



---

## The ‘*Three Moments of Art*’ and Truth-Event: Reflections on Muktibodhian Creative-Process

*Anup Kumar Bali*

### Introduction

Poetry has its own politics within the ambit of its own specificity. But to conceive any phenomena only in an identitarian form<sup>1</sup> is precisely an indication towards the fundamental problem of envisioning phenomena and processes in dichotomized distinct forms that function according to the logic of binary oppositions. This problematic is pertinent to envision the relationship between poetry and politics not as dichotomized distinct processes rather as mutually constitutive ones. On the one hand, dominant ideological manoeuvrings reduce poetry as an instrument for ‘political’ struggles in ‘political’ movements whereas we have also been the spectator of art for art’s sake kind of conception which clenches poetry within the identitarian fortifications of aestheticism on the other extreme. While shattering these kinds of delusional dichotomies, this paper intends to illumine art of poetry as

---

<sup>1</sup>Here identitarian stands for identification of phenomenon without reflecting upon the processuality that leads to phenomenal appearance. German philosopher, Theodor W. Adorno, reflects upon this as identity thinking which privileges positivity, origin, fixity, and most importantly immanence. With his immanent critique of identitarian thinking—which is the consequent result of idealist dialectic of Hegel—he offers Negative dialectics. In light of this discussion, poetry and politics are not two distinct phenomena as binary oppositions functional only at certain junctures rather the entwining of poetry and politics as processual unfolding envisages at diverse junctures. This watertight presumption of limiting politics to so-called political events and poetics to so-called aesthetic or artistic ghettos is a symptom of identity thinking or identitarian envisioning of conception. Adorno in his magnum opus *Negative Dialectics* (2004) reflects upon the non-conceptuality under the aspect of concept. For him, dialectics is the consistent sense of non-identity (Adorno 5). He writes, “Contradiction is nonidentity under the aspect of identity; the dialectical primary of the principle of contradiction makes the thought of unity the measure of heterogeneity. As the heterogeneous collides with its limit it exceeds itself” (ibid). Hence, in the form of non-concept, non-identity is the fundamental premise of societal contradiction(s). For Adorno, identity is a primal and real form of ideology (ibid 148) whereas non-identity as negativity unveils the ideological (ibid 31). Because of his emphasis upon negative and consequently on non-identity, his dialectics is negative dialectics. In this way, the non-identity as untruth of identity with its emphasis upon negative dialectics shatters the ideological constitution of reality.

an embodiment of truth-procedure and this truth-procedurality of art, according to contemporary french philosopher Alain Badiou, is irreducible to other truths. According to Badiou, art as a singular regime of thought is irreducible to philosophy (Badiou 9). On the other hand, Badiou believes that philosophy has no truth of its own and it depends on politics, art, love, and science for truth. In Badiou's own words, philosophy is conditioned by the truth-procedure in above-mentioned four domains (Badiou 101–107). Here it is important to mention that according to Badiou's conception of art, the truth is immanent and singular within art. Therefore, Badiou rejects the intervention of exchange and relationality by envisaging singularity of truth-procedure in art. This paper intends to reflect upon the revolutionary poetry in politics which offers the possibilities of negation of relationality in the context of creative process of poetic-praxis. As discussed above, the understanding of intimate entwinement of poetry and politics beyond above-mentioned delusional polarities neither would be poetry of politics nor poetry for politics.<sup>2</sup> This paper puts emphasis upon the politics inherent in poetry which manifest itself as *poetry in politics* (Ghosh 136). Politics in *poetry in politics* is not something which is outside of poetry, rather it is poetry in its own actualization while its poetic endeavour unfolds its own politics. Undoubtedly, the aesthetic question is predominant in poetry but the politics inherent in poetry is intrinsic and not free from aesthetic questioning. Consequently, the questions of aesthetics is also the question of politics and hence called the politico-aesthetic of Muktibodh. The politics in *poetry in politics* is to negate the possible generalization of networks of exchange-principle in ongoing creative-process of poetry by the concrete useful labour of an artist. This concrete useful labour of artist is his aesthetic labour that constitutes the use-value of art. German philosopher, Walter Benjamin, recognizes the usefulness of artistic labour that has the potentiality to negate the commodity character of society. In his essay, "Author as Producer," he recognised the revolutionary use-value (87) of art which wrenches with modish commerce of capitalist society. In this light, the revolutionary poetry in politics is a politics against the dictates of capital as the dictatorship of exchange and relationality. Contemporary Italian Marxist, Franco "Bifo" Berardi, rightly recognised the revolutionary potential in poetic language. In his essay, "Poetry and Finance," he stated a pertinent point about poetic language, "Poetry is the language of nonexchangeability, the return of infinite hermeneutics, and the return of sensuous body of language" (139–140). Hence, the revolutionary politics in poetry is the politics to invoke the nonexchangeability of poetic language. This negation of relationality is pos-

---

<sup>2</sup>As it leads to instrumentalization of poetry considering it makes poetry an instrument of identitarian politics.

sible only through the negation of exchange-principle inherent in capitalist societal structure and hence through the subtraction from this very structure. Contemporary Marxist Philosopher, Slavoz Žižek, indicates towards exchange-principle in his conception of ideology and ideological fantasy while engaging with the idea of real abstraction given by Frankfurt school economist, Alfred Sohn-Rethel, in his book, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. This negation of exchange-principle with the singularity of truth immanent in art, emancipates poetry from its aestheticist identitarian fortifications and foregrounds what Badiou would call “autonomy of the aesthetic process.”

Hindi poet and literary thinker, Gajanan Madhav Muktibodh,<sup>3</sup> in his creative process of poetry demonstrates the relation of form and content in its singularity and not in relationality. For him, the emergence of the form of artifact is actually a processual continuity. In this sense, the psychic elements (content) which one acquires from social-reality and the emerged form from this content develops from the innovative experience of the artist. This form flows freely in diverse directions and marks the boundaries of the artifact. This free-flow of form is the autonomy of art which capitalist hegemony wants to subordinate through its control. The explicit proof of singular

---

<sup>3</sup>Gajanan Madhav Muktibodh (1917–1964) was a prominent poet of *Nayi Kavita* (New Poetry) and Hindi modernism. Though belonged to central India (Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Maharashtra) and his mother tongue was Marathi and not Hindi, he has been considered as one of the most influential poet and literary thinker of Hindi. Muktibodh was one of the central figures in Hindi literature who endeavored to rethink Marxism and progressivism in his own way. While critiquing dogmatic Marxism and traditional progressivism for their ignorance of the question of individual, he was keen on resolving the complex relationship of individual and society in capitalist social structure while profoundly encountering the question of self-alienation. In this direction, he was heavily influenced by psychoanalysis as is reflected in his critical essays and letters. It is of significance that his exercise of psychoanalysis was influenced by Marxism. This productive relationship between Marxism and psychoanalysis can be seen in few of his poems, such as *Andhere Mein* (In The Dark) (Muktibodh Rachnawali 2, pp. 320–355. Its English translation can be found in the journal *Hindi: Language, Discourse, Writing*, vol. 2 no. 1), *Brahmarakshasa*, *Dimagi Guhaandhkar kaa Orang-Outang* (The Orang-Outang), and *Shunya* (The Void Within). (Muktibodh Rachnawali 2 and their English translation can be found in *Signatures: one hundred Indian Poets*, pp. 68–77). Muktibodh was one among the many Indian writers who innovatively thought about creative process. For this reason, his *Ek Sahityik Kee Diary* is an important document in Hindi and Indian literary history. This paper is a theoretical reflection on the creative process of poetry as *Three Moments of Art*. Since it is a bit complicated to reflect upon Muktibodh’s creative process through his poetry and demands a separate endeavour altogether, this paper will mainly focus on the theoretical aspect of Muktibodhian creative-process. The artistic inquiry of his poetry is beyond the scope of this paper.

processuality of Muktibodh's art-production is his conceptual discovery, *Three Moments of Art*. This paper intends to illumine the poetic-praxis of Hindi poet Gajanan Madhav Muktibodh's critical reflection on creative-process of poetry in context to his *Three Moments of Art*, as well as the envisage the possible relationship between Muktibodhian creative-process and contemporary anti-capitalist global philosophy.

