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1. Discourse on Media Literacy

The discourse on literacy praxis is phenomenologically complex. Literacy by nature is historical both as a ‘condition’ that has evolved over time, and as an ‘event’ that takes place through the construction and deconstruction of meaning as to our daily encounter with multiple genres of ‘texts’ and ‘contexts’. It can be stated here that literacy practice is the clash or conflict of histories\(^1\) and historical entities across time and place. In a broader context, a more subjective way of defining literacy is to be “being in the world” or it refers to one’s social and cultural existence. But a micro perspective on literacy restricts its meaning to the mere encounter of human beings with letters or literal texts with the help of writing and reading. The complexity of practicing literacy is even more in the new age of media and communication. New media, starting from modern TV to Internet have not only provided new platforms where the audience members and users have access to a variety of information, but also they have changed the way people used to live their lives in the past. Media has changed the way people used to identify themselves with other social and cultural entities or with the social and cultural world. Though, the literal meaning of the term literacy is to be “being a literate”, i.e. to acquire the ability to read and write in a language; from a larger context, the meaning of literacy may not be confined to such a narrow understanding, as it is not through writing and reading of ‘letters’ only that we express ourselves, but there are many other events and activities which considerably affect our mode of thinking and living.

The promotion and acquisition of literacy therefore becomes a complex phenomenon where each and every entity within the social world comes into a network of relationship one affecting the other. In a mediated society, the network of relationship is even more complex as a result of over representation and reproduction of ideas and events. A change in the process and means of establishing relationship in the age of [new]media has brought a change in the

\(^1\) Refers to the clash or conflict of histories and historical entities across time and place.
condition of literacy, what is now called as media literacy. Although the primary objective of literacy practice is to establish relationship between ‘self’ and the ‘other’, i.e. the other world, such an activity has become more difficult as a result of the continuous division of the ‘other’ due to over representation and reproduction facilitated by media and literacy. The formation of a more fragmented and fractured “representational space”, i.e. the “other”--is considered to be the consequence of such new forms of literacy practice commonly visible through the conditions of knowledge, civil society and the public sphere. In an Indian context, the representational space not only gets fractured by media in a technical sense, but also, a greater degree of fragmentation is facilitated by policy discourse with an objective to give a pluralistic status to the Indian state. Along with, a high degree of consciousness among individuals and different communities over their rights, and a sense of alienation among certain section of the population, further amplify the situation.

Further, new literacy practice, known as media literacy or new media literacy is affecting the condition of knowledge, public sphere, power structure, the status and positions of intellectuals, and overall, the social dynamics, that seem to be more fractured and diverse in character. It is also a result of the participatory nature of new media, and its power to disseminate information in a greater pace than ever before. As a consequence, theoretically, the discourse of literacy practice has undergone a considerable change. Simultaneously, such alternative theoretical discourses have brought ruptures in one’s social and cultural existence. Literacy as a spatial practice (Ong, 2002)—as it constructs and reconstructs space, as we are living in a representational space, more so in a mediated society—has changed the social and cultural space within which we live or make our existence. The transformation in the social condition has affected the existence of human life as a social being with a change both in its ontological and epistemological status. It has affected the social relations of production through which one constructs one’s own identity. Human identity, as a result of new literacy practice, has gone through a remarkable change both
in its condition and form. On the one hand, the ontological status of human identity in the post-human condition—as explained by Donna Haraway (1999[1985]) in *Cyborg Manifesto*—has been experiencing a transformation that is unimaginable in human history; on the other hand, the epistemological identity in today’s context seems to be more ‘fluid’, ‘unstable’ and ‘fragile’ in nature attributed to new literacy practices.

The importance of literacy practice, therefore, cannot be underestimated in analysing social dynamics. A conscious practice of literacy can bring a revolutionary change in human existence on different counts, starting from its social to cultural and political existence. At the same time, literacy as a false ideology produces an oppressed society where people are seen to be culturally and politically unconscious. Thus the impact of the discourse of literacy practice on the social condition is often conflicting and contradictory. Keeping these aspects in view, the research focuses on the dialectical nature of literacy discourse and its impact on social dynamics in India. It takes a phenomenological approach in analysing media literacy and its impact on social dynamics, primarily, from the point of view of its impact on the condition of knowledge, its impact on civil society, public sphere, and social structure. Shifting its location in between ‘structuralism’ and ‘post-structuralism’, as the two prominent theoretical movements for constructing knowledge and meaning, the study problematises the existing literacy discourse and its impact on social dynamics.

*Literacy/media literacy has been considered as an important factor of social change. As a force of production (Raymond Williams, 1980), media literacy is both material and ideological in character that makes itself a contradictory event. Not only as an event, but also, the role of media literacy can be seen from a dialectical/contradictory perspective as a ‘discourse’. On the one hand, media literacy is considered as force of colonisation, on the other, it can be a force for liberation of the colonised, depending upon the type of literacy discourse that is being practiced among the masses. While literacy*
discourse from a structuralist perspective produces a totalitarian understanding or world view, a post-structuralist discourse in literacy practice brings diversity and multiplicity in the ways of understanding or world views and promotes dialogue among individuals, communities, and larger socio-cultural entities. Post-structural practice as a literacy event, promotes a multicultural society. Literacy from a post-structural perspective enhances an inter-subjective understanding across religion, caste and communities.

As the title suggests, the study primarily focuses on the dialectical/contradictory dimensions of ‘media literacy’ as a phenomenon, and its impact on the social dynamics in India. It would be judicious here to give a slight hint on dialectic as a discourse. Dialectic as a theory of movement of both the subject and the object has been applied by many social thinkers and philosophers in the past to expound the contradictory nature of human progress. G. W. Hegel and Karl Marx are still considered as prominent figures in dialectical thinking. Dialectical principles are also popular among the neo-marxists of the Frankfurt school mainly, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Leo Lowenthal, among others. In France, dialectic as a method of analysis has been popularised by Henri Lefebvre during the later part of 1960s and early 1970s. Irrespective of their differences in approach, dialectic, as Micahel Forster (1993) opines, “is essentially a method of expounding our fundamental categories...It is a method of exposition in which each category in turn is shown to be implicitly self-contradictory and to develop necessarily into the next” (Forster, 1993, p. 132), gradually forming a collective category, which Hegel terms as an ‘absolute idea’. Relying on dialectic as a discourse of interpretation, the purpose of the study here is to develop a concrete idea on the contradictory nature of ‘media literacy’—as there a contradiction lies between structuralism and post-structuralism—and its impact on social dynamics in India.

