The Capitalistic in Paul Auster's Leviathan: A Cultural Materialist Reading

Seyed Hadi Momen[1], Fatemeh Karegar Bardaskan[2], Mehran Shabankhah Leayli[3]

[1]Department of English Language and Literature, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

[2]Department of English Language and Literature, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

[3]Department of English Language and Literature, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

hadimomeni1978@gmail.com, kargarfatemeh0@gmail.com, Mehran.shabankhah@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of the present research is to unveil how capitalism reading can be perceived by a Cultural Materialist Reading in the selected novel Leviathan. Paul Auster is one of those writers who is always multitasking. His stories are never about just one thing, and you can never be sure what's going on behind the scenes until you turn the last page. To put in other words, while a literary work may serve to practice the dominant ideology, it may produce a contrary dissident reading. This possibility mostly is based on the inner contradictions of any literary text. This is the common ground of cultural materialists. In Leviathan, Paul Auster has skillfully exhibited such a verbal game to represent his own concerns regarding the subject of the identity, ideology and power caught in the novels, leading to a "dissident" reading which is potentially opposed and threatening to those social oppressive norms which the protagonists "Benjamin Sachs" are suffered.

I. Introduction

The aim of the present paper is to unveil how the characters and the author himself struggle in a capitalistic society and consciously or unconsciously they are trying at stand against the dominant ideologies and from other hand they themselves are totally dominated by those ideologies in the Leviathan by Paul Auster. Cultural Materialism has root in Marxist instructions, but is totally different from Marxism. Marx believes that the ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class, and economics is the fundamental determining factor in any society or culture. In other words, "the ruling mode of economic production determines the ruling mode of cultural production" (Lodge 265). Thus, capitalism produces its own ideology and expands it on the whole part of man's activities. Thus, an agreed culture developed in which people in the working class identified their own good with the good of the bourgeoisie and helped to maintain the status quo rather than revolting. Concisely hegemony is defined as the means of maintaining the capitalist state. Cultural Materialism with respect to the process of ideological hegemony attempts to activate the dissidence and subversion which is hidden in any textual manifestation of ideology.

In Leviathan, Auster focuses upon authorship and authority, and the debate between complacency and militancy. The revolutionary heritage of the early USA, once associated

with the concepts of liberty and democracy, has been superseded by an unquestioning acceptance of apathy, corruption and materialism. Auster implies that while the contemporary American individual struggles to attach some sort of meaning to daily existence, his understanding of the lives of his American contemporaries fails at a communal, social and political level. In his study of the life and death of the self-styled 'Phantom of Liberty,' Auster investigates whether an author can alter the consciousness of his readership. The life of Benjamin Sachs prisoner of conscience, author, and visionary unravels during the course of the novel. Sachs rejects his literary aspirations, and opts instead for militancy. His actions result in a fraught national debate. Sachs is largely overlooked as an author. As a new American consciousness however, he finally attracts a mass audience. (Paul Auster's Postmodernity 177-78)

II. Review of Literature

As far as the researcher knows, two persons have ever worked om Paul Auster`s novels in Iran. The first one whose MA thesis title is Jamesonian Reading of The Network Trilogy. Another researcher examines Deconstructive Reading of The Network Trilogy. The books that are written on Auster's works are various such as The practice of solitude: agency and the postmodern novelist in Paul Auster's Leviathan by Emma Hegarty. In this book the writer depicts the development of self-awareness as an intense, almost transcendental, practice or endeavor. In Cultural Materialism: On Raymond Williams (1995), Christopher Prendergast focuses and devotes his work on Raymond Williams. Widely regarded as one of the founding figures of international cultural studies, Raymond Williams is of seminal importance in rethinking the idea of culture. In tribute to his legacy, this edited volume is devoted to his theories of cultural materialism and is the most substantial and wide-ranging collection of essays on his work to be offered since his death in 1988. Dominic John D'Urso in his thesis in title of Postmodern and existential ethics in Paul Auster's Moon Palace and Leviathan (2006) states that The Postmodern and existential ethic developed in Moon Palace and Leviathan is anecdotal. Taking into consideration postmodernism's fragmentation and existentialism's abandonment, it seems impossible for any ethic to be anything but situational. Consequently, Auster's ethics are displayed through the telling of stories.

