic groups are springs of life not only for the individual but for social institutions too.

The institutions of society are
1. Family,
2. Educational (Training)
3. Economy
4. Polity
5. Religion
The society is an aggregate of interacting individuals whose relations are governed by role-conferring rules and practices which give their actions their characteristic significance.

Global Culture

Now we are witnessing "global culture". Millions of people finding themselves driven by natural disasters, political oppression, economic need, or hopes of social and economic betterment, for exposures to education in other countries, people travel around the world or change homes and even adopt citizenship of another country. In addition, millions of people cross cultural boundaries under various arrangement on a temporary basis. Artists, masons, labourers, musicians, engineers, doctors, writers to nurses leave their homes in search of greener grounds for employment in other countries or for social service. Diplomats and other government agency employees; researchers working on cultures other than their own; professors and students visiting, working and studying at foreign academic institutions, military personnel on foreign duty; missionaries carrying out their religious service; and journalists on prolonged overseas assignments are crossing cultures. Countless tourists are touring around the world.

Globalization is the process by which the experience of everyday life, marked by the diffusion of commodities and ideas, is becoming standardized around the world. Homogenization of commodity consumption is another important factor. Global culture is typically associated with products, industries and technologies; and the standardization of experiences including travel, entertainment, music, films, cable T.V., new electronic network such as internet, all sorts of satellite telecommunication, food: Continental, Oriental, clothing, fashion, cosmetics, sports even if refined people are trying their best to respect cultural relativism. It is also associated with multinational consumer brands such as Coco-Cola, Pepsi, McDonalds, Holiday Inns, Nike, Adidas, Sony, and so on. Globalization as a process involves the flow of ideas, meaning and values across national and international boundaries.
The flows of the people, products, ideas and information and communication technology intensify familiarity with other cultures pave the way for a global culture in this shrinking world. It is becoming like a triumphant body against relativism making acceptable universal culture to a great extent. The essential character of global culture resides in the consciousness of the global mind that is, individual consciousness of the global situation specifically show that the world is an arena in which we all participate. It is inter-culturalism. The peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world order, the global community. But the actual process of globalization has been intermittent, chaotic, and slow but it is a fact.

Thus after considering the many discussion above we see culture to be a kind attempt in reaching an acceptable refined way of life from the early attempt of man to accepted well formulized tradition and from tradition it is moving towards global culture while on the other hand we see global culture to be a kind dilution of pure culture of different specific group of people. But whatever the case may be it is a way of life in words, thoughts and deeds to attain perfection of human ideal.

Sequential Critical Discourses on Culture

In order to understand any concept clearly and here particularly, "culture" we need to examine from both points of view, that is, the concept and the critical evaluation of it. We need to consider the varieties of Critical discourse about Culture from a historical and conceptual overview.

ix. The Liberal Humanism of the Enlightenment Era,

x. The Romantic Reaction Against the Enlightenment: Hermeneutics,

xi. Demystifying Romantic Attitudes: Materialist Critique,

xii. From Society to Psyche: The New "Science" of Psychoanalysis,

xiii. Semiological and Structural Critique: The New Science of Signs in Society,

xiv. Cultural Critique Between the World Wars: The Frankfurt School of Critical theory,
xv. New Attacks on Liberal Humanism: Poststructuralist and Postmodernist Critiques,

(a) The Liberal Humanism of the Enlightenment Era

The beginning of the modern era is usually associated with the period of European history known as the Enlightenment which commenced sometime toward the end of sixteenth century and lasted until the French Revolution in 1789. While a great number of ideas are typically associated with the Enlightenment—the ascendance of the secular over the sacred, the rise of modern science, the belief in unlimited progress, and the modern conception of democracy, to name some of the most often cited—perhaps the single most feature of the Enlightenment was its self-consciously critical stance. Enlightenment thought emerged as a critical reaction, a protest on behalf of reason against what were regarded as the prevailing superstitions, prejudices, and outright falsehoods inherited from the medieval period, which was considered a "dark age". Enlightenment thinkers tended to speak of culture interchangeably with civilization, which implied barbarism as its opposite. For them, no term was more apt than barbarism to characterize the superstitions and prejudices inherited from the medieval period. They launched against the barbarism of religious and secular authority on behalf of culture, or civilization. Since culture or civilization was directly bound up with the values that the Enlightenment figures wished to promote, their critical practice usually took the form of asserting these values against practices and institutions that tended to suppress or undermine them. Enlightenment thinkers most often invoked the human capacity to reason loosely understood as a spirit of free and open inquiry directed against the blind acceptance of dogma backed by authority. They tended to view culture or civilization a product of the advance reason.  