The study emphasises on both the theory and praxis of media literacy, and its impact on social dynamics. From a theoretical perspective, the
contradiction in analysing media literacy lies between structuralism and post-structuralism, while, a practical perspective delves more into the contradictions that arise as a result of one's conscious or unconscious practice of these theories vis-a-vis structuralism and post-structuralism. Not only the discourse and condition of media literacy is understood from both a pro and counter theoretical perspective, but also, the research attempts to reflect upon the impact of such theoretical discourses on the socio-cultural aspects of the society.

1.1. Understanding Media Literacy: A Phenomenological Perspective
Phenomenology is considered as the science of phenomena. As a philosophical tradition, it is deep rooted in the works of ancient to modern philosophers. Edmund Husserl is considered to be the first modern thinker to popularise phenomenology, and later, its relevance has been felt more in language, literature and cultural studies. Phenomenology as an epistemological tool emphasizes on the understanding of the processes of existence of different phenomena. Relying on such phenomenological traditions, the study considers media literacy as a phenomenon, and evaluates its impact on various other aspects such as culture, ideology, power relations, knowledge, and social structure in India. As Edmund Husserl (1902-03) opines: “Phenomenology: this term designates a science, a complex of scientific disciplines; but it also designates at the same time and above all a method and an attitude of thought: the specifically philosophical attitude of thought, the specifically philosophical method” (Husserl, 1992-03, p. 19). Relying on the phenomenological tradition, the study emphasises on the understanding of media literacy and its relationship with many other social and cultural events.

From a phenomenological perspective, ‘understanding media literacy’ is part this study. It has been argued by the researcher that understanding media literacy is a continuous struggle for the unity of the 'subject' and 'object'. But such a contradiction or disunity between the subject and object has been long-standing since the time of Kant’s philosophical dualism between
‘understanding’ and ‘sensibility’ and Rene Descartes’ problem with mind-body dualism. In a way, media literacy is more concerned with the construction of knowledge through an understanding of the ‘self’, and an understanding of the ‘other’. Such a dialectical relationship between self and the other determines the condition of knowledge. As an absolute understanding is never possible, media literacy is always incomplete and for that matter absolute knowledge or an absolute unity of subject and object. It refers to the fact that change is inevitable as long as there is disunity between the subject and the object. It is only the existing difference between the subject and the object which is the driving force for any evolution or change.

In a Husserlian sense, as a conscious act, through media literacy, the ‘knowing subjects’ attempt to identify with the phenomenological ‘object’ through a ‘phenomenological’ or ‘epistemological’ reduction. Often, media literacy is considered as an epistemological condition as it deals with the construction of meaning and production of knowledge. Conventionally, media literacy is ‘consciousness’ about media construction of images, ideas and texts, and the meaning it generates for the masses. First and for most, the central concern of media literacy, therefore, is on the processes of construction of meaning. Unconventionally, media and literacy has wider connotations that broaden the notion of ‘text’, ‘reading’ and ‘writing’.

Media literacy here is considered both as an ‘object of enquiry’ and a ‘subjective condition’ to overcome the ‘objects of enquiry’, maintaining the dialectical continuity between self and the other, or between the subject and the object as there always exist a lag between the subject or object. In line with Husserl, in *Idea of Phenomenology* (1902-03), one can term media literacy as the act of unity of the ‘act of knowing’ and the ‘object known’, through a ‘knowledge claim’ made in two successive stages: First, at the ‘critical level’ where the ‘knowing subjects’ deals with the ‘possibility of knowledge’, and in the second stage, the ‘meta critical level’ that deals with the ‘possibility of knowledge of the possibility of knowledge’, which, otherwise can be
considered as a ‘meta-understanding’ or understanding about the processes of understanding. Such an approach in phenomenology is more or less similar with a post-structural critique of the self. Here, in the present context, it is a Meta critique of the knowledge that constitutes the self or ‘identity’. Indirectly, it is a critique of the ‘existing structure of knowledge’, and an ‘identity’ that is facilitated by this existing structure of knowledge.

Understanding media literacy is essential for becoming a media literate as it is believed that “understanding is becoming”. In order to become a media literate, it is argued here that there is a need to understand media literacy and learn the processes of literacy practice. Initially, in the critical stage, literacy as a conscious act comes into contact with the objects, where ‘knowledge entails the problem of ‘transcendence’. In the later stages, the problem of knowledge is dealt with the problem of ‘correspondence’ where an agreement takes place between the ‘act of knowing’ and the ‘object known’. Such an agreement is nothing but the unity of the subject and object that is temporal in nature, because, both the subject and the object of inquiry seem to be in a continuous process of change or movement. It includes to the fact that the correlation between the ‘knowing subject’ and the ‘object known’ is dialogical and continuous process.

As an ‘object of inquiry’, media literacy itself requires a ‘subjective condition’ to come to a conclusion about what media literacy is. In this context, it can be said that media literacy is about attaining ‘new subjectivities’ or creating a context for encountering texts and meanings. It is stressed here that ‘subjectivity’ and ‘understanding’ are reciprocal to each other. Here it is considered that understanding is becoming. Therefore, an understanding of media literacy is essential as to become a ‘media literate’. In a sense, media literacy is a simultaneous movement of both the ‘subject’ and the ‘object’, i.e. a movement from ‘being’ to ‘becoming’ and from ‘becoming’ to ‘being—a dialectical process. Before moving ahead with the subject/object of enquiry, it
is better to clarify that both media literacy and literacy are synonymous and they can be used interchangeably.

Walter J. Ong (1982) writes, “Literacy began with writing, but, at a later stage of course, also involves print” (Ong, 1982, 2002; p. 2). Subsequently it has brought e-literacy and digital literacy into its ambit. Thus, it has been argued here that the concept of literacy has remained the same, but the context of practicing literacy has changed the condition of literacy practice. As argued by many others, literacy/media literacy has been seen as a contradictory category or condition. It is both material and cognitive. Presumably, it always works in the direction of a subject-object unity or identity, but always fails in its effort to bring an absolute unity among them. General perception of literacy implies the ability to read and write in a language. But media literacy is beyond the simple act of reading and writing. Even if it is so, then the act of reading and writing should not be taken literally. Most often, media literacy is defined as the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and produce media messages. It deals with two aspects: one is technical, i.e. access to media technology and the other one is cognitive, i.e. much to do with critical thinking. A more conventional approach to media literacy is about the critical consumption and production of media texts that includes both electronic and print media. Unconventionally, media, text and literacy have wider connotations than how they are generally understood.