III. Research Methods

The theoretical foundation of the present study is based on Alan Sinfield's theory of cultural materialism which describes culture is inseparable from its conditions of production and reception in history. Sinfield calls it, 'culture is political'. The state and ruling capitalist class, the bourgeoisie, use cultural institutions to maintain power in capitalist societies. Selection of Sinfield's theory as a theoretical basis of this thesis is due to his transparent discussion on cultural materialism and ideology has such a central position in the thinking of Sinfield. Our point is that the idea of cultural materialism by Alan Sinfield is not only focused on, but also deepens and supports his other major theoretical innovations. According to Alan Sinfield based on ideology all people behavior is taken from their ideology. Taken from their behavior system part comes from the culture you are living in and grown in so cultural materialism culture is a matter important and highlighted. Behavior is taken from the ideology of the culture under which you are trained, educated and grownup. Life has many layers and it is related to the society in

which we are living in and the culture we are trained under nothing is separated. Plausibility refers to this because it is quite real. Plausibility comes from the real life of man that is why it is plausible in all lagers of man's life. Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. In this research, the main features are the application of Alan Sinfield theories on Auster's novels.

3.1 Cultural Materialism

Cultural Materialism as a postmodernist critical approach has root in the contextual approaches. It tries to remove the deficiencies of the traditional contextual approaches and to provide a practical and well-organized theory in literary criticism. Some critics believe that the background of Cultural Materialism refers to the Historical oriented approaches, but some others maintain that it is the result of Marxism. It is important that Cultural studies have significant role in the construction of Cultural Materialism. Contextual approaches were constructed after traditional approaches and New Criticism. Their background goes back to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when scholars asked to what extent literary texts were under the influence of the historical, political, economic, philosophical, religious and psychological contexts of their productions. One example of the contextual approaches was Marxist criticism which regards the production of literary texts as "the interface of material and socio-economic circumstances" (Selden 88). Class and economic structures were the particular focus of Marxist critics.

Marxism views literature in terms of its relationship to society. Marxists critics study literature to examine how a literary work reinforces or undermines the current social structure. After the Second World War contextual approaches, especially Marxism, are considered as the outdated approaches. They have had a major comeback over the last two decades in approaches like New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Cultural Studies. Thus, Cultural Materialism is somehow the revision of Marxism. Some critics demonstrate that Cultural Materialism in studying of historical contexts of the literary works has objective method and belongs to Historicism. The delicate neglected point in this claim is the special viewpoint of Cultural Materialism towards the concept of history. Brannigan declares "Cultural Materialism announces that not only literature is shaped by history but also shapes it as well" (92). There is organic and inseparable relation between history and literature. The most famous concept of "the historicity of text and the textuality of history" (Brannigan 195) in Cultural Materialistic theories reinforces this idea. Cultural Studies emphasize that any cultural phenomenon is valuable for serious analysis. Investigation of literature is one means to pursue Cultural Studies, but literature is no more important or significant culturally than other practices. There is no difference between literary works and other cultural products. Cultural Studies use the theories and methods of literary criticism to probe the depth culture both through the literary study and through the study of other texts or the cultural implications of popular culture. Although it's believed that Cultural Materialism alongside its American counterpart, New Historicism, belong to the same critical domain, there are main differences between Cultural Materialism and New Historicism which distinguish one from the other. Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton mention some of the differences between Cultural Materialism and New Historicism. The major differences between New Historicism and Cultural Materialism are:

New Historicism tends to concentrate on those aspects at the top of the social hierarchy (i.e. the church, the monarchy and the upper class) while Cultural Materialism tends to concentrate on those aspects at the bottom of the social hierarchy (i.e. the lower classes, women and other marginalized peoples). Cultural Materialism is primarily concerns with issues of Class (proletariat, Aristocracy and

bourgeoisie), Economics (or rather economic stages of the historical development, e.g. capitalism, feudalism) and Commodification (the subordination of both private and public realms to the logic of capitalism). (130)

The manifestation of Cultural Materialism as a literary critical method actually refers to 1985 with cultural studies of a great British Marxist Critic, Raymond Williams. He was a member of Wales's working class who remained all his life deeply committed to his proletarian roots. His discussion is central to the formation of the emerging field of Cultural Studies in both England and The United States. Williams in one of his essays, *Culture Is Ordinary* (1958) states, "Latent within historical materialism is a way of understanding and diverse social and material production of works to which the connected but also changing categories of art have been historically applied. I call this position Cultural Materialism" (qtd in Higgin 54).

