

## I. Capitalistic Culture in Roley's *American Son*

Brian Ascalon Roley, the author of *American Son*, was born in the mid 1960s to an American Caucasian father and a Filipino mother. Roley grew up in San Francisco, one of the multicultural statuses of the postmodern America. The Kiriyaama nominee, *American Son* is the debut and the only novel by this amateur writer. But it's a tally that his soft-spoken and erudite manners have been reflected in *American Son* to stage his posture in the American academia as if by a professional writer. Actually, Roley didn't really begin to write seriously until law school, when he desperately needed some "right brain activity" to balance out what turned out, debating the different sides of an issue (18). But he found law school all about sophistry, picking a side and just defending it. By the time he finished law school, the Rodney King riots of 1992 were dividing blacks and whites in Los Angeles and across the country. The riots reawakened his musings on race, and it became race, not the law, that vied hard for his attention. He decided to continue with his writing, and started studying creative writing at Cornell University.

In Roley's view only few young Americans are aware of the US acquisition of the Philippines and of how president MC Kinley's decision to govern the country marked the entrance of America on to the world stage as a colonialist power. He says that Americans are not even familiar enough with their former territory to form any stereotype at all about it.

The debut novel *American Son* evolves around a pathetic yet gusty character and ends up with his sorrowful migration. Tomas, the central character of the novel, migrates to America along with his family and he shows multiple characteristics for better adjustment for living. He fashions himself into a Mexican gangster and breeds pricey dogs which he sells to Hollywood celebrities expecting to make enough

money. Furthermore, for the adaptation he acts in such a way that he can make his family member happy at the beginning. As the time advances, he clings to the material success by hook or crook throughout the novel.

Roley's *American Son* is a grief but heart-breaking story of a young boy's descent into a hellish life. Tomas is a Los Angeles teenager with a mother desperately trying to adjust him from the quasi-violent life. Tomas's American father, another source of violence, left them years earlier, but his absence still scars all of them. Due to such unsystematic way of life Tomas all the time worries about the economic boom. So, he breeds violent dogs for paranoid Los Angelinos and sport scary tattoos, cloths, cars, and haircuts. While on the other hand, his younger brother Gabe decides to escape it all to run away, but his running away has more dire consequences for him. *American Son* is as a whole novel about the dilemma and struggle of adaptation in new places.

The setting is from April 1993 through September 1993. Gabe is in high school, while his older brother, Tomas, is presumed to be approximately 19 or 20 years old. Throughout the story, the complex relationship between Gabe, his brother Tomas, their relationship with their Filipino mother, and their whole family's relationship with American society are explored. But with Gabe as the narrator, one gets the feeling that he wants to say very much more than he does, but that he just can't express the feelings he has.

In the novel, a letter from Gabe and Tomas' uncle Betino in the Philippines, who constantly exhorts his sister to send her wayward boys back to the Philippines to learn respect and discipline, prefaces the three parts of the story. However, also in the course of those letters is the very Filipino-like trait of one-upmanship, in which the uncle proclaims all the success and happiness he and his family are experiencing, a

very unsubtle rubbing-it-in which any Filipino reader would be familiar with. Gabe and Tomas' mother is portrayed as a pitiable character- one who came to the USA seeking a better life for herself and her children, but completely naïve to the ways of the real world, and thoroughly “colonized”- a woman who allows herself to get stomped on and pushed around without so much as a squeak of complaint - but who later cries in shame and anger at herself for not speaking up. Gabe at times tries to shield from this abuse, only to see his efforts unwelcome and unwanted by his mother, and at other times he is ashamed of his mother, whose dark complexion and obvious foreignness is in stark contrast to the fashionable mothers of his classmates. It is this colonialized attitude, which leads to the climax of the story, an outpouring of misplaced righteous anger at being mistreated, and where the story abruptly ends.

In Roley's *American Son*, the protagonist, Tomas appropriates the American cultures like making tattoos, training dogs, hiding mother's identity, tans his skin to a dark brown hue, openly smokes in pot, and wears white tank "wife beater " t- shirts that reveal large menacing tattoos of the virgin de Guadalupe on his trim muscular body. He physically carries himself like the Mexican American gangsters he identifies with. He is protector, the one who both forces him into and sometimes shields him from also, as the oldest male in their fatherless house hold, alternatively Gabriel's tormentor and protector, the one who both forces him into and sometimes shields him from the violence of a life of thievery, drug dealing and other petty crimes.

Protagonist Tomas's appropriations of American culture in Roley's *American Son* reflect his interpellation by the American capitalism. Through living in an economically and racially split world where he is exposed to the quickest lessons, he learns that money is the only reliable weapon against social subjugation. Tomas then

turns to crime and guard dog training as his anger at the many indignities he suffers for his mother and act out earning, first- generation, immigrant single mother. Such indignities include the shame his mother faces even from her own brother, who chastises her for bringing her sons to America's moral depravities and who's only suggested solution to their problems is to bring them back under the rule of his own authoritarian household in the Philippines.

“I want to explore, the difficulties, faced by ‘Hapas’, “people of half-Asian, half-Caucasian ancestry” (20), explains Roley. He thinks an adolescent hero would exemplify the identity questions that loom so large for mixed race Americans. Gabe is not just going through an adolescent born identity crisis: he feels invisible as a Filipino, too. Few Americans around him know much about the country - or its people. “Our household was more Filipino; we had this extended family living with us” (1), Roley recollects his own childhood. “But everyday I went to school in a nearly all-white student body” (1). He adds that while he was growing up, his parents didn’t seem to have much trouble melding their two cultures. But he watched his cousin’s adopting the dress and mannerisms of Latino gang culture. By high school, Roley was becoming more and more aware of his own “invisibility”. “We are different from other Asian Americans because we are easily absorbed into the U.S. culture,” notes Roley:

We are often just barely seen as general Asians. I remember standing around in a group in high school, and even though everyone knew I was Filipino, they would still tell racist jokes. I guess the good thing about being invisible is that I never heard any racist jokes about Filipinos [...] but still felt terrible. (15)

Filipinos are the second largest Asian group in the United States, but it's hard to tell, even in Los Angeles. Some have argued that since so many professionals and skilled Filipinos come to the country, they blend seamlessly into the local workforce. Roley also thinks America's colonial influences have permeated with the Americans, and are often just as happy to seamlessly adopt it when they arrive in the USA.

Despite this, in Roley's *American Son*, the protagonist Tomas appropriates the American cultures like making tattoos, training dogs, wearing American clothes, hiding mother's identity, curious in individual life, dreamt about economic gain by hook and crook. Even he does not regret having done these things; rather he enjoys on doing them. So, Protagonist Tomas's appropriation of American culture in Roley's *American Son* reflects his interpellation by the American capitalism.

*American Son* ends on its own bleak note. Roley says he always envisioned that the brother's disconnection from their roots would be their tragic flaw "Racism, in a way, is its own character in the novel. Attitude jumps about from point to point. The younger brother is tempted by the same attitudes that are used against him. I suppose those choice are his tragic errors" (23).

Roley remembers that a few Filipino and Filipinos Americans apparently took offence at *American Son*. They felt that Filipino values are too strong to ever allow such tragedy to happen. Roley argues that such thinking denies the real problems that some Filipino Americans face: "Showing only the positive side of any racial community is a manipulation that ultimately hurts that same community", he argues (26), Besides, he adds that in that sort of restricted atmosphere good writing that the Filipinos can be proud of will never flourish.

Since its publication, *American Son* has been reviewed from multiple perspectives. Envisioning the element in the text, Jonathan Kirsch on the blurb writes

that Roley has “fused a coming of age story with a variant on the American immigrant saga, and the result is both explosive and illuminating” (Blurb). Brian Ascalon Roley himself sees *American Son* from post-colonial perspective: “the colonized attitude of my characters affect how they assimilate into American culture. I found inspiration in post-colonial works by non-American writers such as V.S. Naipaul. Colonization is a subtext in my new book as well”. He himself too, loves “Greek and Shakespearean tragicomedy” (4).

Reading it sociologically, Karen Har-Yen Chow remarks Gabriel at the beginning as “the good son, the, obedient and quiet, studious one, who always listens to his mother and acts as a character-foil to his bad older brother Tomas” (97). Here, he shows how much Gabe prefers to identify himself with his Filipino mother to avoid the western mimicry of his brother. Tomas's social transgressions from middle-class conservatism are literally writ large over his body, to the dismay of his devoutly Catholic first- generation immigrant Filipino mother and white-collar professional relatives. Tomas sports a shaved head, he physically carries himself like the Mexican American gangsters .By the end of the novel, we see Gaberiel disturbingly internalizing his initial terror and transforming into a man who relishes enacting violence on others.

Seeing from subaltern cultural perspective, Jeff Zaleski, asserts the novel as a “power house study of vulnerable strangers in a brutal, alien land” (52). He finds the Ika’s family alienated in brutal capitalistic world of Los Angeles. He finds the American immigrants' experience. Tomas in the novel has assumed the persona of a young Mexican street thug and is helping her make ends meet by raising and selling guard dogs to rich clients. Roley uses the familiar Cain-and –Abel approach to

illustrate the occasionally vicious tug of wills between the two youths, whose relationship is being slowly altered by the outside forces of the alien American culture.