As Mansy (2009) writes:

They constitute texts in a broad sense (for example, music: a music score, a symphony; art: sculpture, physics: an equation, architecture: a museum) that fuse with religion gender, race, culture, and power, and that produce speakers, writers, artists, communities. In short, through reading, reading the world, and self as texts, literacies constitute ways of becoming with the world. (Mansy, 2009, p. 14)

The above lines made by Mansy, however, looks similar to Heidegger’s notion of ‘Dasein’, i.e. “being-in-the-world” (Heidegger, [1953]1996, p. 150), thus expanding the idea of literacy and the texts that it constitutes. This makes
‘understanding’ or ‘Dasein’, which means ‘being there’, a requisite for literate practice.

From a wider perspective, literacy/reading is an engagement of the ‘self’ with the ‘other’. Literacy as a spatial practice constructs the space. Even ‘space’, as it has been elucidated by Lefebvre (1991) is considered as text constituted by literacy discourse. In this context, the research does not confine ‘space’ only to concrete space, but includes even the metaphysical space. Further, a dialectical analysis establishes the relationship literate practice and metaphysical space. In a way, the researcher considers literacy/media literacy as a force of production of space in both material and immaterial senses. Such a conceptualisation of literacy helps in not only writing or reading the word but also, reading the ‘world’ as a text. As a result, the researcher does not consider literacy only as a means of objective reading or writing, but also, it is a way of living or experiencing the life.

Consciously or unconsciously, at every moment of our life, we write at the same time we read. We live as texts, we live in a text and we live along with texts. It wouldn’t be unwise if it is said that “we live in a textual world”. Continuously, we engage ourselves in encoding, at the same time we decode or recode. We produce, as we consume, and vice-versa. In the process, we come into confrontation with a whole range of ever-changing experiential and symbolic space scattered throughout the world. We engage in a continuous process of translation and transformation of our ‘self’ and the ‘others’ that gives a new direction to the study of literacy as a ‘translational activity’. We transform idea and matter from one to the other, i.e. from source to target, and vice-versa. Then literacy becomes a process of recontextualisation/decontextualisation. Literacy is of de[re]territorialisation. Through literacy, we identify ourselves with space and time and derive meanings out of them. It creates a new identity for us and also for others, substantiating again to the fact that there is always a dialectical relationship between the self and the other.
On the one hand, the ‘self’/ ‘consciousness’ evolves as a result of our continuous engagement with the other, on the other hand, the ‘other’ is moulded and conditioned with an active participation of the self or what is termed as ‘intervention’, necessarily a post-structural and postmodern way of engaging oneself with the space. Literacy is a dialogical process through which one identifies the other while being identified by the other, that constitutes one’s self identity. It conditions the self and also it conditions the other. Literacy/media literacy is more about ‘knowing the other’ or ‘accommodating’ the other, while, at the same time being ‘accommodated by the other’ resulting often in resolution of conflicts and contradictions. In another sense, literacy is the simple act of unity of the self and the other. It is a condition which is maintained through a continuous process of arguments and counter arguments, discourses and counter discourses. The art of being literate or literacy is a continuous process, not a static condition. It is a historical endeavour realized through the constitution of a collective body of knowledge or an expedition through the paths of civilizations from ancient to modern. It is a historical project or a historical condition. Literacy itself is a history and we historicize through literacy. Here the researcher would like to mention that historicism and its connection with literacy is related to the structuralist philosophy of language found mostly in the works of Saussure (1974) and also in the philosophy of Hegel and Marx through their works on structure/history of consciousness/subjects and history of matter/objects. As a discourse, the condition of literacy is realized in historical process or meta-texts, as David R. Olson (1991) considers literacy as a “meta-linguistic activity” (Olson, 1991, p. 251). At the same time, texts are realized through the discourse of literacy establishing a dialectical relationship between literacy and texts.

Both literacy and texts are real and imagined, realized through the condition of tradition, modernity and postmodernity. As a historical condition, literacy is both ideological and material in character. It is an ideo-practical venture which subscribes both to the philosophy of materialism and idealism. Literacy as a process constantly makes an effort to plug the illusive disunity
between idealism and materialism, between the emerging subjects and its new and evolving objects. But it always fails in its effort to unite them, resulting in more number of conflicts, engendering a more contradictory and chaotic socio-cultural space. As an epistemological condition, media literacy deals with the construction of knowledge and search for truth. This ultimately determines the ontological dimensions of our society, culture, politics, economy, and the state. Literacy has never been a complete project. It has its own spatial breaks experienced through the different phases of human civilization as we experience it in the transitory phases; from tradition to modernity and from modernity to postmodernity.

1.2. Dialectics of Media Literacy

The argument over the growth, promotion and culture of literacy/media literacy has been long standing since the early civilization to the modern. In general, media literacy today is considered a great part of Cultural Revolution in terms of general practices related to human interaction. If we study history in proper perspective, we find many instances of how literacy has influenced the growth and evolution of the world. The way literacy has been promoted is subject to question since the early age through the structural and post-structural thinkers. Only an unconventional historical approach would better establish the fact that the present civilization where we live now is the result of a historical transformation. Seemingly, the condition human civilization has arrived at is the result of an inevitable change driven by both material and spiritual forces, and their constant interface with each other. However, the root of such a dialectical process has remained problematic and a material-ideal dilemma. Throughout, the concept of literacy/media literacy has been confined to the modernist discourses of enlightenment and rationality which most often comes into conflict with its postmodern discourses. The structural/functional approach to media literacy with its totalitarian and authoritarian principles has often been challenged by the post-structural and postmodern thinkers. Its temporality i.e., the condition of our civilization including the literacy required
to participate in it, is filled with fear and anxiety, where, at every moment there is something on offer but not without sacrifice, which asserts to the claim made by the postmodern theorists like Best and Kellner (1997) as they write, “The postmodern turn contains a mutating mixture of risks and excitement, losses and gains, resulting from the destruction of the old and creation of the new” (Best and Kellner 1997, p.16). Such a perplexing situation necessitates a dialectical inquiry of media literacy discourse and social dynamics in India.

