

Introduction to Cultural Studies
Dr. Avishek Parui
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology-Madras

Lecture - 36
Ian Hacking – The Social Construction Of What - II

So hello and welcome to this Introduction to Cultural Studies NPTEL course where we are looking at Ian Hacking's The Social Construction Of What. So we have already had one lecture on this particular text and we will move on to the other part of the text that we are covering. So like I said in the earlier lecture, the first lecture for this text that we were looking at introduction quite closely because that so delineates or maps out what this book aspires to do in terms of its semantic content and in terms of its arguments.

So The Social Construction Of What is like I said in the earlier lecture, a warning, a caution against looking at social constructivism as the only analysis, as the only perspective to look at culture and cultural conditions because that then becomes a bit of a grand narrative in its own right and that also becomes quite reifying and quite reductionist and quite rarified. Because it takes away the other complexities, the other complex conditions, other complex components which inform the categories of culture and the different subcategories of culture.

So you know this particular book does not decry social constructivism. It does not decry the social construction argument. It actually calls for a more complex social construction argument. So it so looks at it basically critiques the social construction argument which denies or disregards the other associated arguments and it rather calls for a more complex understanding of culture, more complex understanding of feminism, a more complex understanding of emotion from different perspectives rather than from just a purely social construction perspective.

So this is the long and short, the idea, the argument, the primary argument in this particular book, okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 01:57)

RELATIVISM

For many people, Sokal epitomized what are now called the "science wars." Wars! The science wars can be focused on social construction.

So in the last lecture, the opening lecture for this book Hacking talked about the Sokal phenomenon, the Alan Sokal phenomenon which was basically a hoax idea, a hoax publication, a very sophisticated literary, cultural, general called social text where you know the physicist, New York physicist Alan Sokal, he just appropriated the jargon, the rhetoric of postmodernism, poststructuralism and sent off a submission which was accepted in social text which like he said is a very sophisticated journal.

And that phenomenon, the so called hoax becomes quite viral according to Hacking over here and it opens up the possibilities, it opens up you know some more, some worse situations, some worse examples of people who are not ever aware that they are what they writing is a hoax. Are not even aware that what they are writing is bogus material. They sent their submission, they write articles discussing social events, cultural events, political events using the same reifying, rhetorical you know language and that gets published, that becomes an industry in its own right.

So social construction, this entire idea of social constructivism becomes an academic industry and a dominant grand narrative inside academia. That is what Hacking is decrying over here as a philosopher. He calls for, he summons, he alerts us to a more complex analysis of culture, a more complex understanding of human life, of discourses etc. okay. So in this section that we will cover today, Hacking talks about relativism. So what is relativism?

So relativism obviously as you know is a very post, postmodern phenomenon, a very post postmodern term in some sense. So he talk about relativism as modern relativism, cultural relativism etc., different kinds of relativism can be operative at different points of time and that obviously means there is nothing absent, there is nothing which is primary or authentic or you know which is a given.

Now that is a very poststructuralist, postmodernist argument which we have seen in the various texts that we have covered so far. Now what Hacking is alerting us against or warning us against is not a move away from relativism, definitely not. He is a philosopher in a very globus sophisticated tradition and he is the first one to put his hand up and say and acknowledge the beauties of privileges of relativism, the privileges of social construction as an epistemic analysis.

Now what he is warning us against is shallow relativism, is rarified relativism or reified relativism where we so with argument that everything is related to everything else. So in that analysis, in that kind of an epistemic argument, Hacking argues, in a very short while we will see that. He says anything goes, right. So that break down the walls between truth and non-truth, between culture and liberation, between oppression and articulation.

Because if you are making an argument, everything goes relative and you can justify torture, you can justify oppression, you can justify abuse, you can justify all kinds of horrible hideous human activities and that is again the primary argument that Hacking is making. So he is saying that you know relativism can be a danger if we simplify it, if we use it in a very simplified reductionist manner, okay and therein lies the danger, therein lies the risk of relativism as Hacking would go on to delineate now, okay.