Cultural Materialism literally consists of two key terms: Culture and Material. All cultural critics aim to define these two terms according to their cultural discourses. Jonathon Dollimore and Alan Sinfield in their book *Political Shakespeare* (1985) applied Raymond Williams's theory to a study of Shakespearian drama and defined its parameters in their own terms. They define cultural and material as the two fundamental concepts in Cultural Materialism. They point out that the cultural aspects of the theory combine two meanings: "the analytical term culture refers to social systems studied in anthropology and social sciences, and the evaluative term refers to art and literature as forms of high culture" (86). They also in describing the concept of culture argue: "In cultural Materialism, culture does imply a set of superior values, even a moral and ethical imperative, which provides the impetus behind its critical application to artifacts and practices which have been prized within the evaluative idea of culture" (24).

IV. Discussion

4.1 History of the Siantar Kingdom
a. Capitalist Society in *Leviathan*

Ideology makes humans accept the natural order of things. Ideology is what is always present in every decision a human being makes, every thought process, every discourse, and it happens without the human race, or the human individual noticing, at least not until made aware of it. Understanding ideology and the ideological state apparatuses are pivotal to be able to account for what makes a subject take on various subject positions, and also what forces are at work when this process takes place. According to Terry Eagleton ideology is a concept that allows and constricts human behavior, and it is as mild as it is wild. "The very forces that are intended to subdue chaos are secretly in love with it" (*Ideology* 18). This could be interpreted to mean that there is self-destruct mechanisms in every thought humans have. When one breaks it down, what is at the core are human consciousness and human understandings of concepts and language. Ideology itself has not got a consciousness on the outside of the human grasp of what it is or is not, as it is an abstract manmade concept.

In modern time, the meaning of consumption changes a lot. In consumption, the objects become signs, "In order to become object of consumption, the object must become sign; … it becomes "personalized," and enters in the series, etc., it is never consumed in its materiality, but in its difference" (20). In city, the signs, the basic elements of consumer society, are full of life. On the surface, people consume objects; actually, they consume the image and signs disguised as an object it becomes. Some critics, arguing that terrorism happens when societies live, or are forced to live, in dire economic conditions,

overwhelmed by high unemployment and low economic growth. Williams shows that hegemony permits us to distinguish the complex reality between hegemonic and counter-hegemonic relationships of a specific social process through historical, social or cultural analysis. Hegemonic structures of a culture in contrast to the dominant ideology are the discourses in which there are traces of resistance to all the given dominant ideologies; they form an alternative to those ideologies. On the other hand, counter hegemonic discourses are determined in forms of a frame that all those given hegemonic practices resist them. Williams writes:

> Any hegemonic process must be especially alert and responsive to the alternatives and opposition which question or threaten its dominance. The reality of cultural process must then always include the efforts and contributions of those who are in one way or another outside or at the edge of the terms of the specific hegemony. (*Marxism and Literature* 113)

In *Leviathan* Auster self-examines American culture and criticizes politics. Sachs‟ critical thinking towards American culture and politics is well stated in novel *The New Colossus* he ever published. In the novel, the dominant emotion is anger, a full-blown, lacerating anger that surged up on nearly every page, like Paul Auster, Sachs states questions related to historical facts and fictional characters and writers, however, Sachs‟s novel almost became outdated. The image that dominates *Leviathan* by Auster is that of the Statue of Liberty, a conceit which works on different levels. Through the Statue of Liberty, Sachs gets new understanding of American culture and politics for two times. His first visit to the Statue of Liberty when he was young is portrayed early in the narrative and how Sachs connected personal experience with American culture and politics is a good example. Sachs‟s second encounter with the Statue of Liberty is equally important, as it works as a turning point forever. It is how Sachs explains his action to blow up replicas of the Statue of Liberty. Benjamin Sachs recognized American culture and freedom, symbolized by the Statue of Liberty, has become only a fusty and hollow myth, nothing more, and a derision of real freedom defined by its responsibilities to sustaining the values of democracy.