The question of subjectivity: Interaction between interior and exterior

Self-struggle is a word whose conceptual analysis can only be possible in context to world-view and praxis of the person/artist through which we endeavour to comprehend this struggle. What does it mean in context of Muktibodh's self-struggle? While referring to long poems of Niraala and Muktibodh, renowned Hindi critic, Namwar Singh, underlines the significance of the dual struggle between the self and the world:

English poet W. B. Yeats writes somewhere that when we do struggle outside of our self then fiction literature is created, and when we do struggle within our own self then lyric poetry is created. Lyric poetry which is created during our own self struggle is definitely not romantic (*Chhayawadi*) but rather the song of today's poetry. But there is third possibility also, when we try to struggle with various externalities during our own self struggle, and there are special kinds of long poems created, it is the supreme contribution of modern poetry, Niraala's "*Raam Ki Shaktipuja*" and "*Saroj-Smiriti*" etc. poems are born due to this kind of self-struggle. Muktibodh's long poems come under this tradition only.<sup>4</sup> (As quoted in Nawal 1) [My translation]

While struggling with his own self, Muktibodh was also constantly struggling with the socio-political hegemony. Not only is his poetry but his whole oeuvre a proof of this struggle. Therefore, it is requisite here to understand this self-struggle with its complexities via comprehensive contexts.

The different aspects of an individual's perspective of life are a result of actions, reactions, and self-consciousness of personal desires,

---

<sup>4</sup>अंग्रेजी कवि डब्ल्यू. बी. एट्स ने कहीं लिखा है कि जब हम अपने से बाहर संघर्ष करते हैं, तो कथा साहित्य की सृष्टि होती है, और अपने आपसे लड़ते हैं तो गीत-काव्य की। अपने आप से लड़ने पर जो गीत-काव्य पैदा होता है, वह निस्संदेह छायावादी गीत नहीं बल्कि आज की कविता का गीत है। लेकिन एक तीसरी भी स्थिति है, जब हम अपने आपसे लड़ते हुए बाहरी स्थिति से भी लड़ने की कोशिश करते हैं, और एक विशेष प्रकार की लम्बी कविताएँ पैदा होती हैं, जो आधुनिक कविता की सबसे बड़ी उपलब्धि है। निराला की 'राम की शक्तिपूजा' और 'सरोज-स्मृति' आदि लम्बी कविताएँ इसी प्रकार के आत्मसंघर्ष से पैदा हुई हैं। मुक्तिबोध की लम्बी कविता उसी परम्परा में आती हैं।

aspirations, and social-reality. The different dimensions of these aspects inclusively direct his/her temperament (or psychology). This temperament is also manifest in specific desires which are the outcome of social atmosphere, socio-economic location, as well as familial and community relations of the individual. The question arises here is whether both the processes exist in a form of binary-opposition while differentiating to each other or is it significant to comprehend these processes with some other perspective. This question is relevant because the analytic approach of interaction among interiority and exteriority is fundamentally premised upon it. Psychologist Dr. Anup Dhar and economist Dr. Anjan Chakrabarti put forward the possibility of psycho-social studies while confronting this question. For this possibility, they formulate a correspondence between Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser and Psychologist Jacques Lacan.<sup>5</sup>

Althusser's conception of *interpellating apparatuses* underlines the process of subject formation in a capitalist society with ideological and repressive state apparatuses. Dr. Dhar and Dr. Chakrabarti named this conception as *philosophy of inside*. Similarly, they named the Lacanian conception of Real as *philosophy of outside*. Lacan formulates the Real as the thing which is beyond the process of symbolization or which is the remainder of the process of symbolization. In this way, Real as remainder of symbolization, is always beyond the demarcation of symbolic. Therefore, not only the expression rather the imagination of the Real is also impossible. In this way, Dr Dhar and Dr. Chakrabarti endeavour to reconcile the process of delimitation of subject by capitalist ideology and hegemony; the Althusserian *philosophy of inside*, to Lacanian *philosophy of outside* for comprehending their dynamicity of hegemony within symbolic order or social reality. An individual only sees his/her real conditions in some imaginative illumination because of this ideological hegemony. This is Al-

---

<sup>5</sup>In one of their research papers Dr. Dhar and Dr. Chakrabarti put forward many questions before the reader while attacking hypostatized dichotomy and pseudo distinction between interiority and exteriority. In this direction they strive to envisage the continuous and processual interaction between psychic and social. While referring this point, they write, "If the condition of the psychic is traceable to the "factory of [unconscious] thoughts" (Freud 317), and if unconscious thoughts are an inalienable thread of the overdetermined social, affecting the social and, in turn, being affected by it, how can this dialogue be avoided? How is the "psychic," which is usually understood as a kind of interiority, always already "social?" How is the social, which is usually understood as a kind of exteriority, paradoxically "psychic?" What is the connection then between the psychic and the social? How are they interlinked? Where is the overdetermination and contradiction between interiority and exteriority? – and can the Althusser–Lacan correspondence stand in as the ground for the above-mentioned question?" (221).

thusserian elucidation of ideology which is a ‘representation’ of the imaginary relationships of individuals to their real conditions of existence (Althusser 32). They further quote Mexican psychologist, Pavon-Cuellar, in context of English word *extimacy*.<sup>6</sup> Pavon-Cuellar shattered the pseudo distinction of interiority and exteriority while using this term in context of Lacan.

At this juncture, it is important to reflect upon whether Muktibodh introduces any schema that foregrounds the micro and macro behavior<sup>7</sup> and activities of human vis-à-vis art and literature. His essay, *Vastu aur Rup: Do*, shows a significant denotation related to the idea of non-distinction between interior and exterior. He writes:

Ergo, even if it’s convenient to differentiate sociological and psychological exposition, it is important to know its limitation. The lack of knowledge regarding this limitation, if it makes the exposition of art, on one hand, mechanically sociological, whereas on the other hand, it is assumed as a part of chaste psychology or spirituality.<sup>8</sup> (108) [My translation]

It is evident from Muktibodh’s above quote that he envisions the humanist philosophy of literature in the context of interaction among social and psychological aspects of an individual. Now it is interesting to reflect upon whether there is any attempt in Muktibodhian thought-process for questioning the distinction between interior and exterior or is there any attempt in Muktibodh which shows the continuous interaction and hence dialectics between these two? Here Professor Apoorvanand’s statement seems relevant whether Muktibodh was seeking

---

<sup>6</sup>It’s an English translation of French neologism coined by Lacan. Pavon-Cuellar employ this term to question the hypostatized dichotomy of interiority and exteriority. He writes, “The term “extimacy” is an English translation of the French neologism (*extimité*) coined by the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan (1959–1960). It is deployed in this paper for the purpose of problematizing, questioning, challenging, and even rejecting and going beyond the traditional psychological distinction between exteriority and psychic interiority or intimacy. Instead of this fundamental distinction and the resultant fixed conceptual dualities that cross and constitute psychology, extimacy indicates the non-distinction and essential identity between the dual terms of the outside and the deepest inside, the exterior and the most interior of the psyche, the outer world and the inner world of the subject, culture and the core of personality, the social and the mental, surface and depth, behaviour and thoughts or feelings (Pavon-Cuellar as cited in Dhar and Chakrabarti 224).

<sup>7</sup>Here Micro and macro refers to individual’s psychic and social behavior, respectively.