So this is on your screen the last bit on the page on your screen where Hacking says, for many people, Sokal epitomized what are now called the science wars. Wars. The science wars can be focused on social construction.

(Refer Slide Time: 05:39)

One person argues that scientific results, even in fundamental physics, are social constructs. An opponent, angered, protests that the results are usually discoveries about our world that hold independently of society. People also talk of the culture wars, which often hinge on issues of race, gender, colonialism, or a shared canon of history and literature that children should master—and so on. These conflicts are serious. They invite heartfelt emotions. Nevertheless I doubt that the terms “culture wars,” “science wars” (and now, “Freud wars”) would have caught on if they did not suggest gladiatorial sport. It is the bemused spectators who talk about the “wars.”

One person argues, this is page 4 on your screen. One person argues that scientific results, even in fundamental physics, are social constructs. An opponent, angered, protests that the results are usually discoveries about our world that hold independently of society. People also talk of culture wars, which often hinge on issues of race, gender, colonialism, or a shared canon of history and literature that children should master and so on. These conflicts are serious.

They invite heartfelt emotions. Nevertheless I doubt that the terms culture wars, science wars and now Freud wars would have caught on if they did not suggest gladiatorial sport you know. It is a bemused spectator who talk about the wars. So you know it has a voyeuristic quality. It has a spectator like quality these words and these are eventually ineffective, culture wars, science wars, the war within sciences, the war between culture and science where you know this argument that science is a social construct, mathematics is a social construct.

While it is definitely a social construct at the human level, it is construct over human beings in different historical points of time etc. So in that sense it is definitely a historical social construct. But to look at mathematics or science or physics as purely social construct, so that becomes a dogmatic analysis, that becomes a dogmatic discourse. So you know this is a very thin line between dogma and discourse that we are treading over here and Hacking is alerting us of that particular line.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:12)

There is, alas, a great deal of anger out there that no amount of lightheartedness will dispel. Many more things are at work in these wars than I can possibly touch on. One of them is a great fear of relativism. What is this wicked troll? Clear statements about it are hard to find. Commonly, people suspected of relativism insist they are not haunted by it. A few, such as the Edinburgh sociologists of science, Barry Barnes and David Bloor (1982), gladly accept the epithet "relativist." Paul Feyerabend (1987), of "anything goes" fame, managed to describe some thirteen versions of relativism, but this attempt at divide-and-rule convinced no one.

There is a alas a great deal of anger out there that no amount of lightheartedness will dispel. Many more things are at work in these wars than I can possibly touch on. One of them is a great fear of relativism. What is this wicked troll? Clear sentiments, clear statements about it are hard to find. Commonly, people suspected of relativism insist they are not haunted by it.

A few, such as Edinburgh sociologists of science, Barry Barnes and David Bloor, Paul Feyerabend of anything goes fame managed to describe some thirteen versions of relativism, but this attempt at divide-and-rule convinced no one.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:48)

I think that we should be less highbrow than these authors. Let us get down to gut reactions. What are we afraid of? Plenty. There is the notion that any opinion is as good as any other; if so, won't relativism license anything at all? Feminists have recently cautioned us about the dangers of this kind of relativism, for it seems to leave no ground for criticizing oppressive ideas (Code 1995). The matter may seem especially pressing for third-world feminists (Nanda 1997).

I think we should be less highbrow than these authors. Let us get down to gut reactions. What are we afraid of? Plenty. There is the notion that any opinion is as good as any other. If so, would not relativism license anything at all? Feminists have recently cautioned us about the dangers of this kind of relativism. For it seems to leave no ground for criticizing oppressive ideas. The matter may seem especially pressing for third-world feminists.

Now, feminism keeps coming up in Hacking's arguments and he is making a very strong case over here, very interesting case and he is essentially saying that you know relativism if pushed too far if you say everything is relative, if you say that the entire discursive analysis should hinge over relativism then the danger is that you can actually justify everything with relativism. You can actually talk about everything as a social construct, everything as a relative social construct and in that sense that can cause great dangers to movement like feminism, right.