While every stage of civilization has offered new opportunities, along with them, it has also brought new challenges for the survival and growth of both living and nonliving beings and objects of the world. Further reflections are indispensable for an inquiry on this phenomenal change that would clarify the obscurity underlying media, literacy and change. Hence, the idea of media literacy can be enlarged beyond the conventional boundaries of print and digital culture. This has often confused the historians and philosophers to make a conclusive judgment on the question: whether the change is backed by literacy—in its unconventional terms—or the natural and spiritual transformation of the world has necessitated the evolution and growth of new literacy among the civilizations? The argument over the root of change and its driving forces never ends as it enters the problem of material-ideal or subject-object dualism. Gradually, the civilization has reached the stage where we now belong to, discarding its primordial characters and embracing new elements that have been proved to simplify life and living on earth. Such a dialectical progress of the world is characterized through inventions, discoveries, reorders, ruptures, and many epochal changes creating multiple borders and differences around the globe. While literacy or media literacy has virtually bridged the earlier existing differences, it has led to the creation of artificial and imaginary borders or new and emerging interfaces and surfaces. Here, it would not be unwise to judge that every new invention has led to the alienation of ‘becoming’ from the ‘being’. The justification for reflecting on such a process of alienation is not to show the human civilization a path of reversal to primordiality, but to clarify on the gradual differentiation of men from nature.
Simultaneously, it is an effort to shed light on the false consciousness that is generated through media discourses often loaded with ideological elements, or to minimize or bridge the ever expanding gap between new subjects with the new and evolving objects. Still, it is a contradiction, as individuals who are gradually distancing themselves from nature are also a part of it. It provokes a debate whether there is really any difference or boundary among the entities of the globe or the globe is a living whole or there is something beyond. The same question comes to the mind whether media literacy is a force of unification or division, like many other such opposing tendencies that have long been suspected to have grown out of literacy/ media literacy discourse.

The purpose of such a historical—dialectical—reflection clarifies the coherence among the events and their causal relationships. Such a relentless progress of the world moves dialectically towards an unknown location in space and time. Though its immediate present is decipherable and visible, its root is often untraceable, and its future form is unpredictable because the dialectics never end. Such a self perpetuating force brings change, and the change itself becomes a perpetuating force for further change. Since ages, literacy has remained a force of institutionalization of the process of production for fulfilling human desires and institutional goals. Along the lines, literacy is becoming more complex, associating itself with many other evolving means of production and change in the relations of production. Likewise, a shift from traditional agrarian society to modern industrial society has urged the need for a new kind of literacy in terms of industrial labour, an informational society demands informational labour force for its sustenance and growth. Literacy has not only brought changes in the occupational patterns of the societies around the globe, but also such a condition has brought a significant change in the demographic structures, which is more energetic in the age of globalization and informationalisation. Globalization as a dominant discourse in the cultural, political and economic spheres has insisted the growth and evolution of a new literacy to participate in the global discourses. As a mode of production, globalization has led to the need for a cosmopolitan-literacy to participate in
the formation of cultural, economic and political dialogues among nations, regions, localities, and communities. The internalization of such literacy has led to the birth of cosmopolitan individuals. While, at some levels, such literacy helps in the unification of the world, at some other, it creates divisions with multiple facets of cultural, political, and economic encounters with new and emerging interfaces. In the process the social, cultural, political atmosphere become more complex and chaotic. In the Indian context, such a condition is often experienced as a result of media diversity catering to multiple audience preferences and choices on the basis of age, gender caste, and class, religion and ethnic ideologies that compete for space and recognition.

1.3. Theorizing Media Literacy

Theorizing media literacy comes under a broad range of theoretical adventures from philosophy to cultural and literary theory. From a philosophical perspective, media literacy as a category can be analyzed using dialectics or dialectical phenomenology. It situates media literacy as a contradictory category where the attributes of media literacy are positioned in binary oppositions to each other. However, such an analysis does not seem to have much relevance in the post-modern age where there is an emphasis on multiplicities. Media literacy as a social category relies heavily on the critical traditions developed by the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research through the works of Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Walter Benjamin, Jurgen Habermas, and many others in their critique of media and popular culture and its impact on society, culture and politics of the west. Major contributions to the critical traditions come from the works, such as The Dialectic of Enlightenment (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1993), One Dimensional Man (Marcuse, 1964), Negative Dialectics (Adorno, 1990), Reason and Revolution (Marcuse, 1986), Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, Philosophical Discourses of Modernity, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (1989), and many others. Media literacy also borrows the Marxists traditions from Capital, Grundisse, German
Ideology, and The Communist Manifesto. The analysis of social structure and class consciousness, as analyzed by Marx, and later thinkers have been proved revolutionary among the working class as reflected through the works of Richard Hoggart, Georg Lukacs and E. P. Thompson respectively in The Uses of Literacy, History and Class Consciousness and the Making of the English Working Class.

Media Literacy as a critique of ideology is based on the work of Louis Althusser through his influential essay *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* (ISAs). It helps us in analyzing the ideological interpellations through media and other state agencies. Further, such a critical tradition has been carried forward by Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci in the field of hegemony and in the later stages through the work of Edward Said and Herbert Schiller on Colonialism and Cultural Imperialism respectively. Later in the 1960s, such a tradition takes a cultural turn with the establishment of the Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies (BCCS). Media literacy as a cultural category is reflected in the works, most notably of Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall through their analysis of media, culture and society, and points of their intersection. While Williams’ analysis of media and culture has been based on the Marxist traditions of ‘base and superstructure’ as it is reflected in Culture and Materialism (1980, 2005), Stuart Hall’s analysis of media texts is found in his influential work on Encoding/Decoding. The textual approach to critical theory and cultural studies as applied by Hall has actually been borrowed from the French literary and linguistic traditions through the work of Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault. At certain stages, it seems the structural/functional approach to media literacy, as a theoretical tradition, has been contrasted by the post-structural and post modern approaches developed through the work of Foucault, Derrida and Barthes. Similarly, a modernist approach to literacy as crystallized in the eighteenth century enlightenment has been found deceptive when it is contrasted with the postmodern approach.
Through the ages, media literacy as theoretical tradition has been evolved through discourses and counter discourses in philosophy, culture and literary studies. Even a modernist vision of public sphere as explained by Jurgen Habermas, constituted as a result of literacy discourse in the eighteenth century England and France is questionable. A postmodern literacy, not only questions the condition of public sphere, but also, it questions the condition of politics, culture, and social structure of the global society. A critical examination of media, and literacy connected to it, reflects the changing dimensions of public sphere and its impact on national politics and culture as it is obvious that we cannot draw a clear-cut boundary between public sphere and politics. The condition of the public sphere as a realm of free debate and discussion that largely depends on media literacy practice further conditions the political atmosphere and democratic setup of a country. For instance, the diverse nature of Indian media produces a politically diverse society.