<sup>8</sup>अतएव, मनुष्य की समाजशास्त्रीय व्याख्या और मनोवैज्ञानिक व्याख्या को एक-दूसरे से अलग करना सुविधाजनक भले ही हो, इन दोनों की सीमाएं जान लेना जरूरी है। इस सीमा-बोध के अभाव ने ही कला की व्याख्या को यदि एक ओर यांत्रिक समाजशास्त्रीय बना दिया है, तो दूसरी ओर उसे विशुद्ध मनोवैज्ञानिक का या अध्यात्मवाद का अंग मान लिया गया है।

Marxism or was he preparing his own Marxism. Interestingly, he said so in the context of *Ek Sahityik Kee Dairy* (11). Because of his profound interest in psychoanalysis, Muktibodh has been stamped as an existentialist in Hindi literature but Muktibodh's interest in psychoanalysis is primarily because of the question of self. It is significant to reflect on Muktibodhian literature and critical thinking in relation to whether he was self-obsessed, as argued by renowned Hindi critique professor Ram Vilas Sharma (142) or he was obsessed with the question of self and hence with self-alienation. It is through his emphasis on the question of self that Muktibodh illuminates interactions among interiority and exteriority time and again in his writings while exceeding the pseudo distinctions of interiority and exteriority. This is exemplified by Muktibodh's writing:

Our life which starts with our birth gets fulfilled & developed by the internalization of external life. If this internalization does not happen, we would become as blind worm, or the water creature hydra. Our emotional wealth, knowledge wealth, experience prosperity all these are inseparable parts of this system of internal content. This system we acquired from internalization of external life and world. We internalize the external till our death continuously. But with discussion, debate, writing, speech, literature and poetry, we externalize our self continuously. *Internalization of external and externalization of internal is a perpetual cycle.* This internalization is not just related to contemplation rather it's also related to action. In essence, art is a form of externalization of internal.<sup>9</sup> (105 Emphasis Mine) [My translation]

Therefore, in the process of exceeding from distinction between social and psychic, one thing is explicit: with any change in social-reality, these two domains (social and psychic) get impacted. Hence, they are regulated by social-reality and they also regulate it within their ambit. Here it is important to ponder upon the related inconsistency in social-reality because one format of reality makes social and psychic non-distinct and the other format of 'reality' make them appear as di-

---

<sup>9</sup> हमारे जन्म-काल से ही शुरू होने वाला हमारा जो जीवन है, वह बाह्य जीवन-जगत के आभ्यंतरीकरण द्वारा ही सम्पन्न और विकसित होता है. यदि वह आभ्यंतरीकरण न हो, तो हम अंध-कृमि, हाइड्रा - बन जाएँ. हमारी भाव सम्पदा, ज्ञान सम्पदा, अनुभव समृद्धि तो उस अंतर्गतत्व-व्यवस्था ही का अभिन्न अंग है, कि जो अंतर्गतत्व-व्यवस्था हमने बाह्य जीवन-जगत के आभ्यंतरीकरण से प्राप्त की है. हम मरते दम तक बाह्य जीवन-जगत का आभ्यंतरीकरण करते जाते हैं. किन्तु बातचीत, बहस, लेखन, भाषण, साहित्य और काव्य द्वारा हम निरंतर स्वयं का बाह्यीकरण करते जाते हैं. बाह्य का आभ्यंतरीकरण और आभ्यंतरीकृत का बाह्यीकरण एक निरंतर चक्र है. यह आभ्यंतरीकरण मात्र मनन-जन्य नहीं, वरन् कर्म-जन्य भी है. जो हो, कला आभ्यंतर के बाह्यीकरण का एक रूप है.

chotomize distinct.<sup>10</sup> Does the regulation exist only up to the dialectical nexus of social-psychic or some other interventions also control this regulation? The other pertinent question which persists here is—how is this intervention related to the other format of *reality* which makes social-psychic appear as dichotomize distinct?

### Real abstraction and ideological reality: The Chasm of Social and Psychic

The dichotomize distinction of social-psychic points towards the fact that there are some processes which interrupt an individual in reaching his/her social-reality or rather would be significant to reflect that he/she is alienated from his/her social-reality. Earlier we had seen in context to Althusser that ideology is a 'representation' of the imaginary relationships of individuals to their real conditions of existence. In this sense, the alienation of individual from his/her social-reality is explicit. In this section, the objective is to underline this very situation. When ruling or dominating class publicizes and propagates an aspect of reality (or some special sort of reality or myth) with the help of organized mass mediums of communication for their class related interest, then this representation of reality (with on-going glorification of that reality) appears as *reality* which is different from the actual reality of society. In a way, *reality* alienates from its real. According to this *reality*, a particular social consciousness aligns with the society which seems actual social consciousness of society. This leads to a distorted ideology, constructed on the basis of this false consciousness. Marx and Engels' well-founded concept of false consciousness in their book,

---

<sup>10</sup>This delusional nature of dichotomization directly links to Dr. Dhar, Dr. Chakrabarti, and Dr. Dasgupta's idea of capitalism or capitalist hegemony as unreal. In their recent book, Dr. Dhar, Dr. Chakrabarti, and Dr. Dasgupta bluntly critique, even reject the incessant dichotomizations by referring to Marx's *Capital*. They write, "Marx's Methodology in *Capital: Critique of Political Economy* is premised on dual play of on the one hand defetishing the fetish (the location of the critique), and on the other hand, working through the dialectic of real and unreal, commodity as material and sensuous, concrete labour and abstract labour, labour power and labour...capital as material and capital as more than material, etc. Marx thus, moves beyond the water-tight compartmentalization of object-subject, thing-idea, concrete-abstract, or the strict bifurcation of idealism-materialism. To miss the methodology of Marx is to reduce the delusional nature of reality, and the real nature of delusional into simple matter/idea, true/false consciousness frameworks" (2015, pp. 49). By emphasizing on this methodology of Marx they also reject the dichotomize distinction of real and unreal while putting the idea of unreal. They write, "Taking off from the methodology of Marx, we theorize capitalism as capitalist hegemony, which is both real and unreal, unreal to be precise, and which has a dream-like quality." (ibid, pp. 49) Similarly, my attempt by elucidating Muktibodhanian critical-thinking is to critique, shatter, and even reject dichotomize distinct forms of phenomena, processes, or events which functions according to the logic of binary oppositions.



*German Ideology*, described the characteristic features of ideology cherished by this false consciousness, according to them, in light of ideology—“the human and his conditions seems always upside down.” Similarly, they also reveal the hegemonic ideas of ruling or dominating class: “the ideas of the ruling class are in very epoch the ruling ideas; the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at same time its ruling intellectual force.” Hence, Marx and Engels envisage ideology as an intervention which controls social-reality. On the other hand, contemporary Marxist philosopher, Slavoz Žižek, instead of differentiating ideology from reality, questions the *reality* itself. He writes:

...ideology is not simply a ‘false consciousness’, an illusory representation of reality, it is rather this reality itself which is already to be conceived as ‘ideological’ – *‘ideological’ is a social reality whose very existence implies the non-knowledge of its participants as to its essence* – that is, the social effectivity, the very reproduction of which implies that the individuals ‘do not know what they are doing’. *‘Ideological is not the ‘false consciousness’ of a (social) being but this being itself in so far as it is supported by ‘false consciousness.’* (15–16)

Žižek reveals the structural violence of real abstraction which is inherent in exchange process of capitalist social structure which represses and hides the use-value of commodity. The form of exchange-value came into existence by repressing the content of use-value which remains secret in the internal kernel of commodity fetishism. Consequently, there is always an antagonism between use-value and exchange-value in commodity. Marx writes in volume one of *Das Capital*, “As use value, commodities are above all, of different qualities but as exchange value they are merely different quantities, and consequently do not contain an atom of use value” (45). Therefore, in the process of emergence of exchange-value while repressing use-value, exchange becomes an inevitable need and hence, exchange-principle generalizes itself and becomes universal in every socio-economic domain. Hence, in a capitalist society individual is working within networks of exchange-values of diverse commodities that control and delimit the fundamental unit of social-reality. In a capitalist society, individual is a subject of capital who completely internalizes the logic of real abstraction. Hence, this logic of real abstraction becomes the *reality* of individual on its own. Žižek shows the characteristic feature of this real abstraction, as the non-knowledge of the reality of real abstraction, is a part of its very essence and is possible only on a condition that the individuals partaking in it are not aware of its proper

logic, "...if we come to 'know too much,' to pierce the true functioning of social reality, this reality would dissolve itself" (15).