So he is giving references over here you know that relativism can license anything at all. It can license torture, it can license oppression, it can license the worse from a patriarchal depression, the worse from a patriarchal repression and that too you can assume as social construct and therein you know and the process can be given some currency, can be given some legitimacy you know through a very relativistic understanding of culture.

So feminists have recently cautioned us about the dangers of this kind of relativism, for it seems to leave no ground for criticizing oppressive ideas because an oppressive ideas can be seen as social constructs which are relative to some other constructs and hence they should not be considered to be oppressive. They should not be considered to be you know repressive. They should be seen as texts, as social constructs which can be analyzed and not critiqued. So that becomes a problem, that becomes a real problem.

What Hacking constantly tells us throughout this book is the fact that social construction can often operate in a purely rarified, reified academic space which have very little connection, very little engagement with the daily life reality of life, okay. And therein lies the problem, therein lies the sometimes shallowness of the social constructivist argument and Hacking is alerting us to

that shallowness, to that sort of disconnected condition you know especially when it comes to cultural conditions, okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 10:09)

Then there is historical revisionism. The next stage in the notorious series of holocaust denials might be a book entitled *The Social Construction of the Holocaust*, a work urging that the Nazi extermination camps are exaggerated and the gas chambers fictions. No one wants a relativism that tells us that such a book will, so far as concerns truth, be on a par with all others. My own view is that we do not need to discuss such issues under the heading of relativism. The question of historical revisionism is a question of how to write history.⁵ Barnes and Bloor (1983, 27) make plain that relativist sociologists of their stripe are obliged to sort out their beliefs and actions, using a critical version of the standards of their own culture. Feyerabend's last words (1994) were that every culture is one culture, and we ought to take a stand against oppression

Then there is historical revisionism. The next stage is the notorious series of holocaust denials you know might be a book entitled *The Social Construction of the Holocaust*, a work urging that the Nazi extermination camps are exaggerated and the gas chamber fictions. No one wants a relativism that tells us that such a book will so far as concerns truth be on a par with all the others. So he is saying, he is giving extreme examples over here.

He is saying, now if you take relativism too far, if you look at social construction too far, the entire idea of everything that social construct, if you push it too far, if you look at relativism too far, so there might be a book which might argue, which might be an apology, might be a justification of Nazi torture of Jews. They might deny the holocaust at all and there have been attempts to holocaust denials which is illegal by the way in several parts of Europe for historical reasons.

Now he is saying, now if you allow this relativism to operate freely to be a you know complete free market of ideas, an open market of ideas very soon there is a possibility there might be a book entitled *The Social Construction of the Holocaust* which can be a book about holocaust

denial. It can be a book urging that Nazi's are not bad at all. That they are actually, they were historically not really oppressors of Jews but you know they were something else etc.

So you know in that sense again that goes back to the argument just a while ago where Hacking said that you know in that sense it will be impossible to critique any form of oppression if you are essentially looking at everything as a social construct, everything as a relativistic social construct, okay right. So my own view is that we do not need to discuss such issues under the heading of revisionism.

The question of historical revisionism is a question of how to write history. Make plain that relativist sociologists of their stripe Barnes and Bloor make plain that relativist sociologists of their stripe are obliged to sort out their beliefs and actions using a critical version of the standards of their own culture. Feyerabend's last words were that every culture is one culture and we ought to take a stand against oppression anywhere.

(Refer Slide Time: 12:15)

anywhere. And I ended my own contribution to a book on rationality and relativism by quoting Sartre's last words explaining why the Jewish and Islamic traditions played no part in his thought: they did not for the simple reason that they were no part of his life (Hacking 1983).

There are more global bogeymen. Intellectuals and nationalists are frightened of religious fundamentalism in India, Israel, the Islamic world, and the United States. Does not relativism entail that any kind of religious fundamentalism is as good as any kind of science?