As it is mentioned earlier that literacy is the unity of subject and object. Conflicts and contradictions as we perceive arise as a result of incompleteness in the condition of literacy or subject-object disunity or the perennial break that lies between theory and praxis. Such a condition is characterized through post-modernity where we experience a more chaotic and disjunctive space through a structured and modernist subject. Such cognitive breaks have been experienced in the transitional phases of the civilization from tradition to modernity and post modernity. Literacy as a material force of production has always been discriminatory in character that subscribes to Marxist tradition which asserts the reciprocal relation between ‘material production’ and ‘mental production’. The incomplete and transient nature of literacy both ‘technically’ and ‘cognitively’, as mentioned earlier, only maintains the existing class order. Literacy is deceptive, if it is promoted and appreciated as a false ideology or condition for maintaining the dominant order in the social, economic, cultural, and political realms. But as an ideal condition, literacy has revolutionary potentials to change the existing and dominant social and cultural order.
1.4. History of Literacy Studies

Throughout history, not only literacy, but also literacy studies as argued by Graff (1991) have been a “subject of continuities and contradictions”. Studies on literacy mostly focus on the impact of writing on the human civilization. Media literacy as a concept is the centre of debate in culture and media studies. Even though, ‘literacy’ as a necessity for learning and living has been practiced since early history, it is more like a phenomenon in the contemporary age of media and communication revolution. Studies on literacy and its impact on social and cognitive practices are found mostly in the works of linguists and social psychologists. Notable among them are Lord (1960), McLuhan (1962), Havelock (1963, 1973, 1976, 1978, 1991), Levi-Strauss (1966, 1979, 1982), Goody (1968, 1977), Parry (1971), Sampson (1980), Street (1984), Selfe (1999), Graff (1991, 2007, 2009). Studies on literacy practices in between 1960s and 1990s are focused more on the relationship of literacy to orality, where literacy has been equated with the practices of reading and writing. Most of the studies during this period have related literacy practice to the intellectual traditions and human cognitive thinking, highlighting the contrast between orality and literacy. Recently, the world over, media literacy has caught the attention of media educators, policy makers and a few national and international agencies working for the development and promotion of media literacy. Prominent among them are Aufderheide (1993), Tyner (1998), Livingstone (2003, 2004, 2009), Kellner and Share (2005), Jose Tornero & Varis (2010), Brian O’Neill & Cliona Barnes (2008), Nagaraj and Kundu (2013), Grizzle et al. (2013), Meigs (2013), and Culver (2013). From the studies conducted in the 1990s and after, quite a significant change has been observed in conceptualising literacy practices and its impact on the social dynamics of the world.

Except in cases of a few works, media literacy has been dealt more as a functional category to facilitate the existing relations of production. Media literacy as a force of production is promoted for maintaining the relations that
abide the existing socio, economic and political and cultural order. From among the existing studies, it has been observed that hardly any attempt has been made for a theoretical or philosophical understanding of the concept of media literacy and its impact on social dynamics. A few organizations that are working for the promotion of media literacy argue for the inclusion of media literacy in educational pedagogy as it has been adopted in some of the European nations. A few of them are UNESCO, NORDIC, CML (Center for Media Literacy), Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore Foundation (GRTF) in India, and Peace Gong (India). Though media literacy has become a part of the educational curricula in the school education in many of the western countries in North America and Europe, it has not been fully considered as a part in Indian educational curricula. Its role and importance is certainly ignored in academic parlance and policy discourse.

Considering its role and importance in a media saturated environment, media literacy has been the subject of inquiry not only in academics but also in national and international policy discourses. So far there is not enough literature to trace the history of media literacy. Most of the studies that have been conducted during the 1980s and 1990s are concerned more with literacy as a practice of reading and writing and take a contrasting account of the practice of writing on orality and vice-versa. It is believed that media literacy has its origin in Canada and US through the works of Fr. Jhon Kulkin and Marshall McLuhan (Walkosz et.al, 2008). McLuhan’s (1964) ‘Understanding Media: The Extension of Man’ is still considered to be the founding text in understanding media, messages and its impact on society. McLuhan’s work has given the initial direction to the study of media literacy practices. Later, with UNESCO’s Grunewald declaration in the 1980s, only media literacy as a concept came to much limelight in the global scene. Later, it has been appreciated and promoted by many other agencies. The origin of media literacy can also be traced further down to the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research (ISR) and its invention of critical theory as a method of analyzing mass and popular culture in twentieth century Europe.
As Barbara J. Walkosz, Tessa Jolls and Marry Ann Sund (2008) write:

Media literacy has its roots in the 1960’s through the 1980’s through the work of pioneers like McLuhan, Sister Bede Sullivan and Fr. John Kulkin, among others. Barry Duncan an early media literacy advocate from Canada reports that early conferences in Canada, beginning in 1990 at the University of Wales, Ontario, started attracting a second wave of people interested in concerns about media. Today, the field has continued to grow to point where it is represented in as global as the media itself. Gradually, the perceptions about what media literacy is—and what it isn’t—have emerged as meeting the demand for educating citizens capable of navigating the global village has increased. Understanding that demand is a starting place for understanding media literacy. (Walkosz et.al., 2008, p. 7)