Consequently, he sets out to blow up the models of the Statue of Liberty that he finds in towns spread across America, to arouse the dormant political unconscious of the American people. Sachs does not criticize the American myths but renew them. His understanding and self-examination confronted him with the dreadful indifference of the American public to the ideals of democracy, and he resorts to constrained violence, or terrorism, to regain the sense of freedom and democracy.

Emerson (1983) in his book *Politics* states that: "every actual state is corrupt", he writes in „Politics‟, and, therefore, "good men must not obey the laws too well" (10). The same idea is expressed in "Resistance to Civil Government" and "On Civil Disobedience‟‟‟, which is contributing in shaping Sachs‟s beliefs and attitudes, where Thoreau put forward a model of passive resistance against unjust governments. Echoing Emerson, he writes: "under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also in prison" (11). However, in Aaron`s narrative, we get the understanding that such corruption and hypocrisy is unavoidable and change will only be possible through taking resistance from within the structures of society so as to challenge its practices, The epigraph indicates that the writer shares Sachs‟s idea that America does not live up to the standards discoursed in international ideals, as symbolized by the Statue of Liberty.

Finally, the image of Leviathan as an artificial man uses for implications of American culture and politics and reflects of people's lives. Ideology is so much more than

just one single component with one single meaning in society. It is present on every step of the way in the shaping and staging of human subject positions, present as a constant power in the world of language and concepts. Ideology equals the beliefs people hold. Actually, this is what Sinfiled may anticipate as resistance when he says: "So ideology is the matter of lived relation between men and their world." (qtd. in "*Lenin and Philosophy*" 233)

4.2 Residual, Emergent and Dominant in *Leviathan*

Williams defines Residual as "some social or cultural practice which has been formed in the past, but it is still active and effective in the present cultural system like organized religion" (qtd in Barry 237). A residual cultural element is usually at some distance from the effective dominant culture, but it is some part of it which is embedded in cultural system. The concept of emergent for Raymond Williams means "the creation of new meaning and values, new cultural practices and new relationships within the dominant structure" (qtd in Newton 135). It is important to distinguish between those emergent which are elements of new stage of the dominant culture and those which are actually other element or oppositional to dominant system. The important point in understanding the meaning of dissidence is that it is not thoroughly opposed to power, and it is not also an antithesis which tries to reverse the values and strategies of power. It is instead very close to the structures of power and indeed is produced by the internal contradictions of these structures. Of course, it implies a deviation from the rules of the dominant culture, but it may be that dissidence achieves no reaction from power.

Aaron assures that his account of Sachs's changing subject position is true, there is a definite element of doubt in both his own abilities and in the story, Sachs has told him. Sachs tells Aaron "…once it comes to other people, we don't have a clue" (*Leviathan* 97). Auster mentions to what goes on in the minds of other people. "We never know anything about anyone" (*Leviathan* 96), Sachs continues. Aaron claims to hold some kind of truth, about his long-time friend. Principally, Aaron's account of Sachs' life and steadily changing subject position is all that remains of Benjamin Sachs. "…the writer's legacy carries the taint of his presumptions" (*Leviathan* 165), which is a factor one cannot escape. At one point in Aaron's tale about Sachs, he would have had to draw conclusions that would make his assumptions fit the narrative he was telling; make Sachs' subject position fit the development he assumed it went through. Saltzman (1995) in his book *Leviathan: Post Hoc Harmonies* emphasizes that:

> Sachs and Aaron live by fiction and our three novelists, Auster, Aaron and Sachs, seemingly bent upon triangulation so as to converge upon the truth, instead play out as concentric perspectives if one includes Auster in the equation, one has to delete the other two, because in the end only Paul Auster exists (170).