Suzy Hansen gives a psychological watch to Gabe's character. She says "Gabriel's own self-loathing and alienation prevent him from grasping the opportunity laid out for him by his mother and lead him to a life of violence he's known too well at the hand of Tomas" (15). She points out Gabe's inferiority complex in the mainstream culture of America. Roley explores this omnipresent yet usually invisible story of contemporary American immigrant life with an easy exactitude and a dry, unmerciful eye. In *American Son*, the first generation attempts to guide their children by sending them to Catholic schools and giving them a vague sense of tradition. Yet it's not always enough. What's most memorable and most disturbing is how Roley subtly renders the difference between those who make the journey to American and those who are born out of their hopes.

Though the text has been analyzed through different perspectives, this thesis aims to analyze it in terms of the interpellation of individual by capitalist ideology. This thesis lucidly evinces how ideological state apparatuses call upon individual to take up pre-established subject positions and make directly or indirectly subservient to state apparatuses.

This research paper has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter is the general introduction of the thesis that discusses briefly about the life and works of the author along with the general survey of the novel, and the issue of the present thesis. The second chapter discusses the theoretical modality of this research paper Neo-Marxism. The ideas from Louis Althusser, Antonio Gramsci, and Terry Eagleton are applied to prove the very hypothesis. The third chapter, based on the theoretical modality analyzes Roley's novel in relation to the suffering of non-American people living in American society. Finally, the fourth chapter concludes this research paper on the basis of the textual analysis. Where the researcher will justify the hypothesis.

## II. Neo- Marxism

In Classical Marxism, Marx believed that class identity was configured in the relations with the mode of production. In other words, a class is a collective of individuals who have a similar relationship with means of production. He further deals about certain concept of Classical Marxism. Marx refers to the alienation of people from aspects of their “human nature”. He believed that alienation is a systematic result of capitalism. Under capitalism, the fruits of production belong to the employers, who expropriate the surplus created by others and in so doing generate alienated labour. Alienation describes objective features of a person’s situation in capitalism- it isn’t necessary for them to believe or feel that they are alienated.

Marx and Engels use the “base-structure” concept to explain the idea that the totality of relations among people with regard to “the social production of their existence” forms the economic basis, on which arises a superstructure of political and legal institutions. To the base correspond the social consciousness, which includes religious, philosophical, and other main ideas. In the base condition both; the superstructure and the social consciousness are remained. A conflict between the development of material productive forces and the relations of production causes social revolutions, and the resulting change in the economic basis will sooner or later lead to the transformation of the superstructure (7). For Marx, though, this relationship is not a one way process- it is reflexive; the base determines the superstructure in the first instance at the same time as it remains the foundation of a form of social organization which is itself transformed as an element in the overall dialectical process. The relationship between superstructure and base is considered to be a dialectical one, ineffable in a sense except as it unfolds in its material reality in the actual historical process.

Class-consciousness refers to the awareness, both of itself and of the social world around it, that a social class possesses, and its capacity to act in its own rational interests based on this awareness. Thus class-consciousness must be attained before the class may mount a successful revolution. Other methods of revolutionary action have been developed however, such as vanguardism. Marx refers to the exploitation of an entire segment or class of society by another. He sees it as being an inherent feature and key element of capitalism and free markets. The profit gained by the capitalist is the difference between the value of the product made by the worker and the actual wage that the worker receives; in other words, capitalism functions on the basis of paying workers less than the full value of their labor, in order to enable the capitalist class to turn a profit. Marx first articulated historical materialism, although he himself never used the term. It looks for the causes of developments and changes in human societies in the way in which humans collectively make the means of life, thus giving an emphasis, through economic analysis, to everything that co-exists with the economic base of society. The means of production are a combination of the means of labor and the subject of labor used by workers to make products. The means of labor include machines, tools, equipment, infrastructure, and “all those things with the aid of which man acts upon the subject of labor, and transform it”(8). The subject of labor includes raw materials and materials directly taken from nature. Means of production by themselves produce nothing –labor power is needed for production of images of social reality. According to Engels, “ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, it is true, but with a false consciousness. The real motive forces impelling him remain unknown to him; otherwise it simply would not be an ideological process. Hence he imagines false or seeming motive forces”(10). Because the ruling class controls the society’s means of production, the superstructure

of society, as well as its ruling ideas, will be determined according to what is in the ruling class's best interests. As Marx said famously in *The German Ideology*, "the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force"(11). Therefore the ideology of a society is of enormous importance since it confuses the alienated groups and can create false consciousness such as commodity fetishism. The mode of production is a specific combination of productive forces (including human the means of production and labour power, tools, equipment, buildings and technologies, materials, and improved land) and social and technical relations of production (including the property, power and control relations governing society's productive assets, often codified in law, cooperative work relations and forms of association, relations between people and the objects of their work, and the relations between social classes). The term "political economy" originally meant the study of the conditions under which production was organized in the nation-states of the new-born capitalist system. Political economy, then, studies the mechanism of human activity in organizing material, and the mechanism of distributing the surplus or deficit that is the result of that activity. Political economy studies the means of production; specifically capital, and how this manifests itself in economic activity.

Neo- Marxism is a school of thought that began in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and harkened back to the early writings of Marx before the influence of Engels, which focused on dialectical idealism rather than dialectical materialism. It is also detectable in the interpenetration of base and superstructure. On the one hand, it might be a part of an anti-physical, anti-historical viewpoint. In a society as a whole, this would emphasize the relative autonomy of political and ideological relation as oppose to the

treatment of them as reflection of economic structures and processes. And there is reciprocal action of the superstructure on the base.

This would also stress the distinction between the diachronic emergences of different practices of social and the mode of production as a concept of pertaining to a totality of synchronically reproduce social relation and form. It thus rejects the economic determinisms, focusing instead on non-physical, psychological revolution critical theory, weberian sociology and critical criminology. Neo-Marxism is also frequently used to describe the opposition to inequalities experienced in a global zed world. It adds Max Weber broader understanding of social inequality, such as status and power to Marxist philosophy. Strains of neo-Marxism include Hegelian philosophy, critical, analytical Marxism and French structural Marxism.

### **Capitalist Ideology**

Marxism refers to the economic, cultural and political theory, popularized by Karl Marx and his friend Friedrich Engels. This theory sketches a view of society as consisting of an economic foundation for instance mode of production, means of production, distribution, and exchange, upon which rises a political, legal and superstructure, etc; and to which correspond to forms of social thought. History of human being is the history of class struggles apropos economic foundation. Marx, in the opening line of the introduction to the *Communist Manifesto*, states, “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle”(1). He argues that the evolving history of humanity, of its social groupings, of its thinking, and of its institution is moulded by the changing mode of economic foundation. Therefore, Marx in his book *German Ideology* writes, “Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life”(625). The way we think and the way we experience the

world around us are either wholly or largely conditioned by the way economy is organized.

Broadly speaking, economic foundation determines superstructure. Mode of production is prior to superstructure, which, therefore, does not have its own existence. Education, religion, art, law, philosophy, political programs, etc; are constituted by the way mode of production of material life is programmed. The changes in the class structure of society are, therefore, fundamentally based on historical changes in the fundamental mode of material production.

According to Marxist thinkers, history proceeds through class struggle. Class struggles happen due to the uneven distribution of economic foundation. Annihilating the feudal social structure of society heralds the present capitalist mode of production that is called dialectical materialism. In the precise sense, the essential Marxist view is that superstructure which is determined by the nature of economic base. This belief is principally known as 'economic determinism'.

### **Discourse**

Discourse is a frequently used term in contemporary theory and in post-colonial criticism is mostly employed in such terms as colonial discourse, which is specifically derived from Foucault's use of the concept. It is a discussion of a subject in speech or writing. The process of writing books, newspapers, and producing speeches are discourse formation and whatever is produced it is discourse. Discourse, may be both written and spoken. For Michael Foucault, discourse carries three things: power, knowledge and truth. Power is circulated from different forms of representation, and it creates certain truths, which ultimately becomes truth to everyone who is under the system. Power determines the truth, and as soon as the system of society changes the truth also changes. So, discourse is related to the

production of any information that provides knowledge. For instance, mother creates discourse for her children by saying ‘do this’ and ‘do not do that’. This knowledge becomes truth for the children. The power is generated in society by producing the discourse and by constructing the truths. Discourse deals with the interpersonal relationship. For instance, the western people have created discourse about non-western people. In their discourse, non-western people were given limited space. For western people, non-western people were not mentionable. Their discourse says that non-western people need strict guidance and western people place themselves as a teacher and role model creating the discourse. Thus, those people who are in power produce a body of knowledge for those who are not in the power.