As this tradition continued, the notion of reason came gradually to be joined with an ideal of what human beings could be and accomplish in a

---

civilized society, free of prejudices of the past. Thus, critique was aimed not only at producing a civilized social condition in which rational human nature could flourish but also of creating human beings capable of fulfilling their roles in such order. This tradition has been often called liberal humanism: liberal by virtue of its opposition to artificial constraints, especially of church and state, on human achievement; humanist because of its focus on the realization of human potential as the highest aspiration of both nature and history.

(b) The Romantic Reaction against the Enlightenment: Hermeneutics

Even before French Revolution, doubts about the ideology of the Enlightenment had already begun circulating among writers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau and the young Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Their doubts were confirmed by the bloody outcome of the French Revolution. Particularly in German-speaking countries, close observers of the revolution were troubled by the Enlightenment concepts of abstract reason, history as material progress, and the individual as its focal point. Beginning with Herder, Kant, Fichte, and the early Romantics, all admirers of Rousseau, the logical and mechanistic notion of reason that had developed during the Enlightenment was either altered in favour of a more ethical or practical conception or else rejected in favour of imagination as the central human faculty. Away from viewing history as scientific and technological progress by the Enlightenment thoughts, history increasingly was viewed not as a bold charge into the future but as a reverent recovery of the past and its traditions. The individual came to be seen not as the final result of nature and culture viewed mechanistically, but as part of larger and more complex natural organism that embraced humans both individually and collectively.

All these prepared the way for a new critical discourse, that of hermeneutics (Gr. hermeneuein meaning to translate, interpret, make intelligible), which began to emerge at the turn of the nineteenth century. First in the German theological seminaries (The word was first used by J.C. Dannhauer but the first major thinker to propose a general theory of
interpretation was Friedrich Schleiermacher, 1768-1834)⁴⁰ and later in such fields as literature and history, this new discourse insisted that the primary human relation to the world was not that of description and explanation, of objective observer to observe object, but of communication and interpretation, of reader to text. Within the discourse of hermeneutics, culture was viewed as the sum of human productions, all regarded as texts to be read and interpreted. Though it has tried hard in replacing the many mechanistic idea of Enlightenment, yet in its extreme position of reading the text and interpreting the meanings contained in cultural texts were reconstructed in the imagination of the reader and it could be creative or re-creative. Historian J.G. Droysen (1808-84) stressed that knowledge gained by interpretation- he had historical knowledge especially in mind- is entirely different from scientific knowledge.⁴¹ Wilhelm Dilthey explained a contrast between understanding and explanation saying our knowledge of historical, social and cultural facts which is the realm of the human, or cultural, sciences essentially involves interpretation. This is why it is radically different from the knowledge gained by application of scientific method in the natural sciences. Hermeneutics has since been regarded as a theory of interpretation of all bearers of meaning: not only texts but also human action and the various features of human culture and society.

But the very move by which hermeneutics turned all human cultural productions into texts of roughly equal standing and subjected them to the interpretation of the individual reader deprived it of any solid ground for making critical judgments about either the contents of the texts or the actual historical or political forces that gave rise to their production.