Okay. So Feyerabend who is you know credited with the word anything goes, the phrase anything goes which is sometimes used in a very you know derogatory sense. We will talk about postmodernism that anything goes in postmodernism that you know everything is relative to everything else. So there is nothing called oppression, nothing called liberation. You know what is oppression to one is liberation to other etc.

But Feyerabend over here and Hacking quotes Feyerabend and say that you know his last words were oppressionists oppression and so it is wrong, it is incorrect, it is a error, an epistemic error and also human judgmental error if you look at oppression as some kind of a social construct which can be validated, which can be licensed using a relativistic argument, okay. And I ended my own contribution to a book on rationality and relativism by quoting Jean-Paul Sartre's last words explaining why the Jewish and Islamic traditions played no part in his thoughts.

They did not for the simple reason that they were no part in his life. So you know again we are looking at someone's life as being a real phenomenon and not just a social phenomenon. So you know over here Hacking is referring to a preface that wrote rationality, relativism where he alluded or referred to Jean-Paul Sartre and quite really stated that Sartre's thoughts, his ideas had no influences whatsoever from the Jewish or Islamic condition simply because he did not live those traditions right.

So in that sense you know social construction becomes secondary to life reality and life reality informs intellectual currents to form or prominently form or immediately form or organically with any rarified idea of social construction, okay. There are more global bogeymen. Intellectuals and nationalists are frightened of religious fundamentalism in India, Israel, the Islamic world, the United States.

Does not relativism entail that any kind of religious fundamentalism is as good as any kind of science. So again he is giving an extreme example. He is saying that it is possible if we push the relativism argument too far to argue that you know religious fundamentalist must have valid science, is as you know licensed with science, right.

You know you cannot question fundamentalism, you cannot question abuse, you cannot question mass torture, you cannot question mass deception simply because you are looking at those categories to a social constructs and you are giving a sophistication, an epistemic sophistication. You are conferring an epistemic sophistication on those categories from a social constructivist

perspective. And again the cultural relativism perspective so in that sense you cannot really classify anything as oppression, you cannot really classify anything as torture or abuse.

(Refer Slide Time: 15:05)

11

Relativism and decline are real worries, but I am not going to address them directly. It is good to stay away from them, for I cannot expect successfully to dispel or solve problems where so many wise heads have written so many wise words without effect. More generally, I avoid speculating further on the profound malaise that fuels today's culture wars. I am at most an unhappy witness to it, saddened by what it does.

Okay, and then he ends the section by saying this is the final paragraph before the next section. Relativism and decline are real worries, but I am not going to address them directly. It is good to stay away from them, for I cannot expect successfully to dispel or solve problems where so many wise heads have written so many wise words without effect. More generally, I avoid speculating further on the profound malaise that fuels today's culture wars.

I am most an unhappy witness to it, saddened by what it does. So the entire idea of culture was it is something which becomes real problem, a real life problem according to Hacking and he is saying that this is the problem that we need to address but I am not going to engage with that directly because it is a major problem and it is beyond the scope of this particular book, okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 15:50)

DON'T FIRST DEFINE, ASK FOR THE POINT


Social construction talk has recently been all the rage. I cannot hope to do justice to all parties. I shall take most of my examples from authors who put social construction up front, in their titles. They may not be the clearest, most sensible, or most profound contributors, but at any rate they are self-declared. So what are social constructions and what is social constructionism? With so many inflamed passions going the rounds, you might think that we first want a definition to clear the air. On the contrary, we first need to confront the point of social construction analyses. Don't ask for the meaning, ask what's the point.

And then he goes on to next section where he says quite directly, social construction talk has recently been all the rage. It is a trendy thing, it is the trendy term at the moment. I cannot hope to do justice to all parties. I shall take most of my examples from authors who put social construction up front in their titles. They may not be the clearest, most sensible or the most profound contributors, but at any rate they are self-declared.