Creative-process: Artist's self-struggle against hegemony and ideological reality

Muktibodh envisions reality in its micro, specific, and spatial forms. Its dynamicity reconciles the micro preciosity of reality to the macro expansiveness of reality.<sup>11</sup> This micro preciosity on one hand links with an individual's psychology and, on the other hand, gets regulated and controlled by dynamicity of social-reality. Therefore, Muktibodh's reality-process not only renders the socio-political contextualization of individual's life but also marks the impact of socio-political turmoil on the psyche of individual. It captures the action-reaction of diverse activities of reality. It represents the complex schemas of diverse aspects of action-reaction and strokes and counter-strokes of dragging and intricacies of reality. For Muktibodh, this reality-process which he calls *internalization of external* is important since the artist's art-praxis is fundamentally premised upon this. Moreover, he suggests that if this internalization is carried immaturely and irrationally then it might have decisive consequences on the literature produced. Precisely at this juncture, he emphasizes upon the continuous self-criticism of poet vis-à-vis *internalization of external* (Muktibodh 216). Hence, for Muktibodh the *internalization of external* is a conscious process, where continuous self-criticism illuminates reality-process in its singularity. It doesn't mean that for Muktibodh reality is one-dimensional or monochromatic, rather Muktibodh contextualizes reality in its specificity. The singularity of specific reality here implies the reality in itself. This is use-value or usefulness of reality which negates the exchange-principle and consequently stops the Muktibodhian reality to become the instrument of/for capital. Hence, it is important to reflect how Muktibodh demonstrates the relation of form and content in its singularity and usefulness. Muktibodh writes, while answering this question:

Assuredly the question of development of form is enclosed to the question of development of content; it is incidental to the whole life. Even though we visualize the question of form and content distinctly in accordance to convenience of our intellect, it is inalienable to each other. The relationality of these relations is inherent in entire life like tree roots. Actually the prob-

---

<sup>11</sup>Here micro preciosity refers to subtle detailing of psychic reality and macro expansiveness refers to global and national socio-political turmoil.

lem of form emerges only when the problem of content arises.<sup>12</sup> (118) [My translation]

The above quote explicitly demonstrates Muktibodh as a militant poet and thinker against the exchange-principle of capital. Here, by going forward from the singularity of reality, content, and form, Muktibodh demonstrates whole life in an entire singularity which indicates toward Badiou's *universal singularity* (14–15). This is a generalizability of mutual partaking of specific singularities, which negates the exchange-principle of capitalist relationality. Contemporary Marxist activist and thinker, Pothik Ghosh, calls it relationality of non-relational while referring to Badiou's another conception. (78)

Hence, the self-struggle of Muktibodh is a struggle for mutual partaking of specific singularities in content and form, while going beyond the conscious process of *internalization of external*. Here the question of how Muktibodhian creative-process synthesizes dialectical relation between micro reality of psychic action-reaction and macro reality of socio-political turmoil arises. How does the artifact come into being by this synthesis which maintains singularity of its reality in its production-process? Whether incarnation of the form of an artifact from the content of reality in this processuality is an incarnation of some dichotomy which activates the networks of exchange relations while interrupting the usefulness of reality? In other words, are the roots of this artifact located in specific singularity of reality or is the form of artifact controlled and captivated by and, hence, subsumed within hegemonic ideological reality? What does it mean when Muktibodh ponders upon the complexities of creative-process when he says that "...many people including poets forget this fact, because they don't want to carry on or else they want to run away from middle"<sup>13</sup> (215) [My translation]. Is it an escape from self-struggle of singularity for emerged form from singular reality; the struggle within self in singularity while struggling against the logic of capital (exchange-principle) and capitalist hegemony? For Muktibodh it is important that the quest of form of artifact should be free from any external intervention. But, this external intervention can enter into ongoing creative-process of an artist from the history of some earlier artifact of artist himself. The entry of this external intervention into the singular

<sup>12</sup>निश्चय ही रूप के विकास का प्रश्न तत्त्व के विकास के प्रश्न के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है। वह सारे जीवन से जुड़ा है। हम अपनी बौद्धिक सुविधा की दृष्टि से भले ही रूप और तत्त्व के प्रश्नों को अलग-अलग करके देखें, वे एक दूसरे से अविच्छिन्न हैं। इन संबंधों के सम्बन्ध-सूत्र, वृक्ष-मूलों की भांति सारे जीवन में समाये हुए हैं। सच तो यह है कि रूप की समस्या ही तब उठती है जब तत्त्व की समस्या उठती है।

<sup>13</sup>बहुतेरे लोग जिनमे कवि भी शामिल हैं, इस तथ्य को भूल जाते हैं, क्योंकि वे उस पर चलना नहीं चाहते, अथवा बीच में से ही भाग जाना चाहते हैं।

processual unfolding actually is the lapse of singularity itself and consequently the establishment of exchange-principle and relationality. In this way, the intervention of pre-determined form from already existed artifact, if it intervenes in ongoing creative-process, then the established artifact—which is distinct from artist and already a commodity in exchange networks of capital—extends itself through exchange networks in ongoing creative process through this intervention. Hence, the self-struggle of Muktibodh is a continuous quest of singularities. It is the politics of Muktibodhian poetic-praxis which negates the exchange-principle continuously for the specific singularity of reality to attain generalizability of politics—either in *internalization of external* or for the quest of form for dynamic reality. As a consequence of the lapse of singularity, Muktibodh recognizes the mechanization of poetry production and calls it ‘conditioned literary reflexes’ which can be linked to Walter Benjamin’s idea of mechanical (re)production of art, especially in its impact on literature after the emergence of printing (Benjamin 218–219). In the same line of thought, Muktibodh was aware of the fact that the generalization of publishing industry intervenes into the singularity of creative-process of poetry which results in what he calls reified aesthetic patterns<sup>14</sup> (Muktibodh 239, 105–106). Muktibodh adequately demarcates the reification of internal criticality of poet. He underlines that the poet’s subjectivity during the process of projecting the affective-constellations of his sensible life gradually develops the criticality and internal affective-editing during his creative-process. In this way, he (poet) adequately takes control over psychic form(s) of expression—imagery, rhythm, and suggestive connotation—and adjoins it with the specific affects and affective-constellations of his life. This adjoining of psychic form of expression with the specific sensible-affects gradually becomes the prominent reason of reification which Muktibodh calls ‘conditioned literary reflexes.’<sup>15</sup> This is the lapse of singularity of poetry when it comes under the dictates of exchange.

<sup>14</sup>मुक्तिबोध इसके लिए जड़ीभूत सौंदर्याभिरुचि नामक अवधारणा का प्रयोग करते हैं।

<sup>15</sup>Muktibodh profoundly reflects upon this problem. He strives to comprehend the process behind this conditioning as reification of aesthetics. He writes while subtly inquiring this problem that, “many poets don’t arrive at the cognition of these problematic and the related turning point of life. Instead of further exploration for development they keep on revolving around themselves. Subsequently, their earlier establishment of conditions mechanically and continuously expresses the old echoes. The old tentacles made by them – means old affect and their expression doesn’t let them go further. Conditioned literary reflexes mechanically produce poems. Impulse becomes mechanical and an expressionistic form becomes insentient. Poet stuck within his own cage. And then there is a time when poet ultimately died but his body remains for centenarian” (214) [My translation]. Following is the original quote in