(c) Demystifying Romantic Attitudes: Materialist Critique

Beginning in the 1830s and 1840s, young radicals as Ludwig Feuerbach and Karl Marx firmly rejected the hermeneutic textualization of all cultural production, its operative model of reading ultimately guided by the

⁴¹ Ibid., 248
subjective imagination, and its backward looking view of history. They asserted that hermeneutics discourse was unable to provide a genuine critique of culture precisely because it ultimately reduced such an enterprise to the "subjective imagination" of the individual reader. As early as eighteenth century, scientist-theoreticians as Baron d'Holbach and Julien de LaMettrie had begun to oppose the mainstream liberal humanist tradition of the Enlightenment. They asserted that any approach to nature, society, or human beings that did not adopt the rigorously deterministic, mathematical, and materialist assumptions of the natural sciences was merely another form of superstitious mystification and hence no real advance over the preceding "dark ages". Another less rigorously materialistic yet equally significant development was the beginning of modern political economy in the writings of figures like Adam Smith. Rousseau may be mentioned as the most forceful and widely read eighteenth-century critic of the liberal humanist commitment to the idea that scientific and technological progress was the most important index of civilization's advance. His advocacy of a radical socialist view of democracy influenced both the materialist and the liberal humanist traditions of critical discourse.

Sometime in the middle of the nineteenth century, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels began drawing on certain "dialectical" methods for interpreting history, developed by the German Idealist philosophers, especially G.W.F. Hegel, in order to synthesize these earlier materialist and critical strands of the late Enlightenment into a new type of materialistic critical discourse variously called dialectical materialism, historical materialism or scientific socialism. According to Marx and Engels, the notion of culture was obscured and mystified if it was regarded as equivalent either to some set of presupposed values defining civilization or to a totality of tradition-bearing text. Rather, they expressed that culture must be regarded as a secondary phenomenon, a mere reflection of more fundamental historical forces, the explanation of which was ultimately to be sought in material economic processes. The task of Marxist cultural critique was to begin dismantling the dominant capitalist system by unmasking the various cultural
terms in which the system perpetuated itself in the minds, practices, institutions, and lives of its subjects. However many viewed the mechanistic and hermeneutic alternatives as either equally reductionistic in their own ways or as too dispersed in their seemingly interminable methodological disputes.

(d) From Society to Psyche: The New “Science” of Psychoanalysis:

Sigmund Freud took the step of postulating the existence of the unconscious, a part or layer of the human psyche that he situated between the biological needs and the impulses and that part of the psyche that was conscious or self-aware, and in immediate touch with its environment. In attempting to understand this unconscious, Freud became convinced that it was formed out of the desires, rooted in biology, which were denied access to the conscious part of the mind but remained operative in the unconscious psyche as repressed materials. Such phenomena as dreams, various forms of insanity, human sexual practices, mystical experience, artistic creativity, and even jokes and slips of tongue could now be explained on the basis of unconscious process linking physiological constitution with conscious awareness. Freud expanded his research into the arena of human culture and society. Freud’s general approach to cultural and social issues was to view them as collective projections of processes and conflicts rooted in the psychodynamics of every human being. Against liberal humanism’s concept of self and culture, psychoanalysis asserted not only that individual were generally unaware of the true wellsprings of their action but also that culture could never be adequately understood or criticized purely in terms of conscious, rational standards. While he developed a theory of interpretation, he regarded it as scientifically grounded in the actual dynamics of the human psyche, unlike hermeneutic theory.

However, Psychoanalysis soon underwent attack both as clinical practice and as a cultural theory partly due to critical disagreements about the validity of psychoanalysis’s basic concepts and theories and partly because of various uncritical biases that observers from other disciplines noticed in the general orientation of the new “science”.
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At the close of the nineteenth century, semiology (also called semiotics) began to exert an influence. Few decades later, semiology gave rise to a structuralist development. As elaborated by Charles Sanders Pierce and particularly by Ferdinand de Saussure in the beginning of the twentieth century, semiology was deliberately projected as a new “science that studies the life of signs within society”. Saussure's semiology was to be a sort of "master science" that would elucidate the structural laws of signification governing all forms of human cultural production, interaction, and communication. Thus semiology was conceived of as a discourse about culture that would, on the one hand, be comprehensive enough to embrace all recognized cultural phenomena, but on the other hand, would be free of the perceived reductionist tendencies of the various versions of the nineteenth-century social science. From the point of view of cultural critique, semiology had two important implications. First, it permitted culture in general to be viewed as a total system of signification, operating independently of the individual psychologies of its participants. That way reverses the emphasis on subjective interpretation that was implicit in hermeneutic and psychoanalytic discourse. Second, it contained an implicit critical dimension in its insistence on the arbitrariness, that is, the non-natural character of all signs. Semiology provided a critical vehicle for denaturalizing and relativizing any cultural configuration that had come to appear to its engaged participants as wholly natural, obvious, and unquestionable. This semiological approach allowed it not only to counteract the materialist emphasis in cultural critique but also to appear to offer a much more sophisticated and non-reductive procedure for analyzing specific cultural activities and institutions than was available in materialist and other types of discourse. Meanwhile the Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser utilized the structuralist approach to distance himself from the Hegelian methodology he so resented in Marx's work.