So what are social constructions and what is social constructionism? With so many inflamed passions going the rounds, you might think that we first want a definition to clear the air. On the contrary, we first need to confront the point of social construction analyses. Do not ask for the meaning, ask what is the point. So again we are back to the pragmatic argument. The utilitarian argument. So the functional argument.

So Hacking is saying quite clearly over here before we define what social construction is or the entire idea of social constructionism, the more immediate question should be ought to be what is the point of social construction? So what is the purpose that social construction analysis serves in terms of understanding of culture, in terms of understanding as text, in terms of understanding a way of phenomenon, political or otherwise, okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 17:05)

This is not an unusual situation. There are many words or phrases of which the same thing must be said. Take "exploitation." In a recent book about it, Alan Wertheimer (1996) does a splendid job of seeking out necessary and sufficient conditions for the truth of statements of the form "A exploits B." He does not quite succeed, because the point of saying that middle-class couples exploit surrogate mothers, or that colleges exploit their basketball stars on scholarships—Wertheimer's prized examples—is to raise consciousness. The point is less to describe the relation between colleges and stars than to change how we see those relations. This relies not on necessary and sufficient conditions for claims about exploitation, but on fruitful analogies and new perspectives. 

This is not an unusual situation. There are many words or phrases of which the same thing must be said. Take exploitation. In a recent book about it, Alan Wertheimer does a splendid job of seeking out necessary and sufficient conditions for the truth of statements of the form A exploits B. So exploitation becomes again a very important category in Hacking's analysis. So and he mentions Wertheimer in his book on exploitation.

He does not quite succeed, because the point of saying that middle-class couples exploit surrogate mothers, or that colleges exploit their basketball stars on scholarships, Wertheimer's prized examples is to raise consciousness. The point is less to describe the relation between colleges and stars than to change how we see those relations. This relies not on necessary and sufficient conditions for claims about exploitation but on fruitful analogies and new perspectives.

(Refer Slide Time: 18:02)

In the same way, a primary use of “social construction” has been for raising consciousness.⁶ This is done in two distinct ways, one overarching, the other more localized. First, it is urged that a great deal (or all) of our lived experience, and of the world we inhabit, is to be conceived of as socially constructed. Then there are local claims, about the social construction of a specific X. The X may be authorship or Zulu nationalism. A local claim may be suggested by an overarching attitude, but the point of a local claim is to raise consciousness about something in particular. Local claims are in principle independent of each other. You

In the same way, a primary use of social construction has been for raising consciousness. This is done in two distinct ways, one overarching, the other more localized. First, it is urged that a great deal or all of our lived experience, and of the world we inhabit is to be conceived of as socially constructed. Then there are local claims about the social construction of a specific X. the X may be authorship or Zulu nationalism.

A local claim may be suggested by an overarching attitude, but the point of a local claim is to raise consciousness about something in particular. Local claims are in principle independent of each other.

(Refer Slide Time: 18:38)

might be a social constructionist about brotherhood and fraternity, but maintain that youth homelessness is real enough. Most of this book is about local claims. That is why I began with the question, “The social construction of what?” and opened with a list of whats. The items in my alphabetical list are so various! Danger is a different sort of thing from reality, or women refugees. What unites many of the claims is an underlying aim to raise consciousness.

You might be a social constructionist about brotherhood and fraternity, but maintain that youth homelessness is real enough. Most of this book is about local claims. That is why I began with the question, The social construction of what? And opened with a list of whats. The items in my alphabetical list are so various. Danger is a different sort of thing from reality or women refugees. What unites many of the claims is an underlying aim to raise consciousness.

Now what Hacking exposes over here is a very selectionist way in which social construction works. So when he comes to “real situations” then there is a different kind of perspective which he is taking. But when it comes condition which from which you can distance yourself epistemically or in terms of lift reality and then you can have the luxury of social construction which then becomes a luxury, which then becomes a mode of analysis which is used to raise consciousness, okay.

And he gives us idea over here, a local claim and a macro claim, right; a bigger reality and a local reality. So you know and he says over here you might be a social constructionist about brotherhood and fraternity but maintain that the youth homelessness is real enough. So the he creates a structure over here. He is saying essentially that social construction and reality can often go in opposite directions.