1.5. Media Literacy Now

With an ever encompassing role of media, media literacy today is considered a priority in societies around the globe as they are transforming into information or knowledge societies. The role and importance of media literacy is even felt more as a necessity because of the structural changes that we are experiencing in almost every aspect of our life starting from mediated interactions to socio-cultural practices in the virtual space. Such changes in the socio-cultural space have led to the birth of new categories like ‘digital literacy’, and ‘virtual literacy’. Often, such changes are not free from their own difficulties and contradictions. In an Indian context, we face the difficulties of encapsulating the competing diversities in terms of religion, caste, creed, ethnicity, and gender that makes the promotion of media and information literacy a complicated issue. The role of media and information literacy is even seen as essential because of the transformation of the world centred on agriculture and industry to a world centred on knowledge and information. Considering this fact, as Jānis Kārkliņš (2013) has opined “UNESCO has been actively promoting the concept of Knowledge Societies in which Information Literacy (IL) plays a fundamental role in building inclusive, pluralistic, equitable and participatory societies” (Kārkliņš, 2013, p.7).
Literacy is taking new dimensions along with the invention of new technologies of communication and their adoption in our daily practices. From the age of writing to the age of digital communication, quite unconsciously, literacy is going through a continuous process of evolution and change. Though the traditional definition of literacy has remained as the mere ability to read and write, the context of practicing literacy has gone through a lot of transformation. But the common man’s perception on literacy is still restricted to the conventional ability to recognize letters in symbolic characters or the ability to read and write in a language. Considering the impact and implications of media and literacy on our intellectual traditions, conditions of knowledge, state of the public sphere, politics, democracy, individual and collective identity, culture and traditions, however we see and judge, it is often contradictory and questionable whether literacy/media literacy has brought divisions within societies and countries on the basis of our capacity to learn and decide or it has brought unity through cultural participation as a result of new literacy practices. Such an ambivalence position of literacy has more been the subject matter of enquiry among linguists, social psychologists, literary critics, and philosophers in the recent times.

Literacy practice has always been contextual in nature. The condition and category of literacy varies depending upon its field of study and the context in which it is practiced. The idea of being literate or semi literate raises questions over the concept of literacy and its impact on everyday life in different contexts and locations. On this, Brian O’Neill and Cliona Barnes (2008) opine:

> Media literacy today has become a priority for debate and public action, involving a wide variety of stakeholders, responding to distinct social, political and market forces. The specific context for media literacy in different countries may vary enormously and substantial research is required to properly assess and compare its position in different locations. (Brian O’Neill and Cliona Barnes, 2008, p. 25)

This, however, makes it clear that there is a need for research on media literacy practices to evaluate its positions in different locations and contexts. It
demands a historical understanding of the growth and evolution of media literacy and its impact on social dynamics. The colonial history of India and its resurgence from colonial subjugation escaping from the British administration, and in the later stages, the unification of various provinces under one statehood with a diverse set of competing ideologies and expectations make it worth a critical space for studying different literacy practices, and its impact on socio-political and cultural dynamics. With a rich source of social, cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity, the need for Media and Information Literacy (MIL) is even felt more in India than in any other country of the world. The role of media literacy for the promotion of peace and harmony through intercultural dialogue as argued by Nagaraj and Kundu (2013) is highly valued in the Indian context. Even Tornero and Varis (2010) label media literacy as a ‘new humanism’ for “the creation of a culture of peace and peaceful understanding between communities” (Tornero and Varis, 2010, p.126).

Tornero and Varis (2010) prescribe a seven point agenda for intercultural dialogue among the different sections of people in the world and argue for the promotion of media literacy to “Create a peaceful and interdependent world that constitutes a good place to live” (Ibid., p. 122) that has much relevance in the Indian context. In such circumstances, it is relevant here to ask: What kind of literacy/media literacy we want in India? So far, no comprehensive and complete study has been made on media-literacy taking into consideration the diverse characteristics of Indian society.

1.5.1. Media Literacy: A Global Perspective

Media literacy as a conceptual category and condition for engaging with varied media came to the lime light with the UNESCO’s initiative in the 1980s. The UNESCO International Symposium on Media Education at Grunwald in Germany emphasized the need for media literacy considering the overwhelming presence of media in the daily lives of the people. The Grunwald declaration states that:
We live in a world where media are omnipresent: an increasing number of people spend a great deal of time watching television, reading newspapers and magazines, playing records and listening to radio. In some countries, for example, children already spend more time watching television than they do attending schools. (UNESCO, 1982; http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/MEDIA_E.PDF)

In a world saturated with media, communication and information, media literacy has virtually become a part of our culture and intellectual tradition. In today’s society, access to media and literacy required for participating in social, cultural and political events has become parameters of nobility and development. Few would argue against the unrelenting power of media and its impact on our daily life and existence. The Grunwald Declaration (UNESCO 1982) states:

Rather than condemn or endorse the undoubted power of the media, we need to accept their significant impact and penetration throughout the world as an established fact, and also appreciate their importance as an element of culture in today’s world. The role of communication and media in the process of development should not be underestimated, nor the function of media as instruments for the citizen’s active participation in society. Political and educational systems need to recognize their obligations to promote in their citizens a critical understanding of the phenomena of communication. (Ibid., http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/MEDIA_E.PDF)

However, in the contemporary age, where we talk of network-society (Castells, 1996) and cyber-democracy (Poster, 2000), we equate media literacy merely with the technical ability to access and produce media messages. The ‘critical aspect’ of information processing as a constituent of literacy/media literacy, and decision making relying on such capabilities is often overlooked. Rather, a few would consider media literacy as a parameter of development in a society where there is a greater emphasis on media and information. At the same time, the role of media literacy has often been ignored as a means of democratic participation and franchising citizens’ rights. Questions arise
whether ‘critical autonomy’ in media consumption should be promoted and appreciated as a new form of literacy.