The major difficulties with Saussure's semiology (and its offshoots) as a critical discourse lay in the extremity of its emphasis on synchronic as
opposed to diachronic analysis and in its privilege of systematic structures to the almost total neglect of their effects on individual psychological functioning. In the name of new science of semiology, Saussure and his structuralist offspring seemed many critics to have rejected the relevance of both history and psychology to critical discourse.

(f) Cultural Critique between the World Wars: The Frankfurt School of Critical Theory

During the period between the world wars, cultural critics found the limitations of semiology and the structuralism especially troubling. In Germany, in particular, the failure of the republican Weimar government and the rise of National Socialism posed complex and novel problems with which, neither the older Marxist materialist tradition nor the more recent semiological and structural discourse was prepared to deal. While on the other hand, the victory of the nationalist and fascist mass movements over their communist rivals called into serious question. At the same time, the successes of using modern mass communications media and organizational techniques to manipulate the populace opened up new prospects for political coercion unforeseen in any of the earlier critical paradigms. As a response to such developments, the Institute for Social Research (often called the Frankfurt School because of its original location) was founded in 1923. The overall task of this group was twofold. First, while most of the members of this school rejected as simplistic and totalitarian the dominance of materialist discourse by what had become the Marxist orthodoxy particularly of the Soviet or Leninist cast. They nevertheless remained committed to the general principles of materialistic critique. However, they believed that Marx's historical materialism was in need of a thorough reconstruction before it could be applicable to the drastic changes in the cultural circumstances. Second, while their attitudes toward the traditional social sciences and Freudian psychoanalytic theory tended to be guarded, they nonetheless believed that both with some revision could be incorporated into a broader critical framework aimed at understanding the effects of modern mass media and social organization on the thought and behavior of individuals and social
groups. The School's attitude towards the Enlightenment is that of affirming reason when suitably redefined and applied would be a privilege and the vehicle for genuine accomplishment of the Enlightenment and liberation of humanity.

However to accomplish this, such a discourse would itself have to avoid any dogmatic or theoretically aloof stance of its own, remaining actively engaged with culture as it concretely exists, altering along with changes in social structure and function and most of all, practicing an ongoing and open-ended self-criticism of its own developed theories.

**(g) New Attacks on Liberal Humanism: Poststructuralist and Postmodernist Critiques**

German existentialist philosopher Martin Heidegger's famous "Letter on Humanism" that appeared in 1947 can be regarded as the salvo against the entire tradition of liberal humanist thought, including its modern critical forms. Heidegger, drawing his extensive writings beginning in the 1920s, charged that all European thought since Plato has been guided by a specifically metaphysical conception of Being. In the metaphysical definition of Being, human beings were viewed as one among the many different kinds of things, albeit a type with its own specific essence. He claimed that this conception of human being as a particular kind of thing with its own essential values lay at the basis of any humanism, including modern Enlightenment version. Even if it provided grounding for the human sciences and many modern cultural institutions, the concept of humanism ultimately obscured many more fundamental questioning about the Being and our participatory engagement with it. In asserting a notion of rationality derived from the Enlightenment as an essential feature of human being, humanism served, even if inadvertently, to further the very technological attitudes that Heidegger believed should be criticized.

Heidegger's "antihumanism" became an important point of departure for the generation of post-World War II. French intellectuals, most of whom had already been influenced by the Marxist existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre
and the structuralism of anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss, which sprang from Saussure's semiology. Such figures as psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, cultural historian Michel Foucault, and philosopher and literary critic Jacques Derrida came to be collectively referred to as poststructuralists, since despite many differences in their critical orientation and approach, they shared in common a rejection of structuralism as viable critical discourse, at least in part under the influence of the antihumanist ideas of Heidegger and of Friedrich Nietzsche (who earlier had influenced Heidegger's own view).