There are some similarities in the author's life and his character, Peter Aaron. But the reader must not mistake them for the same person. "Without even knowing it, I enter the lives of strangers, and for as long as they have my book in their hands, my words are the only reality that exists for them" (*Leviathan* 4). However, person writing the novels expresses his or her author subject position, not who they really are. Aaron determines more ideological features dragging Sachs in different directions when he looks into his history. "His father was an Eastern European Jew, and his mother was an Irish Catholic" (*Leviathan* 24). Albeit Aaron assertions that most of Sachs' history is difficult to deliberate, he suggests that Sachs was neither Catholic nor Jewish, and yet both Catholic and Jewish (*Leviathan* 25). The only possible religious aspect of Sachs' physique is that he

is circumcised, and that is noted down as a medical detail rather than a religious detail (*Leviathan* 25). This means that Sachs' subject positions are irreligious.

Eventually he made a choice that confirmed his terrorist subject position. Though it is difficult for those left behind to grasp Sachs' decision, it still remains the fact. Aaron must accept, to keep the picture of his companion alive, that Sachs did not fabricate an ineffectively made bomb that he didn't explode himself and fully interpellated him to occupy a subject position as a terrorist. Sachs did turn to violence. He chose to remain and die in the shadows, and only Aaron's choice to tell Sachs' story grants him other subject positions rather than that of the terrorist.

4.3 Quest of Identity in *Leviathan*

Considering the cultural materialist major critical model in the analysis of the identity construction, the present paper contends that its exploration provides a highly comprehensive account of the process of ideological formation. Specifically, Aaron's life echoes Auster's own life. Auster also lived in France and upon returning to America made his living translating books. Leviathan begins with an author named Peter Aaron, the similarity to Auster's own name unmistakable. The characters in Paul Auster's fiction attempt to make sense of what Auster himself names in another. In Paul Auster's fiction, the self can become the other very easily because it has no cohesion or continuity. *Leviathan* is a quest for the identity. Peter Aaron, as narrator, assumes to be his friend of the writer Benjamin Sachs. It begins with detectives knocking on Aaron's door and ends with these same detectives again at Aaron's door, while the detectives search for the fragmented body's identity, the events of Sachs' life unfold through the narrative we are reading the narrative recreated by Aaron. Yet, the stories we are told and the events that are portrayed are always under question. The characters have different versions of what has happened and the narrator always doubts himself, his memory and his version of the truth. We are continually made aware of the narrator's inability to tell the whole story, even though his goal is to find out what really happened. Because we are able to see the construction of Sachs' story through differing tales, the narrative voice is always multiple and unreliable. As we begin, Aaron writes: "I don't claim to have more than a partial understanding of who he was. I want to tell the truth about him, to set down these memories as honestly as I can, but I can't dismiss the possibility that I'm wrong, that the truth is quite different from what I imagine it to be" (*Leviathan* 25). Mark Brown (2007) in his book under the title of book *Paul Auster* states that Aaron and Sachs are both doubles and opposites in a linguistic sense, that the language with which they are conveyed makes them so (70). Brown also has a focus on characters that apply abstract space when attempting to understand their subject positions (67).

In *Leviathan,* Brown believes that Sachs is a character that goes through a descent, a rescue and then a recovery (67). If this is true, then his rescue, to Sachs, happens the moment he comes to occupy the terrorist subject position. His recovery is when Aaron writes Sachs' narrative. Though, Brown suggests, Aaron is Sachs' replacement. "As the narrative progresses it is apparent that Aaron comes to occupy a similar coherent social and linguistic space that previously was occupied by his friend" (69). Brown suggests that Aaron and Sachs are doubles and opposites in a linguistic manner. Sachs starts off with an innocence that Aaron later adopts, enabling Aaron to write Sachs' story (70). Auster in selected novel says "No one can say where a book comes from, least of all the person who writes it. Books are born out of ignorance, and if they go on living after they are written, it's only to the degree that they cannot be understood" (*Leviathan* 36). In Paul Auster's novels many of his protagonists are authors of some kind, and it is only natural that the life of an author is what fills narrative after narrative. Both the protagonist and the

narrator of *Leviathan* are authors. Sachs is the kind of author who writes naturally but leaves his world of words behind in the end. While Aaron is the kind of author who writes meticulously, and has to work hard producing words and meaning, but can see no other life. Both of them have their view of what a storyteller should or should not be. It is not enough to claim ownership of the text. It becomes clear towards the end of the novel that Sachs has signed copies of Aaron's books (*Leviathan* 244). Shiloh, (2002), in his book *Paul Auster and Postmodern Quest* defined it as:

> Aaron and Sachs' quests in the novel are mirroring each other. Quest is understood as a metaphor for detecting and becoming familiar with one's subject position. However, the two important characters in *Leviathan* are not mirroring each other, they are opposites. They travel in different directions to each other. It is an obvious conclusion to make, to name Aaron and Sachs doubles, and maybe this is where Auster has his fun, tricking his readers into drawing premature conclusions. If Aaron mirrored Sachs, they would both end up in pieces metaphorically, but that is where Sachs' journey ends, not Aaron's. Sachs fails tragically in his quest for wholeness of the self" (114).

Shiloh says that "The most salient features of Auster's protagonists are absence, fragmentation, fluidity and invisibility" (10), which sums up Sachs. He is absent from the very beginning of the novel. The Sachs the reader gets to know through Aaron's narrative, is a man who is searching for his core humanity, only to realize that the core humanity does not exist. Specifically, Sachs has a skeptical outlook, he is always looking for meanings in a world of uncertainty. The novel charts out Sachs''s quest for personal redemption and his literary validity in America. Sachs''s inner journey as suggested by the image of the internal space that he has covered during his disappearance is a quest for justice and meaning in a hostile world. After he finds out the political cause behind Dimaggio''s terrorism, he compares himself to Dimaggio and he comes to a conclusion.

> "I''d sat around grumbling and complaining for the past fifteen years, but for all my-self-righteous opinions and embattled stances, I''d never put myself on the line. I was a hypocrite and Dimaggio wasn''t, and when I thought about myself in comparison to him, I began to feel ashamed." (*Leviathan* 225)

Even at this late stage of alertness of his role in society, he is driven by the compulsion to write about Dimaggio. But for some causes he is unable to understand, he cannot carry out his task. Taking refuge in a bookstore to escape an encounter with an old acquaintance of him in the street, he buys a copy of his own book and in his customary way of starting incredible connections, he relates the cover of *The New Colossus* in which the Statue of Liberty appears, to the cause of Dimaggio and terrorism.

> "I started to think about Dimaggio all the time, to compare myself to him, to question how we''d come together on the road in Vermont. I sensed a kind of cosmic attraction, the pull of some inexorable force...I knew he had been a soldier in Vietnam and that war had turned him inside-out, that he''d left the army with a new understanding of America, of politics, of his own life. It fascinated to me to think that I''d gone to prison because of this war-and that fighting in it had brought him around to more or less the same position as mine." (*Leviathan* 252)

That is how Sachs explains his decision to blow up copies of the Statue of Liberty. The similarities that he finds between himself and his victim are in line with his inclination to establish correspondence and infer meanings from coincidence. As a result of this situation, the characters engage themselves in a quest for the nature of their existence, how

they can handle these unusual circumstances. It becomes a search for their inner selves; in other words, a way to find themselves in an uncertain world.

V. Conclusion

To conclude this research on Leviathan is a novel of Paul Auster that deals with cultural materialism and capitalism in light of Sinfield theory. The challenge is to follow protagonist, Benjamin Sachs and narrator, Peter Aaron on their oppositely directional life journeys, and what determining agents fully interpellated Sachs into a politicized, radicalized subject position. Sachs' subject position from husband and friend to terrorist was a gradual and traumatizing experience, both for him to go through and for his surroundings in particular Peter Aaron to bear witness to and later to narrate. The Ideology relevant for discussion above, here signified by the capitalistic system in the community of Leviathan. The protagonists of the selected novel exist in the margins of these truths, but not in the margins of society as such. None of them are marginalized through social class, race, or gender but are marginalized in terms of mental capacity. This means that they are marginalized within the ideological framework they exist. It is the political differences between his younger and adult self for Benjamin Sachs. He reflects on how a child is at the mercy of an almost repressive ideological state apparatus within the family, how a mother has the power to decide the dress code of a child, even though the child objects. The bourgeois subject is the thoughtful, apparently self-creating, self-activating, and self-disciplined but also socially-oriented subject. The availability of the theory and actuality of this bourgeois subject informs both Marx's critique of capitalism and his conception of the popular collective actor as a radically democratic formation.