The growth and development of media literacy education in the US is time tested. In the US, unlike India and the rest of the world, the concept of media literacy is in the academic and policy circle for quite a long time. There are a number of professional agencies which are working for the growth and promotion of media literacy among the citizens, especially teachers. One such organisation is National Association of Media Literacy Education (NAMLE) that is coordinating the efforts to make media literacy education acceptable in the academic circle and aims to “expand and improve the practice of media literacy education in the United States” (Culver, 2013, p. 77). Sherri Hope Culver (2013) opines:

Media and information literacy has a rich history in the United States populated by a wide variety of local, regional and national efforts. In some cases these efforts target teachers and an ongoing need to enhance classroom methodology and develop curriculum to help develop core competencies for students in media and information literacy. (Culver, 2013, p. 75)

Media literacy is even seen as an essential quality in what Marshall McLuhan (1964) once envisioned a ‘Global Village’. The invention of new communication and its adoption in the process of mediation, communication and socialization has blurred the earlier existing differences among societies, cultures, economies, and politics of the globe. Douglas Kellner and Jeff Share (2008) are of the view:

Cultivating literacies involves attaining competencies in practices and contexts that are governed by rules and conventions. Literacies are socially constructed in educational and cultural practices involved in various institutional discourses and practices. Literacies evolve and shift in response to social and cultural change and the interests of elites who control hegemonic institutions”. (Kellner and Share, 2005, p. 369)

The importance of media literacy is felt more in the age of new media technology and its adoption in the daily practices of individuals. Further, the
unabated influence of new media on human conditions of living, have given birth to new disciplines of studies. Keeping in consideration the growing importance of media, media literacy education has been introduced into the school curricula. It has been argued that education on media should address the problem of increasing differences among societies and cultures. Many social theorists (Kellner and Share, 2005; Tornero and Tapio Varis, 2010; Nagaraj and Kundu, 2013) argue for the need for a media education that would make the masses aware of the discrimination and inequalities in the name of different socio-cultural categories often facilitated through a biased and ambiguous media representation.

Edward Said’s work (1978), “Orientalism”, gives a clear picture on how media representation gives a stereotypical understanding about a particular group or community. Thus, the masses need to understand the underlying principles and ideologies that work beneath the construction of media messages and the meaning it generates for the masses. Even, Theodor Adorno and many other Frankfurt scholars have criticised the role of media in standardising culture and ways of living. Instead there is a growing expectation among the masses, that media should promote pluralism and preserve diversity which is considered to be a major problem in contemporary democratic societies. As a result, not only a growing importance has been felt for the need of a multicultural education, but also, there is a need for multicultural media that would promote diverse cultures irrespective of their central or peripheral status. As Kellner and Share (2005) write:

In the evolving multimedia environment media literacy is arguably more important than ever. Cultural studies and critical pedagogy have begun to teach us to recognize the ubiquity of media culture in contemporary society, the growing trends toward multicultural education, and the need for media literacy that addresses the issue of multicultural and social difference. There is expanding recognition that media representations help construct our images and understanding of the world and that education must meet the dual challenges of teaching media literacy in a multicultural society and sensitizing students and the public to the inequalities and injustices of a society based on gender, race and class inequalities and
discrimination. Recent critical studies see the role of mainstream media in exacerbating or diminishing these inequalities and the ways that media education and production of alternative media can help create a healthy multiculturalism of diversity and more robust democracy. That confronts some of the most serious difficulties and problems that currently face us as educators and citizens. (Ibid., 2005, p. 370)

Further, Tornero and Varis (2010) argue:

Media literacy is beginning to be regarded as a key element in the new cosmopolitan citizenship that is a part and parcel of a global society. Therefore, it is beginning to be viewed as a right and responsibility of all citizens. For this reason, media literacy is starting to be seen as an essential part of new policies related to governance. Along the same lines, it is believed that promoting a fluid, healthy public sphere in which cultural communication should play an essential role in the new culture of peace largely depends on media literacy. (Tornero and Varis, 2010, p.54)

The CML [Centre for Media Literacy] has taken many of the foundational ideas of media literacy and simplified them into a framework. CML (http://www.medialit.org/bp_mlk.html) identifies five core concepts that would justify the necessity for Media Literacy as further elaborated by Douglas Kellner and Jeff Share:

**Core Concept 1: Principle of Non-Transparency: All media messages are ‘constructed’**.

The first core concept is the foundation of media literacy which challenges the power of media to present messages as non-problematic and transparent. Semiotics, the science of signs and how meanings are socially produced from the structural relations in sign systems, has contributed greatly to media literacy. Roland Barthes (1998) explains that semiotics aims to challenge the naturalness of a message, the “what goes without saying” (pp. 11). Masterman asserts that the foundation of media education is the principle of non-transparency. Media do not present reality like transparent windows or simple reflections of the world because media messages are created, shaped, and positioned through a construction process.

**Core Concept 2. Codes and Conventions: media Messages are constructed using a creative language with its own rules.**

The second core concept also relies heavily on semiotics to illustrate how signs and symbols function. From the study of semiotics, media literacy
practitioners analyse the existence of dual meanings of signs: denotations and signifier (the more literal reference to content) and connotation and signified (the more associative, subjective significations of a message based on ideological and cultural codes) (Hall, 1980). When connotation and denotation become one and the same, representation appears natural, making the historical and social construction invisible. Therefore, a goal of cultivating media literacy is to help students distinguish between connotation and denotation and signifier and signified (Fiske, 1990).

Core Concept 3. Audience Decoding: Different people experience the same media message differently.

The third core concept evolves from the work at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in the UK, where the notion of an active audience challenges previous theories that viewed receivers of media as passive recipients and often victims. Building on the semiotic conceptions developed by Roland Barthes and Umberto Eco, Stuart Hall (1980) argues that a distinction must be made between the encoding of the media texts by producers and the decoding by the consumers in a study of “Encoding/decoding”. This distinction highlights the ability of audiences to produce their own readings and meanings and to decode texts in aberrant or oppositional ways, as well as the “preferred” ways in tune with the dominant ideology. The cultural studies approach provides a major advance for understanding literaey, as Ian Ang (2002, p. 180) explains: “textual meanings do not reside in the texts themselves: a certain text can to mean different things depending upon the inter-discursive context in which viewers interpret it”.

Core Concept 4. Content and Message: Media have embedded values and points of view:

The fourth core concept focuses on the actual content of media messages in order to question ideology, bias, and the connotations explicit and implicit in the representation. Cultural studies, feminist theory, and critical pedagogy offer arsenals of research for this line of inquiry to question media representations of race, class, gender and so on. Beyond simply locating the bias in media, this concept helps students recognize the subjective nature of all communication.

Core Concept 5. Motivation: Media are organized to gain profit and/or power:

The fifth concept encourages students to consider the question of why the message was sent and where it came from. Too often students believe that the role of media is simply to entertain or inform, with little knowledge of the economic structure that supports it. Where once there were many
media outlets in every city competing for viewers and readers, a few years ago there were less than [Ten] 10 translational corporations that dominate the global media market. (Kellner and Jeff Share, 2005, p. 374-377)

1.5.2. Media Literacy: Indian Perspective

Media literacy from an Indian context requires thorough and careful understanding of the process of the development of media. The role and functions of media in India in today’s context cannot be understood without revisiting its colonial past. Even in a postcolonial India, the attributes of media seem to be colonial in nature. Hence, media literacy demands an analysis of structuralism and post-structuralism as two approaches to literacy theory, and its impact on the socio-cultural dynamics in India that takes into account the diverse and conflicting nature of Indian society.