First, their common rejection of semiological or structuralist methods was based on a shared conviction that if all structures, whether psychological, social or cultural, were comprised of a set of specific differences among their basic elements, then the play of these differences must be more basic or fundamental than the structures to which they give rise. The poststructuralists sought various interpretative strategies that would destabilize the structures themselves. Second, they came to question the hermeneutic assumption that the consciousness of the reader could be a sufficiently stable site in which meaning could be produced. Taking their lead from Heidegger's critique of humanism and Lacan's revision of psychoanalysis, they held that the notion of the subject as a fixed locus where meaning was somehow produced must itself be deconstructed. Finally, while rejecting historical materialism and the critical theorists of the Frankfurt School, the poststructuralist deconstruction of the unitary and meaning producing subject implied that history could no longer be conceived of as a unitary narrative of rational, conscious, or collective human action. Materialism itself was viewed as just one of the many types of metaphysical theory. In the end, then poststructuralism represented the most extreme intensification of the skeptical tendencies of the Enlightenment. Well aware of the concrete historical failures of such projects of large scale structural change, especially in the twentieth century, the poststructuralists began to suggest a radically different approach to cultural criticism. They believed that they stop thinking about power through metaphor burrowed from the physical sciences.


Like continental poststructuralism, cultural studies does not refer to a single doctrinal position but to a more loosely related set of attitudes and approaches toward cultural criticism. Cultural studies is heavily indebted to the work, beginning in the 1950s, of the British literary critic, cultural historian and social activist Raymond Williams and its distinctive style, practical orientation and general theoretical framework continue to bear traces of his influence. Williams rejected the narrow, essentially humanist conception of culture as paradigmatically encountered in a canon of great works, and he sought to expand it not only to include but to emphasize popular or mass culture, a tendency already evident in the critical theory of the Frankfurt School. Secondly, in contrast to a view of cultural texts as finished products awaiting interpretation, cultural studies emphasizes the processes by which various cultural texts are produced; the various ways in which they are consumed, and the manner in which they maintained and contest existing social differences. Thirdly, in ways often more explicit than in poststructuralism, cultural studies tend to view concrete power differentials, closely related to but never reducible to material features of existing society, as lying at the heart of cultural criticism. In articulating this idea, many working within this discourse have drawn on the earlier revisionist Marxist theories of Louis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci. Finally Cultural studies has tended to emphasize concrete analyses of specific forms of cultural domination- issues involving class, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and so on.

As the most recently developed critical discourse, cultural studies has both drawn on and furthered three significant developments in the current intellectual landscape. After more than a century of intense debate about appropriate methods of cultural critique, cultural studies has shared in the shift of emphasis away from further theorizing and toward more substantive analyses of concrete mode and sites where issues of power and dominance are contested in contemporary society. In doing so, its attitude toward methodological issues has been very open. Rather than defining itself in terms of one or another methodological orientation, cultural studies has very
explicitly "poached" on other traditions of critical discourse, borrowing such analytical and critical tools from one another as seem most appropriate and useful for the subject matter under consideration. Finally, given the broad notion of culture which this discourse assumes, its various topics cut across the more traditional fields of inquiry, making it necessarily cross- and interdisciplinary. It is a matter of heated debate both within cultural studies circles and academic institutions at large, whether this critical discourse will or even should take its place alongside other recognized discipline; or whether it should remain a sort of "parapraxis" operating at the margins of other disciplines.42

There are theories of culture which have dominated anthropological thinking from about 1900 to 1950. They are the process-pattern theory derived from Boas, and best represented by A.L. Kroeber and the structural-functional theory derived mostly from Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown.

Each theory is holistic and universal. Each seeks to explain all aspects of culture within a single theoretical framework, and each intends to apply that framework to societies and cultures of any kind, from small primitive societies to complex civilizations.