Furthermore, Benjamin Sachs who portrays numerous versions of himself to end up with the politicized subject prepared to risk his life for his cause, find truths in his convictions. The protagonists of the selected novel exist in the margins of these truths, but not in the margins of society as such. None of them are marginalized through social class, race, or gender but are marginalized in terms of mental capacity. This means that they are marginalized within the ideological framework they exist. The bourgeois subject is the thoughtful, apparently self-creating, self-activating, and self-disciplined but also socially-oriented subject. The availability of the theory and actuality of this bourgeois subject informs both Sinfield's critique of capitalism and his conception of the popular collective actor as a radically democratic formation. Furthermore, the author explores both the mental and physical activity of modern American society in terms of capitalism.

References

Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. New York: Harcourt   Brace Pub, 1993.

Auster, Paul. Sunset Park. New York: Henry Holt, 2010.

………….. Collected prose: Autobiographical writings, true stories, critical essays, prefaces and collaborations with artists. New York: Picador. 2005

Basirizadeh F, Zaheri Birgani SH, Raoufzadeh N. (2021). Concept of Time in Virginia Woolf's To the Lighthouse: Bergsonian Study. Linglit Journal: Scientific Journal of Linguistics and Literature. Vol. 2, No. 2, June, Page: 67-74 DOI: https://doi.org/10.33258/linglit.v2i2.460

Basirizadeh, Fatemeh. (2019). A Comparative Study of the Psychoanalytical Portrayal of the Women Charactersby Virginia Woolf and Zoya Pirzad. Britain International of Humanatis and Social Sciences Journal, 1-8.

Barone, Dennis. "Introduction: Paul Auster and the Postmodern American Novel". In Beyond the Red Notebook. Ed. Dennis Barone. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995. 34-43

Barry, Peter. Beginning Theory, an Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory. New York: St. Martin press, 1995.

Brannigan, John. New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. New York: ST. Martin press, 1998.

Dr. Mahdi Dehghani Firouz Abadi, Fatemeh sadat basirizadeh, et. Al. The Effect of Covid-19 Pandemic on Online Education of the EFL Learners. Tob Regul Sci. Volume 8, Number 1, January 2022 Doi.org :10.18001/TRS.8.1.304

Dollimore, J. and Sinfield, A. Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism. London: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Dollimore, J. and Sinfield, A. "Culture and Textuality: Debating Cultural Materialism," Textual Practice 4, no.l 1990, pp. 91-100.

Dollimore, Jonathan. "Sexuality, Subjectivity and Transgression: The Jacobean Connection," Renaissance Drama, NS 17 1986. pp. 53-82.

Higgins, John. Raymond Williams, Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism. New York: Routledge Press, 1999.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The Communist Manifesto. London: Penguin, 1983. PDF.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engles. The Communist Manifesto. London: Penguin, 1848. PDF.

Lodge, David, ed. Modern Criticism and Theory. New York: Longman Pub, 2000.

Marx, Karl. Engels, Frederick. Engels, Marx. Collected Works, volume 6 (London: Lawrence and Wishart, (1976), p. 487.

Makaryk, Ireana. Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms. Toronto: Toronto university Press, 1993.

R.J.Rummel. Marxsim, Class Conflict, and the conflict Helix. New York: Sage Publication, 1977. PDF.

Raoufzadeh,N. Basirizadeh, F. Mohammad Hosein, SH. The Study of Interior Monologue in Two Selected Novels, Mrs. Dalloway and to the Lighthouse; A Comparative Study. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Volume 3, No 2, May 2020, Page: 761-767

Selden, Roman. Contemporary Literary Theory. London: Harvester Wheatheaf, 1993.

Sinfield, Alan. Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain .Oxford: Blackwell; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989, Ch. 3.

Soqandi, M. Basirizadeh,F. Cultural Materialism in Lorca‟s Poetry. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Volume 3, No 2, May 2020, Page: 682-691

Thomas, Peter D. The Gramscian Moment Philosophy, Hegemony. USA. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2019.

Williams, Raymond. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press. View publication, 1978.