The force of the term, ideology lies in its capacity to discriminate between those power struggles, which are somehow central to a whole form of social life, and those, which are not. Ideology manifests itself in different ways in the discourse of each of the semi-autonomous institutions of an era, including literature, and also that ideology operates covertly to form and position the users of language as the ‘subject’ in a ‘discourse’ in a way that in fact that ‘subject’ them that is, subordinates them-to the interests of the ruling classes.

### **Ideology and Interpellation**

Ideology refers the thought mechanism, which is a way of thinking and interpreting of the things in the living world. It also conveys something as general as a system of ideas, values, and beliefs either true or false. Ideology is a term that embodies all the problems associated with the cultural complexity of language. It also has a history, during which it has taken on various, sometimes- contradictory meanings. The word ‘Ideology’ was originally used by a French rationalist philosopher of the late eighteenth century to define a “science of ideas” or

“philosophy of mind ”that would be separate from older metaphysical conceptions. Ideology has been widely used in the discourse of political theory, particularly in Marxist because Marxism always seeks to be not just narrowly political, but a more comprehensive kind of theory.

Ideology, in a sense, has become the term through which Marxists have been trying to articulate in various ways. We are most likely to encounter the word ideology in news programs, pieces of political analysis, and then also in different changing variety of social apparatuses: the family, churches, schools, sports, networks, films, fictions, comic books and so on. However, ideology is well-known expression that was invented by Cabins, Destutt de Tracy and their friends, who assigned to it as objects the theory of ideas. When Marx took up this term fifty years later, he gave it a quite different meaning and opined, “Ideology is the system of the ideas and representations, which dominate the mind of a man or a social group”(Qtd. in Zizek, 120).

According to Karl Mannheim, historical reconstruction of meaning shifts ideology. The modern meaning of the word ‘ideology’ was born when Napoleon Bonaparte uses it in an abusive way against ‘ideologues’ to express the pettiness of his political opponents. Perhaps the near-original meaning of ideology is Hippolyte Taine’s work on the ancient regime. In the *Origins of Contemporary France*, ideology rather like teaching philosophy by the Socratic method, and without examples extending the observation that practical science would require.

In The *German Ideology* (1844), Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels elaborates a polemical definition and critique of ideology. They also gave more diverse suggestions about how to understand ideology. In the German Ideology, they argue:

The production of ideas, concepts and consciousness is first of all directly interwoven with the material intercourse of man, the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking, the spiritual intercourse of men, appear here as the direct effluent of men's material behavior [...] we do not proceed from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as described, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at corporeal man; rather we proceed from the really active man [...]. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is no determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life.

(qtd. in Eagleton 4)

Ideology, the way we often use the term as referring to a set of beliefs, awareness and articulation. For, Marxist, the term is much more encompassing and is a belief system that is product of cultural conditioning. Hans Bertens, in his *Literary Theory: The Basic*, states, "For Marxist, ideology is not so much a set of beliefs or assumptions that we are aware of, but it is that which makes us experience our life in a certain way, and makes us believe that way of seeing ourselves and the world is natural"(84). He further puts:

Ideology distorts reality in one way or another level and falsely presents as natural and harmonious what is artificial and contradictory the class differences that we find under capitalism [...] if we succumb to ideology we live in an illusory world, in what in Marxism has often been described as a state of false consciousness. (84-85)

There are some other critics who view science as an ideology in it, or being an effective ideology called scientism. Some scientists respond that, while the scientific method is itself an ideology as it is a collection of ideas; there is nothing particularly wrong or bad about it. In social studies a political ideology is a certain ethical set of ideas, principles, doctrines, myths or symbols of social movement, institutions, class, or large group that explains how society should work, and offers some political and cultural blueprint for a certain order. Political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what end it should be used. Thus political ideology has two dimensions: how society should work; and the most appropriate ways to which the ideas are arranged.

Dominant ideology appears as neutral, holding to the assumptions are largely unchallenged. Meanwhile, all other ideologies that differ from dominant ideologies are seen as radical. The philosopher Michel Foucault wrote about the concept of ideological neutrality. Philosophy is a way of life, while ideology is an almost ideal of life for society. According to French intellect Adolphe, ruling ideologies can shape the desires and wants of those who are in power, he states:

Ruling ideology can actively shape the wants and desires of those subjected to them, but they must also engage significantly with the wants and desires that people already have, catching up genuine hopes and needs, re inflecting them in their own peculiar idiom, and feelings them back to their subjects in ways which render those ideologies plausible and attractive. (Qtd. Terry Eagleton 14-15)

Terry Eagleton, in his book *Ideology*, remarks that ideology has wide range of historical meaning and relates it with the interest wants of ruling class. He puts forward:

The term 'ideology' has a wide range of historical meaning, all the way from the unworkably broader sense of social determination of thoughts to the suspiciously narrow idea of the development of false ideas in the direct interest of a ruling class. Very often, it refers to the ways on which signs, meanings, and values help to reproduce a dominant social power but it can also denote any significant conjecture between discourse and political interest (221).

Terry Eagleton, in the very book *Ideology*, is of the view that ideology is the product of discourse rather than the product of language. He proceeds:

Ideology is a matter of discourse rather than of language of certain concrete discursive effects rather than of signification as such. It represents the points where power impacts up on certain utterances and inscribes itself tacitly within them. But it is not therefore to be equated with just any form of any discursive partisanship, interested speech or theoretical bias, rather, the concept of ideology aims to disclose something of the relation between an utterance and its material conditions of possibility. When those conditions of possibility are viewed in the light of certain power-struggle central to the reproduction, it represents the whole form of social life. (223)

Ideology, in its Marxist usage, is more encompassing. Hans Bertens in his book *Literary Theory: The Basic as*:

In Marxist usage, ideology is what causes to misrepresent the world to us. [...] Marxism the basis of any society is its economic organization, which, then gives rise to certain social relations for instance, the class relations between the capitalists and workers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century capitalist society. This socio-economic base then conditions the

cultural superstructure. [...] The liberal humanist idea that we think are essentially free can remain free as long as we can think. For Marxist, ideology is no so much a set of belief or assumptions that we are aware of, but it is that which makes us experience our life in a certain way and makes us believe that the way of seeing the world and we is natural. In so doing, ideology distorts reality in one way or another way and falsely present as natural and harmonious. (85-86)

Ideology, in its distinctively Marxist use, in any era is conceived to be the production of its economic and resulting class-interest and class-relations. Karl Marx proposed that a society's dominant ideology is a part of superstructures. Superstructure comprises of society's ideology, as well as its legal system, political system and relation. For Marx base determines superstructure. The ruling class controls the society's means of productions and its superstructure. He proceeds:

The production of ideas, concepts, and consciousness is first of all directly interwoven with the material intercourse of man, the language of real life. Convincing thinking, the spiritual intercourse of man appeals here as the direct effluent of man's material behavior [...] we do not proceed from what men say, imagine, conceive nor from man as narrated thought of, imagined conceived, in order to arrive at man in the flesh [...]. They have no history, no development but men developing their material production and material intercourse, after along with this their thinking.' Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life. (Qtd. in Adams 625)

The ideology of a society of enormous importance; it confuses the alienated groups and can create false consciousness such as the fetishism of commodities, alienation

and reification. In capitalist society, all means of production, distribution and means of economic foundation are owned by Bourgeois, thus ideology also represents wants and desire of Bourgeois class. The labor force, or who are the workers are known, as proletarians are not themselves proprietors of the means of productions and who are consequently obliged to sell on the market their own labour instead of the product of their labour. This condition alienates the proletarians from their own real condition. Hence they undergo through the process of commodification.

Commodity fetishism is a definite social relation between men that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of relation between things. Consequently the essential feature of commodity fetishism does not consist of the famous replacement of men with things, rather it consists of a certain misrecognition which concerns between the structured network and one of its elements: what is really a structural effect, an effect of the network of elements, appears as an immediate property of one of the element, as if this property also belongs to its other elements.

Engels proposed ideology as a 'false consciousness'. So that for Marx and Engels, by contrast, ideas have no independent history at all: they are the product of specific historical condition. Many later Marxists view ideology to be constituted by unconscious propositions that are illusionary, in contrast to the scientific knowledge of the economic determinants, historical evolution and the present constitutions of the social world. Some others take ideology as a form of synecdoche, which can totalize. As Karl Korsch argues:

Ideology is a form of synecdoche, the figure of speech in which we take the part for the whole. What is peculiar to proletarian consciousness, in its fullest political development, is capacity to

totalize the social order, for without the knowledge of the working will never be able to understand and transform its own conditions. (95)

As a whole, Marx and Engels view ideology as superstructure. But many later Marxists entrench ideology as a material recognition. Among them is Althusser who is of the view that there is relative autonomy between base and superstructure. There lies reciprocal relation between matter and superstructure, as superstructure includes ideology, so on.

French structural Marxist, Louis Althusser's "ideology and ideological state Apparatus" establishes the concept of ideology, which is also based on Gramsci's theory of hegemony. Whereas hegemony is ultimately determined entirely by political force, ideology draws on Freud's and Lacan's concept of the conscious and mirror phase respectively, and describe the structure and systems that enable the concept of self.