So you can be a social constructionist when it comes to certain issues such as brotherhood or fraternity or something related to gender but then you know when it comes to youth homelessness or youth joblessness then you can talk about that as you know a reality. So again there is a degree of pseudo-reality about social constructionism that Hacking is maintaining. So the entire idea of social construction or being a social constructionist can often generate pseudo-reality which can take you away from the lift reality of experience, right. So therein lies the danger, therein lies the problem that Hacking is delineating, okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 20:36)

AGAINST INEVITABILITY

Social construction work is critical of the status quo. Social constructionists about *X* tend to hold that:

- (1) *X* need not have existed, or need not be at all as it is. *X*, or *X* as it is at present, is not determined by the nature of things; it is not inevitable.

Very often they go further, and urge that:

- (2) *X* is quite bad as it is.
- (3) We would be much better off if *X* were done away with, or at least radically transformed.

A thesis of type (1) is the starting point: the existence or character of *X*

So and then he moves on to say, talk about how social construction works. One of the ways in which social construction works according to Hacking is to raise a clarion call against inevitability and this is the section that is you know on your screen and should be appearing on the screen at the moment. Social construction work is critical of the status quo. Social constructionists about *X* tend to hold that 1) *X* need not have existed, or need not be at all as it is.

X or *X* as it is at present is not determined by the nature of things. It is not inevitable. So the inevitability argument is something which is a characteristic of most social constructionist theories. And Hacking says over here that you know one of the series, one of ways in which these series branch out or flush out into bigger theories is by assuming that *X* need not have existed. That *X* does not exist except as a social construct.

X is not determined by nature of things. It is not inevitable, right and what one of the problems with this argument is that you can sometimes take away the reality of *X* by saying it is not inevitable, by saying it is not it does not exist by saying it is not natural by saying it is completely engineered socially. You take away the reality, you take away the experientiality from *X* as a category and therein lies the problem that Hacking is highlighting.

Very often they go further and urge that 2) *X* is quite bad as it is. 3) We would be much better off if *X* were done away with or at least radically transformed. So you know suppose you replace *X*

with patriarchy or X with female you know violence in women. Now if you are to say that violence and women does not exist except for the social construction that does not exist except as something which can be analyzed socially.


Then obviously you are doing a great disservice, a massive disservice to the human sufferers of that kind of abuse. The human sufferers of that kind of violence right you know and very often you connect it by saying it is quite bad as it is; will be much better off if X were done away with or at least radically transformed. So again if you look at the rhetoric that has been used over here, it is very rhetorical, it is very jargon heavy, it is very you know epistemic.

It is strictly epistemic. It is strictly constructivist in quality and that does away that does disservice to a great extent, to the lift reality of experience, right and therein lies the problem that Hacking is constantly emphasizing. The lift reality as against the discursive understanding you know of that particular condition, okay. A thesis of type 1 is the starting point.

So type 1 obviously is the claim that X need not have existed, does not exist, not natural you know not inhabitable etc. So that is the analysis, that is the first thesis that is been urged, that is been stated over here. A thesis of type 1 is the starting point.

(Refer Slide Time: 23:28)

is not determined by the nature of things. X is not inevitable. X was ^{NP} brought into existence or shaped by social events, forces, history, all of which could well have been different. Many social construction theses at once advance to (2) and (3), but they need not do so. One may realize that something, which seems inevitable in the present state of things, was not inevitable, and yet is not thereby a bad thing. But most people who use the social construction idea enthusiastically want to criticize, change, or destroy some X that they dislike in the established order of things.



The existence or character of X is not determined by the nature of things. X is not inevitable. X was brought into existence or shaped by social events, forces, history all of which could well have been different. Many social construction theses at once advance to 2 and 3, but they need not do so. One may realize that something which seems inevitable in the present state of things was not inevitable and yet is not thereby a bad thing.