Pattern Culture

A significant text for pattern theory of culture is the historical and critical review given by Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn after summary formulation of several hundreds of definitions of culture, which they believe, would be acceptable to most social scientists is stated below:

"Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture system

May, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action.⁴³

Ruth Benedict, in *Patterns of Culture* (1934), described cultures in terms of general emotional approach to the world. She viewed culture as a more or less consistent pattern of thought and action, with a characteristic purpose that pervades the forms of behavior and institutions of a society. Culture patterns may vary in complexity and in degree to which members of culture are conscious of them. Simple, explicit patterns may be expressed in work customs, dress, and diet. More complex patterns may be found in social, political, or economic systems. The U.S. anthropologist Kroeber distinguished between basic patterns, those which have persisted for thousands of years, and serve important functions, and secondary patterns, those which are less stable and allow more variations. Universal patterns, a framework for all cultures, have also been postulated.

**Structural functionalism**

The structural functionalism is likely to go better with the study of tribal culture. So we can see few features about it, apply it to tribal culture and analyze it to see how it works. Structural functionalism is a sociological paradigm which addresses what social functions various elements of the social system perform in regard to the entire system. Social structures are stressed and placed at the center of analysis, and social functions are deduced from these structures. It was developed in the United States by sociologist Talcott Parsons. It was developed, independently, in the United Kingdom by the students of social anthropologists Bronislaw Malinowski and Alfred Radcliffe-Brown. Functionalism is most often associated with sociology and socio-cultural anthropology.

Structural-functionalism drew its inspiration primarily from the ideas of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. A 'functionalist' approach, taken from

---

Durkheim meant that it was now possible to look at the rituals, taboos, and mores of primitive societies without trying seeing them judgmentally. Instead it was possible to look at such institutions from the standpoint of their functionality to those societies. Durkheim's nephew, the anthropologist Marcel Mauss pioneered the functionalist analysis in his study of the role of symbolic gifts amongst Native Americans. This less judgmental and more objective approach was already being taken up by American anthropologists like Boas and his students. Levi-Strauss realized that de Saussure's approach meant that it was possible to go further than Durkheim's functionalism. Not just language, but culture itself could be looked upon as a code of meaning in de Saussure's sense. The functionalist approach meant isolating particular institutions and trying to find parallels between those and modern institutions. But this meant that other cultures were still seen simply as version of our own.

Herbert Spencer, a British sociologist, was in many ways the first true sociological functionalist. Spencer recognized three functional needs or requisites that produced selection pressures: regulatory, operative (production), and distributive. He argued that all societies needed to solve problems of control and coordination, production of goods, services, and ideas, and finally, find ways to distribute these resources. Initially, in tribal societies, all three of these needs are inseparable, and the kinship system is the dominant structure satisfying them. As many scholars have noted, all institutions were subsumed under kinship organization. However, with increasing population, both in terms of sheer numbers and density, problems emerged in regards to feeding individuals, creating new forms of organization (i.e., the emergent division of labor), coordinating and controlling various differentiated social units, and developing systems of resource distribution. The solution, as Spencer sees it, would be to differentiate structures to fulfill more specialized functions. Thus, a chief or "big man" emerges, followed soon by a group of lieutenants, and later kings and administrators. In fact,

while Durkheim is widely considered the most important functionalist of the positivist theorists, it is well-known that much of his analysis was culled from reading Spencer's work; especially his Principles of Sociology.

Functionalism emphasizes the central role that agreement (consensus) between members of a society on morals plays in maintaining social order. This moral consensus creates an equilibrium, the normal state of society. Durkheim was concerned with the question of how societies maintain internal stability and survive over time. Durkheim proposed that such societies tend to be segmentary, with equivalent parts held together by shared values, common symbols, or, as his nephew Marcel Mauss held, systems of exchanges. In modern, complex societies members perform very different tasks, resulting in a strong interdependence between them. Based on the metaphor of an organism in which many parts function together to sustain the whole, Durkheim argued that complex societies are held together by organic solidarity. His views were continued by Radcliffe-Brown, who, following Auguste Comte, believed that the social constituted a separate "level" of reality distinct from both the biological and inorganic matter. Explanations of social phenomena therefore had to be constructed within this social level, with individuals merely being transient occupants of comparatively stable social roles.