He sees Marxism as a science and his work is in the structural tradition. One feature of Althusserian Marxism is a rejection of Marx's Hegelian essentialism i.e. reduction of things to a single principle or essence. Althusser rejects two kinds of Marxist essentialism: 'economism' - economic determinism and 'humanism' - in which social developments were seen as expensive of a pre-given human nature. He condemns ideas like 'human potential' and 'species being' which are often put forth by Marxist as outgrowth of a bourgeois ideology of humanity. Therefore, Althusserian Marxism is anti-humanist. In rejecting economism, he sees ideology as itself a determining force shaping consciousness, embodied in the material signifying practices of ideological state apparatus and enjoying 'relative autonomy'.

Althusser builds up the work of Jacques Lacan to understand the way that ideology functions in society. Thus, he moves away from the earlier Marxist

understanding of ideology. In the earlier model, ideology was believed to create what was termed “false consciousness” but he opposes its definition, he declares instead that ideologies vary according to the form and practices of each mode of state apparatus, that the ideology of each mode operated by means of a type of discourse which interpellates the individual to take up a pre-established “subject matter” that is a position as person with certain views and values which in every instance, serve the ultimate interest of the ruling class:

Althusser explains that for Marx, “ideology is thought as an imaginary construction whose status is exactly the theoretical status of the dream among writers before Freud. For those writers, the dream was the purely imaginary that null, result of the day’s residues.”(56)

Althusser, by contrast approximates ideology to Lacan’s understanding of “reality” the world we construct around us after our entrance into the symbolic order. For Althusser, as for Lacan, it is impossible to access the “real conditions of existence” due to our dependence on language; however, though a rigorous ‘scientific’ approach to society, economics and history, we can come close to perceiving if not these ‘real conditions’ at least the ways that we are inscribed in ideology by complex processes of recognition.

Althusser introduces the concept of interpellation, in “ideology and Ideological State Apparatus” to describe the process by which ideology addresses the pre-ideological individual thus, effectively producing him as subject proper. Unlike classical definition of the subject, he argues that an individual is always- already interpellated as a subject by ideology, even before he is born because he bears his own identity, which is irreplaceable. His argument here strongly draws from Lacan’s concept of the Mirror Stage. According to Althusser, interpellation is the process of

recognition of the individual/self with ideology or transformation of the individual as a subject Althusser posits a series of hypothesis that he explores to clarify his understanding of ideology:

Firstly, Althusser argues; "Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real condition of existence"(123). The traditional way of thinking of ideology led Marxists to show how ideologies are false by pointing to the real world hidden by ideology that real economic base for ideology. According to Althusser, by contrast, ideology does not reflect the real world but represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to the real world; the ruling ideology represents is itself already at one remove from the real. In this, Althusser follows the Lacanian understanding of the imaginary order, which is itself at one step removed from the Lacanian Real. In other words, we are always within ideology because of our dependence on language to establish our reality, different ideologies are but different representations of our social and imaginary reality not a representation of the real itself. Thus, for Althusser, ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. Ideology transforms human beings into subjects, leading them to see themselves as self-determining agents when ideological processes in fact shape them.

Secondly, he argues: "Ideology has a material existence"(126). Althusser contends that ideology has a material existence because an ideology always exists in an apparatus, and its practice, or practices. Ideology always manifests itself through actions, which are inserted into practices such as rituals, conventional behaviors and so on. Indeed, Althusser goes so far as to adopt Pascal's formula for belief: Pascal says, "more or less kneel down, move your lips in prayer and you will believe" (87).

Thirdly, he argues: “all ideology hails or interpellate concrete individuals as concrete subjects”(128). According to Althusser, the main purpose of ideology is in constituting concrete individuals as subjects. At this level, concrete subjects only exist in so far as concrete individual supports them. So, pervasive is ideology of subjects that it forms our very reality and thus appears to us as true or obvious. The rituals of ideological recognition guarantee for us that we are indeed concrete, individual, distinguishable and irreplaceable subject. According to Althusser, ideology functions or acts in such a way that it ‘recruits’ subject among the individuals or transforms the individual into subject by that very precise operation which he called interpellation or hailing. Through “interpellation,” individuals are turned into subjects that are always ideological. To make clear of it, he gives an example of the “hello” on a street; he writes:

Somewhere the hail rings out: ‘Hey, you are there!’ one individual turns round, believing/suspecting/ knowing that it is for him, i.e. recognize that ‘it really is he’ you meant by hailing. However, in reality these things happen without any succession. The existence of ideology and the hailing or interpellation of individuals as subjects is one and the same thing [...] what reality takes place in ideology seems therefore to take place outside it. That is why those who are in ideology believe themselves by definition outside ideology: one of the effects of ideology is the practical denegation of the ideological character of ideology by ideology: Ideology never says I am ideological. (Althusser-131)

He becomes a subject by this very ideology. In fact, we do not recognize this interaction as ideological speaks to the power of ideology: what thus seems to take

place outside ideology, in reality takes place in ideology. As he puts it, the individual is interpellated as a subject in order that he shall submit freely to the commandment of the subject, i.e. in order that he shall freely accept his subjection, i.e. in order that he shall make the gestures and actions of his subjection all by himself.

Finally, he argues: “individuals are always-already subjects”(129). Although he presents his example of interpellation in a temporal form (I am interpellated and thus I became a subject, I enter ideology), Althusser makes it clear that the “becoming-subject” happens even before we are born. This proposition might seem paradoxical but Althusser writes:

That an individual is always-already a subject, even before is born, and is nevertheless the plain reality, accessible to everyone and not paradox at all [...] i.e. the forms of family ideology – paternal. Maternal, conjugal, and fraternal, in which the unborn child is expected: it is certain in advance that it will bear its Father’s Name and will therefore have an identity and be irreplaceable. Before its birth, the child is, therefore always- already a subject, appointed as a subject once, it has been conceived. (Althusser-132)

Thus, Althusser proves that how an individual is interpellated as a subject even before his/her birth and once again invokes Lacan’s idea, that understanding of the Name-of-the Father.

Althusser argues that of our roles and activities are given to us by social practices: for instance, the production of steelworkers is a part of economic practice, while the production of lawyers is a part of political-legal practice. However, other characteristics of individuals, such as their beliefs about good life or their metaphysical reflections in nature of the self, do not easily fit into these categories. In

Althusser's view, our values, desires and preferences are inculcated in us by ideological practices, the sphere that has the defining property of constituting individuals as subject through the process of interpellation. Ideological practice consists of an assortment of institutions called Ideological State Apparatus which includes the family, the media, religious organizations and most importantly the education system as well as the receive ideas they propagate.

According to him, State Apparatus contains two bodies: Repressive State Apparatus and Ideological State Apparatus. State Apparatus are part, on contrary, of the private domain. Churches, some schools, trade etc, are private. He writes:

In Marxists theory, the State Apparatus contains the government, the administration, the army, the police, the court, the prison etc. [...]  
Ideological State Apparatus contains: the religions Ideological state Apparatus, the educational ideological State Apparatus, the family Ideological State Apparatus, the legal Ideological State Apparatus, the political ISA, the trade- union ISA, the communication ISA, the cultural ISA etc. (Althusser 110)

Althusser differences State Apparatus from Ideological State Apparatus that Repressive State Apparatus functions by violence, whereas Ideological State Apparatus functions by ideology. State Apparatus functions massively, predominantly by repression while functioning secondarily by ideology whereas the Ideological State Apparatus functions massively and predominantly by ideology but functions secondarily by repression. The ruling class in principle holds State power and therefore has at its disposal the State Apparatus and this same ruling class is active in the Ideological State Apparatus in so far as it is ultimately the ruling ideology within

is realized in the Ideological State Apparatus precisely in its contradiction. But for Althusser, no class holds in the Ideological State Apparatus.

Another critique, Italian Communist thinker, Antonio Gramsci, came up with the concept of hegemony. While the fascist government imprisoned him, he wrote approximately thirty documents on political, social and cultural subjects, known as the "Prison Notebooks" edited and published in English translation as *Selection from Prison Notebooks*. Gramsci's exploration and elaboration of the concept of hegemony has become a central tenet on Neo-Marxist theorizing. Gramsci uses the term "hegemony", or moral, ethical leadership, to describe the means by which consent is organized.

Gramsci defines hegemony as the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all, that a social class achieves a predominant influence and power, not by direct and overt means, but by succeeding in making its ideological view of society so pervasive that the subordinate classes unwillingly accept that flows from enabling the spontaneous consent of the populace through intellectual and moral leadership or authority as employed by the subalterns of the State. The power of hegemony is thus primarily through coercion and consent rather than armed force.