But most people use the social construction idea enthusiastically want to criticize, change or destroy some X that they dislike in the established order of things. Now this bit is very important. Now what Hacking is doing over here, he is bringing in the idea of, bringing in the quotient of prejudice. So there is a prejudice which is often operative in social constructionist theory.

So if you do not like X, if you do not like X the phenomenon you first say it does not exist naturally. It is a socially engineered phenomenon. And then you move on very quickly to the axiomatic attachment and say that you know this is a bad thing. It should be done away with etc. That is obviously a reductionist thing. Now if X, suppose we have a phenomenon, a very complex phenomenon such as I do not know suppose football fandom.

A football fandom can be a discursive phenomenon, football fandom can be a real experience, football fandom can be you know a completely socially engineered situation according to social constructionist theory and if you say football fandom is a is a is a purely socially engineered condition but obviously is reductionist but that takes away some of the other factors which come into being you know such as you know emotions, effect, biology, you know different kinds of effective associations which may not be called social in quality.

It is an entanglement of the inside and the outside, between the interior and the exterior, right and that is problem 1. Problem 2 is if you do not lie, I mean it is very easy, one of the conditions, one of the markers, one of the hallmarks of social constructionist theory is that to meet the brand that phenomenon as negative. Is to brand that phenomenon as something which is appalling and evil, can be done away with etc.

Now again by wishing that it is evil, by saying it is evil, by you know making up, claim that it should be done away with, it does not really affect the real human engagement with that phenomenon. Now it is a very complex phenomenon. I am using the word, the example of football fandom as just one random example. Now you can think about other examples as well.

Now it is real prejudice which comes in, in social constructionist theory and more often than not social constructionist theory it comes with a series of negative understanding of a particular event. If it does not like it, there is a degree of prejudice, a degree of you know hypercriticality about that particular analysis and that hypercriticality, that prejudice can often become a reductionist way of understanding the phenomenon because you are not really looking at it as a complex phenomenon. You are looking at it from a prejudiced perspective.

You do not like the phenomenon and you wish it were done away with. You wish that it do not exist at all and that wish, that prejudice, that presupposition makes you a prejudiced examiner of that phenomenon, a prejudiced student, a prejudiced you know person in terms of understanding or engaging the phenomenon right. So that prejudiced quotient is something that Hacking is highlighting over here and he is saying that most people who use the social construction idea enthusiastically want to criticize, change, or destroy some X that they dislike in the established order of things.

So again it is very easy to be seduced by the social constructionist idea of anti-establishment say anything which is established, anything which is status quo is necessarily barred and hence must be done away with, must be questioned etc. Now that kind of an understanding is a very narrow understanding of the phenomenon according to Hacking and that does a lot disservice to the real life experience of that particular phenomenon which affects lots of people in a real space.

Okay, so you know I will stop at this point in this lecture, but just to sum up before I move on to the next section which is gender, what Hacking is warning us against is not the privileges of social constructionist theory. He is very aware and he acknowledges and he admits and he is a fan of the privileged to a certain extent. He is obviously aware and obviously assertive of the fact that you know historical phenomenon or social constructs are socially conditioned to a great

extent and that conditioning takes into account economy, language, religion, politics, and a whole host of other factors and components.

However, you know it is a very complex phenomenon and to look at those phenomenon just from a constructionist perspective, just as a negative perspective, just from a perspective of criticality can often do a disservice to the complexity of the phenomena, to the human affective associations with that phenomena, the human suffering of that phenomena and if you couple that with moral relativism, cultural relativism it makes it even worse.

Because then you can justify everything as a social text, you can justify everything as a socially engineered process which then become, makes it almost impossible to criticize a real human suffering, to criticize you know historical examples of human abuse and torture and all kinds of oppression. So in that sense social constructionist theory can be limiting, can be reductionist and more importantly towards the end as you can see it can be prejudicial in quality, right.

So I will stop at this point in this lecture today and I will continue with the next lecture with this text. Thank you for your attention.