1.6. Statement of the Problem

When it comes to media literacy, it makes us sceptical about the form, structure and functions of media in relation to society. The question arises: Whether media literacy is about learning media or maintaining a distance from the structure of media? Whether it is about bridging the gap or regenerating the gap that has been blurred by media? In this process we often forget that we are very much within the structure of media, which seems to be no more rational, responsible and accountable, and we hardly notice this fact because it is not visible. It may be because we are literate but not media literate. It may be because sometimes we do not dare to question media. Our perception of media as the mirror of the society compels us to believe that media represents reality. We do not question whether media reflects or observes more than what it reflects in the process of mediation? It leads us to a state of confusion and misunderstanding of the whole structure and functioning of society and media as part of it and the lives of individuals within the society. Does the new media such as television and internet and the literacy associated with such media take us to a sphere of unconsciousness, distracting us from our thoughts and beliefs?
Does it alienate us by altering the social structure creating a false consciousness of being together? Does media serve the society as part of its social responsibility or is it driven by commercial interests? In this context, is there a need for literacy beyond the conventional characters to strengthen the society, promote social integrity, social harmony, and peace? How far the media has been able to promote and preserve pluralism, in terms of art, expression, opinion, and democratic participation? Does it promote a dominant culture, suppressing the emergent and counter cultures through the process of homogenization of diverse cultures and cultural practices that would serve the interests of the dominant class? Does media serve the society with an obscure intention of turning the public into merely consumers of mass and popular culture? Media’s role as a catalyst of positive social change is under suspicion as some claim that media works for maintaining the status-quo dividing and alienating individuals from their community and suppressing radical voice. Instead of restructuring the power, does the media shift the power among three alternative structures, i.e. the politicians, corporate and media owners? The concept of media literacy would bring a lot of invisibles to the public scrutiny and reveal the dynamics of culture, politics, media and corporate alliance.

If we go by McLuhan’s (1964) famous quote “medium is the message”, then both media and literacy are synonymous. However, the conventional meaning of literacy is restricted to the mere ability to read and write in a language, i.e. writing or acquiring the technical skills to participate in the communication process. Here, literacy/media literacy is confined to a narrow sense of technicalities of communication from a functionalist perspective. Not only literacy but also the concept of media has been restricted to a set of technical capabilities. If the concept of literacy is widened, the cultural component of media and literacy required to participate in the socio-cultural affairs can be brought under the purview of media literacy for a meaningful debate and discourse.
Chapter End Notes:

1. Texts and contexts are considered here as histories or historical entities. Literacy as an event creates texts and contexts leading further to the clash or conflict of histories or historical events embedded in texts and contexts. From a broader context, one needs to understand that ‘texts’, ‘contexts’, ‘histories’ and ‘historical entities’, are articulated through ‘literate practice’/ literacy. Media literacy helps one to construct/deconstruct the text, which is itself a conflict materialized through writing or reading in a larger context. Media literacy helps one in creating text, and also in constructing meaning by establishing an inter-textual relationship among the existing texts, ideas and events.

2. Edmund Husserl, “The Idea of Phenomenology” 1902-03. Trans. Lee Hardy. Such a conceptualization of literacy is based on an anti-positivistic plane. In an epistemological sense, it reconceptualizes literacy that “yields the distinction between [23] positive science and philosophy” (Husserl, 1902-03, p. 19). Husserl terms such a science as “metaphysics” that grows out of critique of positive knowledge.

3. The term ‘transcendence’ refers to how consciousness reaches out beyond itself and makes contact with object wholly external to it. This is where a Meta critique of knowledge takes place from a post-positivistic/post-structural point of view. It rejects the claim for certainty and absoluteness of the being or the condition of knowledge. For detail, see Husserl, 1902-03, p. 03 and p. 19.

4. In a certain way it has been argued here that literacy is a ‘reading practice’ where it blurs the distinction between reading and writing. A Derridean perspective on reading even considers objective writing as an abstract form of reading and vice-versa. However, a post-structural understanding of either reading or writing goes beyond an objective and literal understanding, and includes everyday experience and life events as reading or writing practices. As Peter Brooker writes, “reading is one of the expanses of the terms in the study of culture, and frequently used synonymously with the practice of interpretation and the analysis of texts and discourses. These terms are themselves used to refer beyond the literally textual to social processes and institutions that, if not seen as texts themselves, are understood to be accessible only through semiotic or textual material. The use of the term ‘reading’ in such studies therefore enforces the sense , especially common in poststructuralist –influenced academic work, that the social and cultural is constructed rather than given and that its textual and SIGN systems must therefore be ‘read’ if they are to produce social meanings” (Brooker, 2003, p. 216).

5. Henri Lefebvre is considered to be one of the finest among French intellectuals who rose to reputation for his analysis of space or “The Production of Space” (1991). As a critic of both Hegelian and Marxian dialectic, Lefebvre has drawn a synthesis between them. Lefebvre’s Dialectical Materialism (2009), rescues dialectic from its over reliance either on Hegelian idealism or Marxist materialism.
6. Dialectical philosophy is prevalent among the works of G. W. Hegel and Karl Marx. In actual sense, the shades of dialectical principles are there in the works Plato, Aristotle and Immanuel Kant much before Hegel’s and Marx’s interpretation of the history of consciousness and history of matter respectively. Later on, Philosophers like Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Jean Paul Sartre, Morley Ponty, and Henri Lefebvre among others have very clearly explicated on the concept of Dialectical Phenomenology. Both Lefebvre and George Lukacs have designed a synthesis of dialectical phenomenology, with a mixture both the Hegelian principles of dialectical idealism and Marxist’s principles of dialectical materialism in their works Dialectical Materialism (2009) and History of Class Consciousness (1993). In the twentieth century, the principles of dialectic have been applied by post-structural thinkers like Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida to unearth the truth claims by their predecessors such as G.W. Hegel and Karl Marx.
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