According to Gramsci, hegemony is a form of control exercised primarily through a society's superstructure as opposed to its base or social relations of production of a predominantly economic character. Gramsci splits superstructure into two major levels: one that is called 'civil society' that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private' and that of 'political society', or the State. Civil society includes organizations such as churches, trade unions, and schools which, as Gramsci notes are typically thought of as or non-political including economy. Political society

is the arena of political institutions and legal constitutional control. A major piece of Gramsci's project is to show that civil society's ways of establishing and organizing human relationship and consciousness are deeply political and should in fact be considered integral to class domination, especially in Western Europe. According to Gramsci: Civil Society corresponds to 'hegemony' while political society or state corresponds to 'direct domination or command'. The former is the realm of consent and the latter of force.

Gramsci further delineates these two relatively distinct forms of control as: firstly, social hegemony names the spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group i.e., the ruling class in Gramsci's Western Europe, the bourgeois; this consent is historically prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production. Secondly, political government names the apparatus of state coercive power, which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not consent either actively or passively. However, this apparatus is constituted for the whole of society in anticipation of moments of crisis of command and direction when spontaneous consent has failed.

While Gramsci at times uses 'State' narrowly to refer the governmental coercive apparatus, he also deploys a broader 'general notion of state' or integral state, which includes both the functions of social hegemony and political government as, described above. In this general or integral sense, "State = dictatorship and hegemony" (239). "State is the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but

manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules” (244). Again, Gramsci writes:

The general notion of state includes elements, which need to be referred back to the notion of civil society (in the sense that might say that state = political society + civil society, in other words hegemony protected by the armor of coercion). In a doctrine of the state, which convinces the later as tendentially capable of withering away and of being subsumed into regulated society, the argument is the fundamental one. (263)

His concept of hegemony is intimately linked to his formulation of the relationship between the superstructure and the economic base. He specifies two ways in which the superstructure reproduces capitalist relation. The first is hegemonic through ideology and universalized ‘spontaneous consent’ while the second is through legal enforcement of judiciaries and other institutions associated with the state. With his focus on the processes of hegemony and domination and the state’s role in the two, Gramsci places and emphasis on the superstructure’s autonomy from the economic base. He argues:

[...] the fact that the state/ government, conceived as an autonomous force, should reflect back its prestige upon the class which it is based, is of the greatest practical and theoretical importance, and deserves to be analyzed more fully if one wants a more realistic concept of the state itself. (Gramsci-269)

However, Gramsci does not elevate the superstructure to independent status. Rather, he conceives of the superstructure as being dialectically related to the economic base: Economic structures and superstructures form a historical bloc. That is to say, the

complex contradictory and discordant ensemble of the superstructure is the reflection of the ensemble of the social relations of production. From this, that only a totalitarian system of ideologies gives a rational reflection of the contradiction of the structure.

Gramsci's description of the superstructure as a complex, contradictory and discordant ensemble of parts, suggesting a dialectical, non-functionalist conception of the relationship, a conception he reiterates through his work.

Gramsci sees the role of the intellectuals as a crucial one in the context of creation counter hegemony. He is clear that the transformation from capitalism to socialism requires mass participation. There is no question that socialism could be brought by an elite group of dedicated revolutionaries acting for the working class. It has to be work of the majority of the population conscious of what they are doing; and not an organized party leadership. The revolution led by Lenin and the Bolshevik in Russia in 1917 was not the model suitable for Western Europe or indeed any advanced industrial countries. The Leninist model took place in a backward country with a huge peasantry and a tiny working class. The result was that the mass of the population were not involved. For Gramsci, mass consciousness is essential and the role of the intellectuals is crucial. It is important at this juncture to note that when Gramsci writes about intellectuals, he is not referring solely to the boffins and academics that sat in ivory towers or wrote erudite for academic journals only read by others of same ilk.

He writes that all men are potentially intellectual in the sense of having an intellect and using it but not all intellectuals by social function. He means that everyone has an intellect and uses it but not all are intellectuals by social function. He explains this by stating that everyone at some time fries a couple of eggs or sews up a tear in a jacket; we do not necessarily say that everyone is a cook or tailor. Each social

group that comes into existence creates within itself one of more strata of intellectuals that give it meaning that helps to bind it together and helps it function. They can take the form of managers, civil servants, the clergy, professors and teachers, technicians and scientists, lawyers, doctors etc. Essentially, they have developed organically alongside the ruling class and function for the benefit of the ruling class. Gramsci maintains that the notion of intellectuals as being a distinct social category independent of class was a myth. He identifies two types of intellectuals- traditional and organic. He writes:

Intellectuals in the functional sense fall into two groups. In the first place, there the “traditional” professional intellectuals, literary, scientific and so on, whose position in the interstices of society has a certain inter-class aura about it but derives ultimately from past and present class relations and conceals as attachment to various historical class formations. (3)

Traditional intellectuals give themselves an aura of historical continuity despite all the social upheavals that they might go through. The clergy are an example of that as are the men of letters, the philosophers. These are what we tend to think of when think intellectuals. They like to think of themselves as independent of ruling groups, this is usually a myth and illusion. They are essentially conservative allied to and assisting the ruling group in society:

The second type is the organic intellectual. There are the “organic” intellectuals, the thinking and organizing elements of a particular fundamental social class. Those organic intellectuals are distinguished less by their professional, which may be any job characteristic of their

class than by their function in directing the ideas and aspirations of the class, which they organically belong. (3)

This is the group mentioned earlier that grows organically with the dominant social important to see them for what they are. They produce by the educational system to perform a function for the dominant social group in society. It is through this group that the ruling class maintains its hegemony over the rest of society. Having said that what is required for those who wish to overthrow the present was a counter hegemony, a method of upsetting the consensus, of countering the ‘common sense’ view of society, how could this be done?

Gramsci sees one of his roles as assisting on the creation of organic intellectuals from the working class and the winning over of as many traditional intellectuals to the revolutionary causes as possible. He attempts this through the columns of a journal called *L' Ordine Nuovo*, subtitled “a weekly review of Socialist Culture”. This journal came out at the same time as the huge spontaneous outbreak of industrial and political militancy that swept Turin in 1919. This outbreak mirrored events throughout the industrial world that shook the very foundations of capitalist society. Gramsci’s insistence on the fundamental importance of the ideological struggle to social change means that this struggle is not limited to consciousness rising but must aim at consciousness transformations the creation of socialist consciousness. It is not something that could be imposed on people; but must arise from their actual working lives. The intellectual realm therefore is not be seen as something confined to elite but to be seen as something grounded in everyday life. The creation of working class intellectuals actively participation in practical life, helping to create a counter hegemony that would undermine existing social relations is Gramsci’s contribution to the development of a philosophy that would link theory

with practice. His philosophy is a direct counter to those elitists and authoritarian philosophies associated with Fascism and Stalinism. His approach is open and non-sectarian. He believes in innate capacity of human beings to understand their world and to change it. In his Notebooks, he asks the question: “is it better to think” without having critical awareness, or on the other hand, is it better to work out consciously and critically one’s own conception of the world? Gramsci writes:

One of the most important functions of a state is to raise the great mass of Population to a particular cultural and moral level, a level which corresponds to the needs of the productive forces for development and hence to the interests of the ruling class. The school as a positive educative function and the court as a repressive and negative educative functions are the most important state activities in this sense. (258)

The ruling class in Gramsci’s Italy was the bourgeois, though it’s seems that his remarks might function also as a blueprint for communist rule. Gramsci proceeds to claim that that state which at one point Gramsci asserts is equivalent to the fundamental, economic group or ruling class itself implements its educative project of channels, both public and private with a school as a positive educative function and a courts as a repressive and negative educative function constituting the most important state activities in this sense.

But in reality, Gramsci maintains multitude of other so called private initiatives and activities tend to the same and initiatives and activities, which form the apparatus of the political and cultural hegemony of the ruling classes. Hegemony, therefore, is process by which educative pressure is applied to single individuals so as to obtain their consent and their collaborations, turning necessities and coercion into freedom. The freedom produced by instrument of ruling class thus moulds the free

subject to the needs of and economic base, the continuous development of the economic apparatus of production. It is difficult to determine the status of this educated freedom in Gramsci's writing, but Gramsci does assert its immense political value in a discussion of political parties, which for Gramsci must show in their specific internal life that they have assimilated as principles of moral conduct those rules, which in the state are legal obligations.

Hence, schooling plays an important part in Gramsci's analysis of modern society. The school system is just one part of the system of ideological hegemony in which individuals are socialized into maintaining the status quo. He doesn't write much in his Notebooks on the school system but what he writes is essentially a critique of the increased specialization occurring within the Italian school system and a plea for a more comprehensive form of education. The vocational is being created in order to help modernize Italy. This new system is advocated as being democratic while in fact it destined not merely to perpetuate social differences but to crystallize them in Chinese complexities. Gramsci writes:

The social character of the traditional school as determined by the fact that each social group throughout society has its own type of school intended to perpetuate a specific traditional function, ruling or subordinate but the answer to the question of modernizing education is not to create a whole system different type of vocational school but to create a single type of formative school which would take the child up to the threshold of his choice of job, forming him during this time as a person capable of thinking, studying and ruling or controlling who rule. (Gramsci-40)

Gramsci maintains that this type of school could only achieve success with the active participation of pupils and in order for this to happen, the school must relate to everyday life. This doesn't mean that education should not include abstract ideas but that philosophical concepts, formal logics, and rule of grammar, etc. needed to be acquired in school through work and reflection. He is clear that learning is not something that comes easily for the majority of young people. "The individual consciousness of overwhelming majority of children reflects social and cultural relation which are different from an antagonistic to those, which are represented social curricula" (35).