It would be significant to look into Berardi's reflection on poetic language here. For him, "...poetry opens the door of perception to singularity. Poetry is language's excess, poetry is what in language cannot be reduced to information, and is not exchangeable, but gives to a new common ground of understanding, of shared meaning: the creation of new world" (147). As soon as poetry comes under the dictates of exchange, it becomes commodity. Benjamin contends that the most perfect reproduction of artifact lacks its temporal and spatial sense. Hence, there is a decadence of art's specific spatiality and consequently of its existence (220). In this way, Benjamin shows that the mechanical reproduction of art leads to the decay of its aura (ibid 222–223). This could be understood as the increasing democratization of art and culture whereas on the other hand this decay also underlines the subsumption of art and culture under the dictates of capital. The widespread distribution of artworks is the ideology of mechanical reproduction of art. Here distribution represses the internal technique of art while subordinating it under the dictates of market forces. In this way, the use-value of art, or in other words the aesthetic labour which organizes the internal laws of art, subsumes under the exchange-principle of capital. Adorno formulates the concept of *culture industry* for explicating the intervention of capital in art and culture as mechanical reproduction of artworks and its widespread distribution. He writes while underlining the peculiarity of *culture industry*, "what might be call use value in the reception of cultural assets is being replaced by exchange value" (128). He underlines that the universal victory of mechanical production and reproduction of art ensures that nothing will change and nothing unsuitable will emerge (106–107). In this precise sense the conception of *culture industry* signifies the intense penetration of capital in the socio-culture scenario. Interestingly, Muktibodh recognizes this intense penetration of capital in his own way in Hindi cultural landscape. He writes:

This is the age of capitalism. It is hostile to poetry. Capitalism primarily attacks poetry in the cultural landscape once it establishes itself. While wrecking the poetry from its overall emotionality, passion and zeal, capital detaches the poetry from the significant vibrations which is fostered with the great virtues of mutually conflicting diverse full life and world. This age makes

---

Hindi by Muktibodh: किन्तु, बहुतेरे कवि इन कठिनाइयों के बोध तक, जीवन के उस घुमाव तक, आ ही नहीं पाते. वे आगे के विकास के बजाय अपने ही आस-पास घूमते रहते हैं. फलतः उनके पूर्व की स्थिति स्थापना, यांत्रिक रूप से, पुरानी गूँजे प्रकट कराती रहती हैं. उनके खुद के तैयार किये गए पुराने शिकंजे – यानी पुराने भाव और उनकी अभिव्यक्ति – उन्हें आगे नहीं बढ़ने देती. कण्डीशण्ड साहित्यिक रिफ्लेक्सेज यंत्रवत् कविताएँ तैयार करवाते हैं. मनोवेग यांत्रिक हो जाते हैं, अभिव्यंजक रूप जड़ीभूत हो जाते हैं. कवि अपने बनाये कटघरे में फंस जाता है. और एक समय आता है जब कवि कतई मर जाता है, किन्तु उसका शरीर शतायु रहता है.

poetry sterile or in other words, it diminishes poetry to decaying obscurity (239).<sup>16</sup> [My translation]

It is significant to relate poetry as decaying obscurity to Benjamin's decay of aura, which is a consequence of mechanical production and reproduction of art. Here the decaying obscurity of poetry denotes the commodification of poetry that results in the increasing generalization of *culture industry*. In his poem *Meetha Ber* (sweet jujube), Muktibodh underlines the intense penetration of capital in Hindi cultural landscape. Here the sweet wild jujube tree is a symbol of aesthetic labour of creativity which critiques the exchange-principle inherent in mechanical (re)production of art. Muktibodh portrays the mechanical (re)production of *culture industry* in these imageries:

Thousands lines of flashlights  
Write your poems  
In colorful alphabets  
Reside In remotely situated clouds!!  
Thousands of flashlights  
That you have import from remotely situated countries  
That you have made to  
Enlighten your zeal  
Those are your treasure. (C: 22)<sup>17</sup> [My Translation]

For Muktibodh, this symbol of wild jujube shrub represents the creativity inherent in human-labour. Interestingly, for Berardi, the poetic sensibility is the ability to understand what cannot be verbalized (143–144), whereas Badiou recognizes the unnameable singularity of poetic sensible which shatters the dichotomy of sensibility and thought in his profound essay “Philosophy and Poetry from the Vantage Point of the Unnameable” (47–48). It is precisely the non-identity of creativity due to which Muktibodh calls it unnameable.

I would also die unnamed

---

<sup>16</sup>यह युग पूंजीवाद का युग है, कि जो पूंजीवाद कविता का दुश्मन है। पूंजीवाद एक बार सुप्रतिष्ठित हो जाने पर सांस्कृतिक क्षेत्र में सबसे पहले कविता पर हमला करता है। कविता को समस्त भावावेशों से छिन्नकर, इस विशाल परस्पर-द्वंद्वमय महान गुणों से युक्त वैविध्य-पूर्ण जीवन-जगत के सार्थक स्पंदों से बहुत दूर हटाकर, यह युग उसे (कविता को) निष्प्राण अथवा क्षीण-छाया-समान बना देता है।

<sup>17</sup>हजारों फ्लैशलाइट रेखाएँ

सुदूर मेघों पर

तुम्हारी कविताएँ लिखती हैं

रंगीन अक्षरों में !!

हजारों फ्लैशलाइटें

जो तुमने मंगायी हैं दूर स्थित देशों से

जो तुमने बनायी हैं अपने आवेश

प्रकाशन के लिए

वे निधि तुम्हारी हैं !!

Yet also  
 I would flow  
 As red blood flows in veins  
 In the body of every generation  
 One by one  
 Unnamed radiant red blood.<sup>18</sup> (ibid 22–23) [My Translation]

According to his Marxist world-view, Muktibodh considers the fundamental premise of human knowledge to be the creativity of human-doing. He knows that the artifacts amassed with the aesthetic labour of art express the fundamental power of human expression. Hence, this creativity of human-doing flows as social flow of doing. This social flow of doing as power-to has been precluded by exchange-relations of capital. This preclusion of social flow of doing and power-to have been replaced or substituted by the power-relations constituted by capital. Irish philosopher, John Holloway, would call this power-over (28). Nevertheless, this social-flow of creativity of human-doing in the form of negativity remains active as the possibility of destruction of these power-relations. This negative is the use-value of human creativity. Muktibodh adequately recognizes the use-value of creativity. It is extremely difficult to conciliate it but its taste is sweet.

The overall savour and pile of knowledge  
 As amassed in jujube's (fruit)  
 Has been becoming more strengthful  
 Becoming a vigor.  
 I do not need  
 Flashlights, clouds and sky  
 Foy my self-glorification!!  
 I do not display  
 I just spread and flow in blood!!  
 Because I am a wild jujube shrub  
 Thorny and wild  
 But sweet!!<sup>19</sup> (ibid 23) [My Translation]

---

<sup>18</sup>मैं भी मर जाऊंगा नामहीन  
 फिर भी मैं  
 पुशत-दर-पुशत  
 पीढ़ी-दर-पीढ़ी की देह में  
 शिराओं में  
 लाल-लाल खून बन बहता ही रहूँगा –  
 प्रकाशमान लाल रक्त नामहीन ।

<sup>19</sup>बसों में इकट्ठा  
 सारी ज्ञान-रस-राशि  
 लाखों की रगों में बह रही है  
 वीर्य बन रही है

For Muktibodh wild and thorny is a symbol of self-struggle. The struggle is fundamental in artist's life against the mechanical (re)production of poetry and, hence, against the reification of aesthetics. It is extremely difficult and painful at the same time. The poet is trapped within the network of relationality while escaping from the challenge of self-struggle and consequently becomes the subject of exchange-principle. But the negation of relationality and exchange is also depicted in Muktibodh's writing:

The process of conditioned literary reflexes is natural but at the same time, it's also obvious that there must be some change in poet's inner-subjectivity. Subsequently, the newly formed constellations of affects would be confronted with old reflexes. If poet courageously accelerates the self-struggle and by self-introspection makes this self-struggle significant then there is a hope that he should discover new ground.<sup>20</sup> (214) [My translation]

The discovery of new grounds by an artist implies discovery and the making of reality by the artist himself/herself. In this direction, Muktibodh rejects the intervention of capitalist hegemony which alienates an individual from his/her own labour and consequently from reality. Muktibodh negates this alienation through the specific singularities and its mutual partaking of his life-process, creative-process, and critical-process. But this negation is not easy. For this, creator has to question his self, time and again, while continually confronting himself. In this process poet also feels 'inferior.' But he/she does not discover new ground without confronting this level. This discovery is inherent to self-discovery. The continual confrontation of self while continuously questioning self is actually the processuality of self-discovery. This processuality in its dynamicity re-questions the phenomenality of the newly discovered self, and consequently ensures continuation of self-discovery. This continuation of self-discovery en-

ओजस बन गयी है !!  
मुझे निजत्व-प्रकाशन-हित  
पलेशलाइटों व मेघों व व्योम की  
जरूरत ही नहीं है !!  
स्वयं का प्रकाशन नहीं करता  
मैं तो सिर्फ फेलता हूँ बहता हूँ खून में !!  
क्योंकि मैं एक बेर का झाड़ू हूँ  
जंगली और कंटीला  
किन्तु मीठा !!