Durkheim proposed that most stateless "primitive" societies that lack strong centralized institutions are based on an association of such corporate descent groups. Structural-functionalism also took on Malinowski's argument that the basic building block of society is the nuclear family, and that clans are therefore an outgrowth of families, not vice versa.

The central concern of structural-functionalism was a continuation of the Durkheimian task of explaining the apparent stability and internal cohesion needed by societies to endure over time. Societies are seen as coherent, bounded and fundamentally relational constructs, that function like organisms, with their various parts (social institutions) serving together. The various parts of society are assumed to work in an unconscious, quasi-
automatic fashion toward the overall social equilibrium. All social and cultural phenomena are therefore seen as functional in the sense of working together and are effectively deemed to have a "life" of their own. They are then primarily analyzed in terms of this function they serve. Individuals are significant not in and of themselves but in terms of their status, their position in patterns of social relations, and the behavior(s) associated with their status. The social structure is then the network of statuses connected by associated roles.

Structural functionalism is built upon twin emphases: application of the scientific method to the objective social world and use of an analogy between the individual organism and society. The emphasis on scientific method leads to the assertion that one can study the social world in the same ways as one studies the physical world. Thus, Functionalists see the social world as "objectively real," as observable with such techniques as social surveys and interviews. They believe that rules and regulations help organize relationships between members of society. Values provide general guidelines for behavior in terms of roles and norms. These institutions of society such as the family, religion, the economy, the educational and political systems, are major aspects of the social structure. Institutions are made up of interconnected roles or inter-related norms. For example, inter-connected roles in the institution of the family are of wife, mother, husband, father, son, brother, sister and daughter.

The theory is based around a number of key concepts. First, society is viewed as a system, a collection of interdependent parts, with a tendency toward equilibrium. Second, there are functional requirements that must be met in a society for its survival (such as reproduction of the population). Third, phenomena are seen to exist because they serve a function.47

Functionalists believe that one can compare society to a living organism, in that both a society and an organism are made up of interdependent working parts (organs) and systems that must function together in order for the greater body to function. An example of this can be found in the theory of Emergence. Functionalist sociologists say that the different parts of society e.g. the family, education, religion, law and order, media etc. have to be seen in terms of the contribution that they make to the functioning of the whole of society. This 'organic analogy' sees the different parts of society working together to form a social system in the same way that the different parts of an organism form a cohesive functioning entity.

Talcott Parsons was heavily influenced by Durkheim and Max Weber, synthesizing much of their work into his theory. Parsons' developed an action-theory based on system-theoretical concept and on the methodological principle of voluntary action. He stated that "the social system is made up of the actions of individuals". His starting point was the interaction between two individuals. Those individuals were faced with a variety of choices about how they might act. However, those choices are influenced and constrained by a number of physical and social factors. Parsons determined that each individual has expectations of the other's action and reaction to their own behaviour, and that these expectations would be "derived" from the accepted norms and values of the society which they inhabit.

Parsons then developed the idea of roles into collectivities of roles that complemented each other in fulfilling functions for society. Some of the roles are bound up in institutions and social structures, such as economic, educational, legal, and even gender structures. These structures are

---


functional in the sense they assist society to operate and fulfill its functional needs so that the society runs smoothly. A society where there is no conflict, where everyone knows what is expected of them, and where these expectations are constantly being met, is in a perfect state of equilibrium. The key processes for Parsons in attaining this equilibrium are socialization and social control. Socialization is important because it is the mechanism for transferring the accepted norms and values of a society to the individuals within the system. Perfect socialization occurs when these norms and values are completely internalized, that is they become part of the individual's personality. Parsons states, "this point, it should be made clear, is independent of the sense in which individual is concretely autonomous or creative rather than 'passive' or 'conforming', for individuality and creativity, are to a considerable extent, phenomena of the institutionalization of expectations", that is they are culturally constructed characteristics. Socialization is supported by the positive and negative sanctioning of role behaviours which do or do not meet these expectations. A punishment could be informal, such as a snigger or gossip, or more formalized through institutions such as prisons and mental institutions. If these two processes were perfect then society would become static and unchanging, and in reality this is unlikely to occur for long.