For him, a learner has to active not a passive and mechanical recipient. The relationship between pupil's psychology and the educational forms must always active and creative. For instance, the interpellated subjects in the ideology of the religion and educational systems would thus believe that the mass and large organization are for the welfare of the larger number of people, which is in turn the false hegemony created by the capitalists. Although the analysis of interpellation of the normal subjects was first advanced in terms of economic classes, it can be applied more broadly. Gramsci's analysis suggested that prevailing cultural norms should not be viewed as natural or inevitable. Rather, cultural norms, including institution, practices, and beliefs- should be investigated for their roots in domination and their implications for liberation.

In such layers of hegemony, individual common sense, which is fragmented, is effective in helping people deal with small everyday activities. But common also inhibits their ability to grasp the larger systematic nature of exploitation and hegemony. People focus on immediate concerns and problems rather than focusing upon more fundamental source of social oppression.

The subject here would be some notion of physical perfection, or body cult, the rules that the subjects is to. Althusser uses examples of Christian religious ideologies, which takes slavery as an anti Christian, yet prevailed in the society in the past, and remains in one or other forms, even today. The subject here would be some nation of physical perfection, or body cult, the rules that the subjects is to. Althusser uses examples of Christian religious ideology, with god as the ultimate subject the counter of the system.

The question arises where ideology does come from and how has it acquired its immense influence? To answer these questions Althusser thinks about ideology to the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan directly, nothing that the structure of ideology is secular like Lacan's Mirror Stage. For Lacan the processes that we go through when we grow up leave us forever incomplete. S/he turns into ideology, which constantly hails us and addresses us as concrete subjects as if we are already complete. Hence there is no practice except by and ideology; and there is no ideology by the subjects and for subjects.

Hence, interpellation is an illustration, an example adapted to a particular mode of exposition to impose the capitalist notion of truth. Interpellation makes the super structural link determined by the economic-between the repressive state apparatus and ideological state apparatus exercise its force only in so far as it is experienced, in the unconsciousness economy of the subject, as a traumatic sense of injunction. Althusser puts forward the process of ideology and Gramsci hegemony in which the symbolic machine of interpellation to experience the truth and meaning on to the larger groups of people.

### III. Interpellation of Individual in Roley's *American Son*

Brain Ascalon Roley's *American Son* presents a vivid picture of interpellation of an individual in the capitalist world. Since time immemorial our world is marred by the ideas of bourgeoisie and the proletariats, which thereby has helped in the domination by the so-called higher class upon the lower class. The social structure has been set up in such a way, thank to the sophisticated class of people that modern mankind is in a psychological state to accept the hegemony of the superiority and inferiority.

Roley's *American Son* reveals the individual's capitalist desire; the novel offers its reader a window into the lives of the people depicting in subtle detail the stark realities of American society. *American Son* is the story of two Filipino brothers adrift in contemporary California. The older brother, Tomas fashions himself into a Mexican gangster and breeds pricey attack dogs which he sells to Hollywood celebrities. The narrator is younger brother Gabe, who tries to avoid the tar pit of Tomas's waywardness, yet moves ever closer to embracing it. Their mother, who is now divorced from their American father, struggles to keep her sons in line while working two dead-end jobs. When Gabe runs away, he brings shame and unforeseen consequences to the family. Full of the ache of being caught in a violent and alienating world, *American Son* is a debut novel that captures the underbelly the modern immigrant experience.

Roley, in the novel has tried to expose the schizophrenic desire of individual in capitalist society. In the initial part of the novel, the elder to the proper adaptation in American society. Roley writes:

Tomas is the son who help mortgage by selling attack dogs to rich people and celebrities. He is the son who keeps our mother up late with

worry. He is the son who causes her embarrassment by showing up at family parties with his muscles covered in gangster tattoos and his head shaved down to stubble and his eyes bloodshot from pot. He is really half white, half Filipino but dresses like a Mexican, and it troubles our mother that he does this. (15)

The lines explore Tomas's imitative psychology that is quite young and not satisfied in Filipino culture. He wants to assimilate the American people's behavior, culture and so on. Schizophrenic desires of individual especially in young people are the tendency of capitalist society, where everything can be copied for strong existence of that particular place. In a capitalist society tricky people like Tomas are able to earn money, he sells pricey dogs to rich people or celebrities. Actually thinking that a rich person easily fulfilled any desires in the market. It shows that protagonist of the novel is guided by capitalist ideology. He is trying to dominate slower adaptable people through his ideology. His ideology is based on socio-economic background.

In the very beginning of the novel Roley portrays the capitalist society where haves not are non-respectable person. The protagonist Tomas who is in search of reputable existence in capitalist society, he wants to sell pricey dogs to the Hollywood celebrities, even he is aware about caste and creed system of American society. Thus, the exploration of capitalist psychology of the young man who is hurried about the imitation of American culture in terms of capitalism is explored in the novel: Tomas would not do any chores around the house and barely talked to her for a week. He sat in his room watching TV and refused to do any homework, which is how he knew he could must hurt her (24).

These lines show how the protagonist is going to prove his individual passion in terms of economic gain. He is enjoying with the financial ideas, which are

broadcasting throughout TV. He never thinks to his mother rather complained her as a domestic woman. His brother also in the beginning rejects his attitude and more commradable to his mother. But, he is different than his mother and brother and is practicing to connect ideology with its social practices. It shows that money is power and youth. He has desire so he can learn everything in order to fit with American people i.e., sometimes enjoys with hippie and sometimes in gangster party. He is selecting one object out of piles of objects i.e., sells pricey dogs. He only knows who I am and how I become successful person being non-American so he dam care to other family members. People in capitalist society are forced to enjoy with pet animals as the lack of proper human sentiment. Because, Tomas like persons are in search about gaining and loosing. Then mother of Tomas takes the dog as her partner. So narrator says:

Sometimes our mother has a hand on Buster's neck, as if she were her husband. It seems strange that our mother would like Buster so much considering what the dog did to Saint Elmo and sister Teresa. Saint Elmo was our mother's white cat, which was sweet. (26)

Indeed, such animal like nature of his mother is practical for Tomas. He all and always curious about different types of dogs and cats also, being such similar habit he pretends, and even he says he loves his mother and "Tomas says- He would smack any bitch who treated her badly"? (29).

Thus, protagonist challenges his other common interest and shows his earning desire. Everytime he wants to buy the dogs and wants to sell them different people after the skillful training, he trains according to Schutzhund method. His every relation with the people while selling dogs is in terms of money. Although he realizes that such money making tendency is not practical all the time:

Tomas put Sun-In in his hair, though instead of turning blond it went all red. Then he began hanging out with Mexicans, who are tougher. He stopped surfing and dyed his hair black again. If anyone tried calling him an Asian he beat them up, and he started taunting these Korean kids who could barely speak English. Father Ryan brought him in to talk about it, to a school psychologist. And he hated it when Tomas started wearing a big gold cross; that was what Mexican gangsters wore then. Each time my brother taunted a Korean kid Father Ryan would call our mother in to pick Tomas up, and it embarrassed her. She would lower her head and apologize, saying she was a bad mother, so finally Father Ryan had to reassure her. It angered him that Tomas made her feel ashamed. (30)

The protagonist shows his capitalistic ideology, he is trying to rule others with the help of capitalist culture. His every action is based on money and charm. He neglects everything; it means either suggestion from school psychologist, or from his mother and anybody else. Rather he develops his relation with dogs and Mexican gangsters. The protagonist even hides his original identity due to fear of domination in capitalistic society. Though it is his compulsion, which is disagreeable to schoolteacher. Tomas is condemned strongly by Father Ryan without knowing the reality about him. Actually Tomas's family is the representative family of haves not. In capitalist society the haves have accumulated the property, rights and haves not have become faithless in the society. Haves not people are ready to sell their labour and knowledge for survival. In capitalist society haves are supposed to play the role of the given and have not play the role of receiver. But this applies only in the case of might and power. As people have controlled the power and play the roles of owner.

The protagonist makes possible his dream with the relation of Mexican people and other clients. In capitalism, people have so-called mentality of hegemony.

“Everything’s about appearance. They’re all afraid of being poor, so they act like they’re rich, and talk tsismis about each other behind their backs” (33).

In capitalist society, everything is measured in terms of money the protagonist’s desire also guided by capitalist ideology; all means of production, distribution and means of economic foundation are owned by bourgeois, thus ideology also presents wants and desire of bourgeois class. The protagonist of the novel is guided by capitalist ideology on the other hand the women who are compelled to stay in confined place and even suppressed by society and they can’t work according to their will because they have not freedom due to presser of society. Men think as if they are ruler of the society. The protagonist thinks to earn money by using any techniques like being angry with his mother, brother and even though he lied. He wants to do something hit or yell at him or take the dog off and forget high-eight thousand dollars –and Tomas does not want to does it (50).