<sup>20</sup> कण्ठीशण्ड साहित्यिक रिफ्लेक्सेज बनने का नियम प्राकृतिक है. किन्तु इसके साथ यह भी स्वाभाविक है कि कवि मनुष्य के अंतर्व्यक्तित्व में परिवर्तन होता जाए. इस परिवर्तन के फलस्वरूप उत्पन्न होने वाली नयी भाव-श्रेणियां, पुराने रिफ्लेक्सों से टकराएंगी ही. यदि साहसपूर्वक कवि इस आत्मसंघर्ष को तीव्र करता गया, और आत्म-निरीक्षण द्वारा उसे और सार्थक बनाता गया, तो यह आशा की जानी चाहिए कि वह नयी भूमि की खोज करके रहेगा.



sure the self-transformation of the individual. In this sense, Muktibodh does not only discover and transform the form of his artifact from the psychic elements (content) of internalized reality but rather there is a continuation of self-transformation of Muktibodh which keeps going on in the process of transformation of living-reality into creative-reality. Muktibodh's diary and his entire critical thinking is a proof of these self-transformations whereas his creative literature, poems, and stories are infinite constellations of artistic-truths acquired from such self-transformation(s). Badiou also indicates towards the conception of truth-procedurality in reference to art. Badiou believes that there is no truth without Event and in the context of art, truth is not a work of art rather *truth is an artistic procedure which is initiated by an Event* (11–12 Emphasis Mine). It is pertinent to look into Badiou's conception of Event to investigate the relation between singularity and Event. In his magnum opus, *Being And Event*, Badiou specifically explains that singular term is something which is presented in *situation* but not represented in the *state of the situation*.<sup>21</sup> For Badiou, singular term or singularity "is an essential attribute of historical being, and especially of Evental site" (ibid 522) from where Event emerges. Event is an actuality of singularity and a lapse of relationality. Interestingly, Muktibodh also rejects hypostatized dichotomies which function according to the logic of binary oppositions. In his book *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*, Žižek explains Badiou's *Truth-Event* in these words:

In this precise sense, Event emerges *ex nihilo*: ..... it attaches itself precisely to the Void of every situation, to its inherent in-

---

<sup>21</sup>For Badiou, situation is a term which shows any presented multiplicity and in order to demonstrate presented multiplicity situation homogenizes it which Badiou would call empire of count-as-one (24). On the other hand, state of the situation refers as organization of situation which constitutes the counting of homogeneous structure and hence the re-counting of the count-as-one. In this sense, state of the situation is a meta-structure of the structure of situation. Hence, on one hand, terms of presented multiplicity belong to situation and on the other hand, state of the situation in its meta-structure includes them. Situation presents the terms of presented multiplicity whereas state of the situation represents them (102). In this way, state of the situation incorporates the essence of political nation-state which strives to homogenize the presented multiplicity in its meta-structure. For Badiou, singularity is a term which shows the inherent inconsistency between situation and state of the situation. In this sense, singular term is inconsistent multiple vis-à-vis state of the situation. Badiou writes while referring to singular term, "...a singular term is definitely a one-multiple of the situation, but it is 'indecomposable' inasmuch as what it is composed of, or at least part of the latter, is not presented anywhere in the situation in a *separate manner*.... This term exists – it is presented – but its existence is not directly verified by the state" (ibid 99).

consistency and/or its excess. The Event is the Truth of the situation that makes visible/legible what the ‘official’ situation had to ‘repress’ but it is also always localized – that is to say, the Truth is always the Truth *of* a specific situation.....An event thus involves its own series of determinations: the Event itself; its naming.....; its ultimate goal.....; its operator.....; and last but not least, its *subject*, the agent who, on behalf of the Truth-Event, intervenes in the historical multiple of the situation and discerns/ identifies in it signs-effects of the Event. *What defines the subject is his fidelity to the Event: the subject comes after the Event and persists in discerning its traces within his situation.* (130, Emphasis Mine)

It is explicit from the above quote that intervention is a pertinent point during the process of Event. It is precisely the intervention which recognizes the Event (Badiou 202) and generalizes the Eventuality of the Event. Since Event is an epistemological break within prevailing limits of situation of knowledge or in other words it reveals the fissures in prevailing epistemological framework—Event can become the ground for new knowledge, but it depends upon intervention and the generalization of Eventuality of the Event; hence, it is undecidable from the standpoint of situation. Only the subject of Event can recognize the multiplicity of situation as Event as far as he participates/intervenes in the Event. In this way, Badiouian subject is not an ideological subject since it emerges out of Event, and precisely through his fidelity to Event, the subject tries to reconstruct situation after the post-Evental subversion of hypostatized dichotomy. Once he breaks with his fidelity to an Event, subject loses his subjecthood (Feltham and Clemens 8). The task of this subject is to intervene in Event while inquiring the traces of Event. Badiou states, “The undecidability of the events belonging is a vanishing point that leaves a trace in the ontological Idea in which the intervention-being is inscribed: a trace which is precisely the unassignable or quasi-non-one character of the function of choice” (227). In his diary, Muktibodh is trying to trace the truth of the Event of his artistic endeavours reflected in his different artistic works. In Muktibodh’s literature and especially in his giant and complex poems, one can see the enfolded marks of *Truth-Event*. The uninterrupted processuality of poetic-praxis in Muktibodh indicates his exertion for discerning the traces of Event. This processuality of investigating these traces is actually an artistic-procedure which is Truth as suggested by Badiou in his book *Handbook of Inaesthetics*. These lines from Muktibodh’s poem explicitly reflect his indefatigable militant inquiry for *Truth-Event*:

Restless eagle!!!

Like him, I am an excursion-seeker  
 always thirsty  
 I will look out for a shining Lake  
 or a mirage of water  
 in whose white shimmer there is a strange  
 empty denial!!<sup>22</sup> (442–443) [Translation quoted from Ghosh,  
 137]

Therefore, on one hand Muktibodhian critical-thinking as uninterrupted processuality renders him as a militant of Truth,<sup>23</sup> Truth of the Event, for infinite discovery of philosophy of praxis. On the other hand, Michel Foucault's conception of *ascesis* ineluctably connects truth and self-transformation (Truth-as-self-transformation). Foucault used a term *ascesis* for a long labour for acquiring truth. He explicitly said that there can be no achievement of truth without self-transformation (15–16).<sup>24</sup> Muktibodh's entire life seems like a long labour of *ascesis* for acquiring artistic-truths. Here, he is continuously struggling with the long labour of *ascesis* against the well-equipped ideological reality of capitalist hegemony. Needless to say, Muktibodh envisions this long labour of *ascesis* against the literary conditioned reflexes and consequently against the reification of aesthetics. Hence, Foucault's idea gives a new reading into Muktibodh's life and self-struggle. Nonetheless, Foucault also reflects upon disciplinary power in his earlier works. He demarcates the subject formation in light of

---

<sup>22</sup>बैचैन चील !!

उस-जैसा मैं पर्यटनशील

प्यासा-प्यासा,

देखता रहूँगा एक धमकती हुई झील

या पानी का कोरा झाँसा

जिसकी सफेद चिलचिलाहटों में है अजीब

इनकार एक सूना!!