It shows that the protagonist uses any hook and crook to grab the money, due to capitalist tendency of American society. Simply, American culture and society is guided by money, matter and mind, being non- American of immigrant person Tomas has multiple challenges to put the further existence that’s why his financial exercise is guided such capitalistic ideology. In fact, he does not successful businessman but a person who try to indicate about the business concept. To put pricey dogs in order to sell Hollywood celebrities is the nice example for the economic achievement. That’s why people are guided by capitalistic point of view all the time in order to earn name and fame throughout the money. By thinking so, they seem individual and focus upon

individualistic way of life. Furthermore, the sound should not hear melodious, which writer writes:

There is almost hurt in his voice and he looks down at Johan listen, I promise you I'm not conning you. This one boy dog's my favorite dog next to Buster. His head's small, that's true, but his ears are shaped so you know he's physically balanced and his temples are placed right up to it, not too high of low, which shows he's got a good temperament.

(53)

This is the life of capitalism, as Althusser argues that ideology hails or interpellates concrete individual as concrete object. The protagonist is interpolated as a subject by ideology. His identity is of a rich people this appointed as a subject in and by the specific familial ideology configuration. He demands more dogs in his house with the help of mother and brother to earn the money. It shows that money is life. He is ready to punch his brother and scold his mother and even exploit the working people because he is representative character of capitalism. As Althusser sees ideology is itself a determining force shaping consciousness, embodied in the material signifying practices of ideological state apparatus enjoying 'relative economy'. All the poor believe that they should agree and do what the capitalist order them. When the working class non-American people are in the trap of capitalism they are trapped in vicious cycle of anxiety, no one American people are ready to think for them. They never dare speak for justice and equality. They never utter a single word in favor of Asian or other countries people. Non-American people are conscious of the present global world, freedom and justice. Not only their status but also their existential rights, which have been considered about further way of life. So, their consciousness is too profitable for the capitalism.

In the novel *American Son* Filipino people are conscious significance of capitalism in the global world. So, they are ready to do anything for the sake of money. So, even in family there is no response with each other's, everybody steps out according to his or her will. That's why due to capitalism the nature of individual has been developed in most of the country i.e., Filipines or in America:

It has been a few hours since I stole my brother's dog and sold her, and already I miss her though there is no way I could turn back now. There are a group of teenagers hanging out in the parking lot, empty except for their cars. The guys wear these cowboy boots and one of them had a Stetson, his boot heel raised and set on his trucks Chrome bumper.

(64)

If we closely examine the different people's mentality, we discover that they want to have something forcefully. They are guided by self-ideology and do not care about other feelings and emotions. Among them the protagonist leaves all things including his lunch and searching for now more dogs. It shows that his lunch and his reading are less important than the different dogs. It is the good example of capitalism where people are guided by capitalist mentality. He makes the impossible is very little thing in front of money. Tomas says:

I am nervous because although I have the cash from selling Buster, I have no credit card, and in these places they usually want some sort an imprint for a deposit. My hand slips into my pocket and fingers the lump of bills and I try to think of what to say. (110)

Althusser argues that many of our roles and activities are given to us by social practices. The protagonist of the novel is the symbol of future generation of the west because his roles and activities are guided by capitalist ideology. No doubt, he is the

source of inspiration to his younger brother Gabe. Being non-American Tomas's imitation of capitalism and even social practices signify his interpolative nature. Tomas is always worried about value of money and try to update the financial account. It means Tomas represents a complete western behavior and attitude:

Tomas gained the courage to play with his Filipino cousins. He in particular was quite handsome. As I recall, he took to the animals such as the parrots and carabao and wished to start an import business to ship them to Los Angeles such ambitious ideas for a nine years old.

(133)

There is no escapist psychology on Tomas. Being Filipino he seems more courageous and tries to deal with his Filipino cousins and imports different animals like parrots and Carabao. The protagonist has not normal psychology rather he had creative from nine years old because he has concerned with the alienation of humankind under socialism. He looks visionary to promote the business and uses his creative ideas. He is not only business type of person throughout the potential technique of knowledge but also physical charm:

Apparently he showed up to a party you held for her, an elder- wearing a sleeveless T-shirt that exposed some quite ugly tattoos. Moreover, he also had shaved his head in a manner that apparently the Mexican gangster enjoys having. (135)

These lines show the nature of capitalist people's desire. Why Tomas has guilty feelings not being an American blood then tries to habituate with Mexican gangster in outer appearance? His activities are not too real but he tries to prove he is not other than American heritage of people. So, he does not care about family members sentiment, psychology and their delicate heart. As for Eagleton's ideology in the

novel *American Son* Filipino boy, the protagonist wants to change his original identity and motivates his younger brother to use hook and crook in order to earn the money.

The protagonist is ideologically guided and he makes plan to sell different dogs to rich clients. Protagonist-trained dogs influence the clients. They are ready to do what the protagonist orders them. That's why non-American common people are under the shadow of American society. Those who are not like him in any activities i.e., Gabe, he tortures them mentally as well as physically. They totally remain speechless under the command of protagonist. Then Roley writes:

Tomas knows these neighborhoods, places, like the Palisades, Beverly Hills, or Bel Air, because many of his dog-owner clients live there. He says most of them leave their side doors open; they tell him to just walk on in. (143)

The clients have sometimes suffered Tomas's talking nature. They have so many interests about dogs there are no one on Gabe's side. It means; the protagonist of the novel held the power and he does what he wants.

The protagonist of the novel, quite young boy is the true representative of the capitalist society. In such society money is praised as God. Rich capitalist always speak for the haves. Societal structure is such that it shapes the life of people in a discriminating way. Haves-not are not supposed to be equal to haves. In social structure haves stand in a higher rank and from there they command and control over have not. Haves-not are taken as objects devoid of feeling. Their sentiments are all the time neglected. They are supposed to be inferior. It's the feature of a capitalist society not to give right and property to have not. In any society ideology has certain structural coherence. The protagonist has such kind of structural coherence. In

capitalist society people are guided by ideology. The protagonist is also guided by such kind of ideology:

It sounds like a stupid excuse to me, but my brother seems irritated, so I keep quiet. Lately he has been increasingly inconsiderate towards her. I don't know exactly why. Maybe I notice it more now, after what happened in Oregon. It has been a gradual development, and maybe it has been coming on as Tomas has grown taller and more confident, and found more friends. (157)

It shows that how he is dominated by ideology. Such kind of ideology is handed over by American capitalism. To take full entertainment with many friends and even with girl friends is showy nature of capitalism. The protagonist's mother also wants to show her capitalist ideology. She is leading her life herself not concerning with Tomas and engage herself in different jobs:

Sunday comes again and our mother asks Tomas if he will drive us to church. Though I had already gotten her Tercel key and put on my sweatshirt ready to drive her myself-I keep quiet and hide the chain gently in my pocket. He turns and looks at her. He wears an undershirt with no sleeves and you can see the gang tattoo in Spanish on his shoulder. (169)

The protagonist seems different than his brother because he visits all the people and places according to the situation. He does not live as the will of his family members. He provides Tercel to his mother so he does not think to hold her till church. On the contrary, Gabe, brother of Tomas lies beside his mother, helps her and reads her psychology through her body language. But, Tomas prepares his body and mind alike Mexican gangsters who have opulent amount of power in the case of money and

matter. Tomas's administration in his family is dominant; neither brother nor mother raises their voice against the will of Tomas. It shows he is the representative figure of upper class society. He holds each thing up to the demanding area of other people. He even guides people throughout his ideology and he says quality of life is determined by money. So, those who are interested about sophisticated life buy pricey dogs and show your power of entertainment. This is how undoubtedly his emerging expression is unmatched to his brother. He reads the position of repetitive American people's class and makes plan how to adopt him. Tomas watches American people on the street, even though he knows they would not recognize him because his appearance not different than them. He imagines, they in what extent are true native people or unreal like him, but he also know that he would not trade his suffering for anything in the world. During the separation from his country Filipines, the protagonist happens to see his long ago private life and people of his country. Now he meets different people who advice him not to die without knowing the wonder of American life. Moreover, Tomas interested about modern entertainment like film, and wonder with girl friends. Which represents modern style of life, which is guided throughout the capitalist ideology. Roley writes:

A camera crew from some local news station was able to film all this without fazing the older guys. Tomas and many though, were too smart to get on film. My brother has been even said he would take me to parties, though for now he avoids them because he wants to wait for Eddy 'Ho to cool off'. He fined out a couple of weeks ago that Eddy was alive and not crippled. Somehow his girlfriend heard about it at work. A week ago he heard that some of Eddy's friends were looking for us, especially for Tomas. My brother showed up at a party in

Culvar City, at one of those modern apartment complex which are impressive looking from the outside but whose drywall is so paper-thin you can here people in the next room breathing and fucking and on Friday or Saturday nights the muffled sound of parties going on throughout the building. Johnny Guerro, one of Eddy's friends was there and had a few words with Tomas. Luckily Tomas was with some friends including Manny, who studies Thai boxing and Indonesian Stick-fighting with Danny Inosanto; Flip who teaches kali in some warehouse in the ratty section of Marina Del Rey, and who was friends with Bruce Lee. (172)

These lines show that the relationship between protagonist and his friends like Eddy, Manny to them he enjoys a lot. Tomas makes effort to study about Thai-boxing and Indonesian Stick-fighting. Moreover, he enjoys with his friends in different parties. The protagonist is expressing his powerful experience and his imagination is the capacity to organize new description of experience. The narrator says; "My brother has even said he would take me to parties, though for now he avoids them because he wants to wait for Eddy Ho to cool off" (172).

It shows that the protagonist is self-centered person who is only concerned about *carpe deim* (enjoy the moment). He develops the power upon other family members like mother and brother. He is practicing the idea of social and cultural practices of American people. He shows his individual nature in capitalistic society. When he remains all the time with his friends his mother is compelled to take her individual life. This is the tragic aspect of American culture. It shows that any aspect of human life cannot escape from the ideology. Ideology is a kind of "what is there", situation. Society is the product of such ideology. We can never escape from the

ideology of the society. The protagonist has such kind of desire what the society has and he also shows his individual tendency among the non-American innocent people.

Tomas is not only interested in inner quest of American life but also he is equally careful about physical beauty. So, in order to show charm in body, he trained his mother about the common sense of cosmetics items. The protagonist elaborates this way:

I remember the time at Fedco when the perfume sales people passed her number and she got so upset. That day Tomas comforted her with a hand on her shoulder, and he took her crumpled number up to the counter so she could buy a perfume. But Tomas is not here today and it has fallen on me to help her. I approach, she glances up, but seeing it is me, she peers down through the glass again, as if deep in concentration. (180)

These lines echo upper class people those are able to show their good smiling face and perfuming body. In capitalistic society, individual way of life is highly focused which is different than the normal life of non-western people. As Roley further writes, “Tomas stays out many nights a week, not bothering to tell her he will not dinner” (190).

This statement provides the clear vision of people who are guided by capitalistic tendency in capitalistic society; cut off from family, disobedient towards self-culture and negligent about the meaning and responsibilities of kinship. These are the things, which derived from so called nature of capitalism. The protagonist likes psychological repression he is psychologically guided by capitalism. It is an event since it happens. Desire process so he is suffering schizophrenic desire according to his demand. His desire is fantastic because he wants to develop moneymaking

activities using any trick either selling dogs or taking uncle's money very cleverly according to his own desire:

What the hell do you think you were doing out there, mister? She says, her hands on her hips, she is angry, not merely trying to look angry the way she usually does with Tomas she wants him to take her seriously. My brother's eyes are not as bloodshot as they have been, and he seems a little. Surprised and off guard as he looks up at her from his chair. What you so mad about? I think you know, Tomas. I can't read your mind. (195)

The protagonist is serious at first and to steal the money is the consolation for him when he cannot live properly. It shows that the switch from extensive to intensive capitalist accumulation leads to the spread of capitalist relations of production and the commodification of social life. No one care about non-American people. It is the culture of capitalism, which produces satisfaction to the American people, depolarizing the identity of non-white people, limiting the horizon to political and economic goals that can be achieved within the oppressive and exploitative framework of capitalist production within early childhood period. He works according to the culture of capitalism and becomes its agent. His economic, political, ideological systems reveal his own schizophrenic desire. He recognizes culture as a process of human perfection and as a matter of documentary collection of best thoughts and experiences of different ages and finally he argues that culture is a description of a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art but also in intuitions and ordinary behavior. The protagonist collects his best thoughts and experiences of his different ages but his best experiences are his schizophrenic desire

in his age. "Tomas, I fear you have waited too long and not listened to me, and that it is in my mind no longer a Filipino or a Laurel" (202).

The above quote ideas clarify the fact of capitalism that is greatest repression of desiring person. Such information reflects from the activities of the protagonist and shows how the protagonist suffers from his schizophrenic desire in his youth. The protagonist has psychological repression so he is psychologically guided by capitalism. Desire is process so he is suffering from schizophrenic desire according to his demand.

Thus, it is the power imposed by the capitalist arrangement that make lowly human beings to imitate or perceive the hegemonic tendency of American capitalism. The protagonist, Tomas is a representative capitalist character as he is not willing to follow the capitalistic culture but the things he does are the result of his compulsion.

#### IV. Conclusion

In *American Son* Brian Ascalon Roley highlights the capitalist culture of America, where non-western American people like Tomas are interpellated by the influence of capitalism. People have their minds pre-occupied with the perception of the west that it does have a better life, more opportunities and better financial freedom. That is why the protagonist Tomas assimilates American system in terms of capitalism. Tomas is interestingly participated in different activities for the quicker adaptation of America. He is not much happy in foreign land but due to his compulsion he all the time is ready to neglect the family responsibility and develops friendship with Mexican gangster. More than that Tomas sells pricey dogs to Hollywood celebrities. Tomas claims, he trains the dogs with Nazi technique and then sells them to wealthy producer.

It's not difficult for the readers to guess why Tomas becomes like Mexican gangster. Most probably, it's the social, cultural and environmental influence that makes Tomas a gangster. Additionally, his teacher Ryan, who always mocks him in the classroom, and his anti-innocent feelings constantly provoke him. Tomas has the quickest adaptability. His character reflects that of the American boys. He is the symbol of the future generations of the west. The traditions, education systems, behaviors are all sponsored truths of the resourceful people's ideology based on the hegemony of power. In fact it is nothing more than the truth created by the capitalist group of people. Tomas does not escape from his heritage inwardly from the activities of individual show, but escapes from his well-wishers and family members due to dire consequences of capitalism.

Therefore, in the text, *American Son*, Roley has realistically depicted the immigrant experience and about the life of non-American people in America. Roley illustrates not only pathetic condition of non-American people like Tomas but also focuses how capitalistic culture is transcended among the people out of the west. This shows that even today the hegemony of the powerful people continues to rule the common folks.

### Works Cited

- Abrahams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Banglore: Prism Books, 2001.
- Adams, Hazard. "Karl Marx." *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1992. 624-25.
- Alsaybar, Bangele. "Deconstructing Deviance: Phillipino American Youth, Gangs' Party, Culture, and Ethnic Identity in Los Angeles." *Amerasia Journal* 25.1(1999). 116-38.
- Althusser, Louis. " Ideological State Apparatus." *Mapping Ideology*. Ed. Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso, 1999. 100-40.
- Beach, Joseph. W. "Maugham Considers Mystics." *New York Times* 23 April; 1944. 352-54.
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basic*. Delhi: Routledge, 2003.
- Dirik, Arif. "The Global in the Local." *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*. Ed. Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake. Durtham: Duke UP, 1996. 21-45.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. New York: Rutledge, 2002.
- - -. "What is Ideology?" *Ideology*. London: Verso, 1991.1-31.
- - -. "Ideology Strategies." *Ideology*, 33-61.
- Eleanor, Ty. "Abjection, Masculinity, and Violence in Brian Roley's *American Son*." *Proquest*. Jan 2004. July 2007. <<http://proquest.umi.com/...>>.
- Foucault, Michael. Truth and Power." *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt HBJCP, 1992. 1133-45.
- Gramsci, Antonio. "Problem of History and Culture." *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. 3-23.
- - -. "Notes on Politics." *Prison Notebooks*. 44-120.

- Grossberg, Lawrence, et al. eds. Introduction. *Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Hansen, Suzy. "American Son: A Review." *Proquest*. 17 May 2001. Publishers Weekly. July 2007. <<http://proquest.umi.com/...>>.
- Hemon, Alexander. "No Surfer Dudes." *Proquest*. 12 Aug 2001. Academic Research Library. July 2007. <<http://proquest.umi.com/...>>.
- Kins, Jenny. *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back*. London: Lynne Rienner, 1999.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror-phase as Formative of the Function of the I." *Mapping Ideology*. Ed. Slavoj Zizek. London: Verso, 1999. 93-99.
- Lee, Robert G. *Orientalism: Asian American in Popular Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1999.
- Marx, Karl. *The German Ideology. Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed Adams 624- 625.
- Olney, Kathryn. "Interview with Brian Ascalon Roley." *Altavista*. July July 2004. <<Http.www.altavista/papertigers.org>>
- Richie, Donald. "Social Realism Enhanced by the Pastoral." *The Japan Times* 86 (2008). 11.
- Roley, Brian Ascalon. *American Son*. London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001.
- Smith, Steven. "Louis Althusser." Microsoft® Encarta® 2009 [DVD]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User Friendly Guide*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2008.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Universal Publication, 1992.
- Zaleski, Jeff. "American Son: A Review." *Proquest*. 14 May 2001. Publishers Weekly. July 2007. <<http://proquest.umi.com/...>>