<sup>23</sup>For Badiou, "subject of a Truth" is a finite moment within the infinite process of Truth. In this precise sense, for him artistic procedure as infinite rendition of Truth is Truth-procedure whereas individual artworks and artists are subject of a particular Truth. In this way, for him subject does not have any kind of mastery vis-à-vis Event(s). In this process, he avoids the ideological interpellation of subject. "At the very most," he writes, "we can say, in an absolutely general fashion, that subject is the militant of truth" (55).

<sup>24</sup>"Spirituality postulates that the truth is never given to the subject by right. ...truth is not given to the subject by the simple act of knowledge (*connaissance*), ...for the subject to have right of access to the truth he must be changed, transformed, shifted, and become, to some extent and up to a certain point other than himself. The truth is only given to the subject at a price that brings the subject's being into play...there can be no truth without a conversion or a transformation of the subject.... This is a work of the self on the self, an elaboration of the self by the self, a progressive transformation of the self by the self for which one takes responsibility in a long labor of *ascesis* (*askesis*)" (Foucault 15–16).

these power-relations. He also notes that power or power-relations also produce resistance. It is interesting to note that Foucault underlines the possibility of Truth in his later phase. Hence, the pertinent question that persists here is—was Foucault thinking about the possible place which is not completely constituted by power-relations or was he offering the critique of power in the complex conceptions of resistance and autonomy? According to Oliver Feltham and Justin Clemens, Foucault has no answers regarding these questions. Contrary to this, in his later phase Foucault affirms the agency of few privilege subjects, who resist power with their aesthetic endeavors.<sup>25</sup> In the same direction, Badiou on the other hand offers the convincing thesis of Truth-procedurality. In the context of the question of agency, he does not start from the question of how subjects initiate an action in autonomous manner rather he shows how subject emerges through an autonomous constellations of changing situation. For Badiou, this change or subversion of situation is Event.

For Muktibodh, the emergence of form of artifact or the incarnation of artifact is actually a processual continuity. Needless to say, Muktibodh renders this processual continuity as constellation of specific singularities. The explicit proof of processual singularity of Muktibodh's art-production is his conceptual discovery—*Three Moments of Art*. It is significant to enter into Muktibodh's art's laboratory for recognizing the singularity in art-production. In the long essay of his diary named, "Teesra Kshan," Muktibodh describes this conception comprehensively. By discerning the uninterrupted singularities of creative-process, Muktibodh writes:

The first moment of art is the ardent and intense experience moment of life. The second moment is the detachment of this experience from its roots of throes and pain and embodies a form of fantasy which seems like concrete figuration before our eyes. The third and last moment is the moment of initiation of symbolization and the process of dynamicity of its completion. The uninterrupted flow during the process of symbolization is a flow of entire individuality and life. The fantasy proceeds further while transforming itself during its development. In this way, fantasy embodies new form while abandoning its original form. The fantasy which is under the endeavour of

---

<sup>25</sup>While referring to this inconsistency – regarding source of truth and resistance as autonomous from constituted power – of Foucault, Feltham, and Clemens writes, "In his later work, he deals with this problem by assigning agency to those subjects who resist power by means of an aesthetic project of self-authoring. Again, the source of such privileged agency – why do some subjects shape themselves against the grain and not others? – is not explained" (5–6).

symbolization goes much far from its original form, that it is difficult to say that this new fantasy is an image of original form of fantasy. The creation during the process of symbolization of fantasy – with which artifact respectively develops – is a third and last moment of art. (85)<sup>26</sup> [My translation]

In above mentioned quote Muktibodh explicitly shows the intimate entwinement of form and content within the dynamics of creative-process. The first moment of art gives form and shape to content. He underlines that the psychic content concurs with other contents of inner psyche and transforms as concrete figuration of fantasy before psychic-screen. This concrete figuration of fantasy represents the second moment of art. Here Muktibodh ponders upon two processes which basically relate to same dynamics but has their own specific functions. On one hand, this concrete figuration is a consequence of impersonification of personified empiric and on the other hand, this impersonification is itself a result of internal distantiation and detachment from the empiric of first moment. Whereas in the third moment, the process of initiation of symbolization of impersonified fantasy, the dialectical process between the psychic-form and words-affects results in the development of new material form of artifact which is autonomous from psychic-form. But according to Muktibodh, the primitive imprint of psychic-form resides in the artifact since in the third and final moment of impersonified art, fantasy melts down and starts flowing in this primitive stream. Muktibodh writes while positing the singularity of these three moments of art in these words:

During impersonalization of fantasy from its personified state, it embraces something new with which it becomes autonomous from its real experience. Fantasy is a daughter of experience and the daughter has her own autonomous developing individuality. *It procreates from experience, therefore free from experience...the artifact produced after symbolization or after the completion of portraying of imagery is the daughter of fantasy of second moment of artifact nor its image or imitation. There-*

<sup>26</sup>कला का पहला क्षण है जीवन का उत्कट तीव्र अनुभव क्षण। दूसरा क्षण है इस अनुभव का अपने कसकते-दुखते हुए मूलों से पृथक हो जाना, और एक ऐसी फैंटेसी का रूप धारण कर लेना, मानो वह फैंटेसी अपनी आँखों के सामने खड़ी हो। तीसरा और अंतिम क्षण है इस फैंटेसी के शब्द-बद्ध होने की प्रक्रिया का आरंभ और उसकी परिपूर्णवस्था तक की गतिमानता। शब्द-बद्ध होने की प्रक्रिया के भीतर जो प्रवाह बहता रहता है वह समस्त व्यक्तित्व और जीवन का प्रवाह है। प्रवाह में फैंटेसी अनवरत रूप से विकसित परिवर्तित होती हुई आगे बढ़ती जाती है। इस प्रकार वह फैंटेसी अपने मूल रूप को बहुत कुछ त्यागती हुई नवीन रूप धारण कर लेती है। जिस फैंटेसी को शब्द-बद्ध करने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है वह फैंटेसी अपने मूल रूप से इतनी अधिक दूर चली जाती है कि यह कहना कठिन है कि फैंटेसी का यह नया रूप अपने मूल रूप की प्रतिकृति है। फैंटेसी को शब्द-बद्ध करने की प्रक्रिया के दौरान जो-जो सृजन होता है – जिसके कारण कृति क्रमशः विकसित होती जाती है – वही कला का तीसरा और अंतिम क्षण है।

*fore, her individuality is free, bizarre and separate from original fantasy.*<sup>27</sup> (ibid, emphasis mine)

Hence, Muktibodhian self-struggle of continual processuality of uninterrupted singularities is actually a struggle to emancipate self from the dazzle of capitalist hegemony. Therefore, Muktibodh attacks fundamental logical premise of capitalist hegemony. This attack is not only related to political activeness rather it also demands self-activeness. Here Muktibodh makes the self-activeness inevitable for political activeness. This self-activeness qua militant inquiry underlines the continual processuality of self-discovery which, by continuous questioning of phenomenon self, makes self-introspection possible. Hence, this self-activeness becomes the concrete basis of/for self-transformation which is the inevitable condition and dialectical need in processual terms for individual's dedicated political-activeness which he embodies for the struggle for social-transformation. Therefore, Muktibodh explicitly demonstrates the schemas of self-transformation and social-transformation. While questioning the phenomenon self, the continual processuality of self-transformation points towards the idea which Dr. Dhar and Dr. Chakrabarti used from Lacanian Marxist 'I'. Parker's conception of '*revolutions in subjectivity*' and for making this self-transformation inevitable and dialectical need for social-transformation, Parker used another idea of '*subjects in revolutions*' (as cited by Dhar and Chakrabarti 229). The only difference is that Dr. Dhar and Dr. Chakrabarti envision or visualize '*revolutions in subjectivity*' inside the psychiatric clinic in context of psychoanalysis (ibid 227), whereas Muktibodh extends this clinic extensively and establishes it in his art-laboratory. Badiou on other hand abandons the subject<sup>28</sup> for its ideological attribute, as he explicitly said, subject-effect are statist and hence ideological (65). For him, over-determination is in truth the political place, as it belongs to subjective realm (choice, partisanship, militancy) without having any subject-effect (such effects are ideological) (ibid). This subtraction of subject-effect from subjective in political place of over-determination gives Badiou a possibility to explain the term for revolutionary militancy qua *subjectivity without a subject or object*. Badiou explains thus:

<sup>27</sup>वैयक्तिक से निर्वैयक्तिक होने के दौरान ही उस फैंटेसी ने कुछ ऐसा नवीन ग्रहण का लिया कि जिससे वह स्वयं भी वास्तविक अनुभव से स्वतंत्र बन बैठी। फैंटेसी अनुभव की कन्या है और उस कन्या का अपना स्वतंत्र विकासमान व्यक्तित्व है। वह अनुभव से प्रसूत है इसलिए वह उससे स्वतंत्र है।.....शब्द-बद्ध होने पर अथवा चित्रित होने पर जो कृति या रचना तैयार होती है, वह कृति या रचना कला के दूसरे क्षण की पुत्री है, प्रतिकृति नहीं। इसीलिए मूल फैंटेसी से उसका व्यक्तित्व स्वतंत्र, विचित्र और पृथक है। कला का यह तीसरा या अंतिम क्षण है। इन तीन क्षणों के बिना कला असंभव है। इन तीनों क्षणों की विकास-गति के अपने-अपने अलग नियम हैं।

<sup>28</sup>Here Badiou uses the subject not in the context of event.

How should 'subjectivity' without a subject or object be understood here? It is a process of homogeneous thought in the material form of militancy, one not determined through (scientific) objectivity, nor captive to the (ideological) subject-effect. At the place of overdetermination..., this process balances over into the possible, and does so in accordance with a partisanship, a prescription, that nothing guarantees, neither in the objective order of the economy nor in the statist order of the subject, but which nonetheless is capable of tracing a real trajectory in the situation. (65–66)

The *revolutions in subjectivity* are possible within the order of *subjectivity without a subject*, as it's giving a possibility of thinking against its own thought. As we have discussed in second section, in his exposition of structural violence of real abstraction, Žižek renders this abstraction as exchange-abstraction. He demarcates that it is precisely the material reality of real abstraction which alienates individual from his concrete useful labour which subsumes in the order of exchange relations of abstract labour. This is how the individual is alienated from the real of his/her reality and it is precisely the material reality of real abstraction which constitutes the chasm between interior and exterior or, in other words, between psychic and social of subject. Žižek explicates that this real abstraction is not thought rather it is *form of thought*. He writes:

Here we have one of the possible definitions of the unconscious: *the form of thought whose ontological status is not that of thought*, that is to say, the form of thought external to the thought itself – in short, some Other Scene external to the thought whereby the form of the thought is already articulated in advance. The symbolic order is precisely such a formal order which supplements and/or disrupts the dual relationship of 'external' factual reality and 'internal' subjective experience. (10)

If *form of thought* is already present which is before and external to thought itself, then it's ineluctable that this thought is determined by *form of thought*. Hence, thinking against its own thought is actually struggle against *form of thought* and consequently against real abstraction qua rule of capital which alienates psychic from its social milieu. The process of thinking, in thinking against its own thought, is actually its action. Hence, this action embodies its own thought which is *action as its own thought*. Badiou's homogeneous thought in *subjectivity without a subject* is precisely this, which is struggle against fundamental logical premise of rule of capital. Hence, *subjectivity without a sub-*

*ject* is actualization of *revolutions in subjectivity*. This *subjectivity without a subject* and its actualization as *revolutions in subjectivity* gives tremendous peculiarity to Muktibodh's literature and thought. This is the greatness of his literature which never allows it to become old. Therefore, new time and new era discovers, makes, and presents a new Muktibodh in new circumstances and conditions. Hence, Muktibodh's *Ek Sahityik Kee Diary* is a creative document of this self-struggle (*subjectivity without a subject*) and self-introspection (*revolutions in subjectivity*).

### Conclusion

In this way, Muktibodh, while shattering the dichotomy and binary of interiority and exteriority ensures the comprehension of social and psychic in their continual interaction renders his understanding about hegemony as specific and detailed and subtle and it expresses through the network of power-relations which are explicit through his creative literature and critical thinking. Hence, Muktibodhian praxis negates the exchange-principle inherent in ideological reality of hegemony. Consequently, *poetry in politics* is precisely the critic of instrumentalist appropriation of poetry in dominating 'political' fronts which is continuation and extension of Muktibodhian critic of traditional progressive literature.<sup>29</sup> Within these grounds of poetry as a political struggle, poetry manifests itself in fantasy supported with reality. As we have seen, fantasy is an inevitable part of Muktibodhian singular creative-process as *Three Moments of Art*. This singularity ensures the Truth-Event and consequently the Truth for Muktibodhian artistic-procedure. Hence, these *Three Moments of Art* render Muktibodh's *fidelity* to the Event which make Muktibodh militant of Truth—Truth of the Event.



---

<sup>29</sup>Muktibodh writes while critiquing traditional progressive literature, "...progressive criticism and literature hugely emphasis only on socio-political struggle of individual. There is very little emphasis or no emphasis on others facets comparatively. Consequently, the representational image of human which presents in front of reader was unilateral; there were no manifestation of overall progressive perspective of human sovereignty in that." (Muktibodh 357). Following is the original quote in Hindi by Muktibodh: प्रगतिवादी समीक्षा और साहित्य ने मनुष्य के मात्र सामाजिक-राजनीतिक संघर्ष पर ही खूब जोर दिया. इसके शेष पक्षों पर, तुलनात्मक दृष्टि से, बहुत कम बल रहा, या नहीं ही रहा. परिणामतः पाठक के सामने मनुष्य का जो चित्र प्रस्तुत हुआ, वह एक-पक्षीय ही था, उसमें मानव-सत्ता की सर्वांगीण प्रगतिशील दृष्टि का प्रगटीकरण नहीं था.



## Work Cited

- Adorno, Theodor. W. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr. Translated by Edmund Jephcott, Stanford University Press, 2002, pp. 94–136.
- . *Negative Dialectics*. Trans. E. B. Ashton. Routledge, 2004.
- Althusser, L. *Ideology & Ideological State Apparatuses*. Trans. Ben Brewster. Critical Quest, 2012.
- Apoorvanand. "Vyakul Vyom Ka Kshitij." *Aalochna Sehsrabadi Ank*, Edition no. 55, July-December 2015, pp. 5–14.
- Badiou, Alain. *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism*. Trans. Ray Brassier, Stanford University Press, 2003.
- . *Infinite Thought: Truth and the Return to Philosophy*. Trans. and edited by Oliver Feltham and Justin Clemens, Continuum, 2004.
- . *Handbook of Inaesthetics*, Trans. by Alberto Toscano, Stanford University Press, 2005.
- . *Being and Event*. Trans, Oliver Feltham, Continuum, 2005.
- . "Althusser: Subjectivity without a Subject." *Metapolitics*, Trans. Jason Barker. Verso, 2005.
- . "Rhapsody for the Theatre: A Short Philosophical Treatise." *Rhapsody for the Theatre*, Trans. and edited by Bruno Bosteels, 2013.
- . "Philosophy and Poetry from the Vantage Point of the Unnameable." *The Age of the Poets*. Trans. and edited by Bruno Bosteels, Verso, 2014.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*, Schocken Books, 1985, pp. 217–252.
- . "The Author as Producer." *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Berardi, Franco. "Bifo." "Poetry and finance." *The Uprising: On Poetry and Finance*, Aakar Books, 2017.
- Chakrabarti, Anjan. and Anup, Dhar. "The Althusser–Lacan Correspondence as Ground for Psycho-social Studies." *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2014, pp. 220–233.

- Chakrabarti, Anjan, et al. "Capitalism: The Delusive Appearance of Things." *The Indian Economy in Transition: Globalization, Capitalism and Development*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Feltham, Oliver and Justin. Clemens. "An introduction to Alain Badiou's Philosophy." *Infinite Thought: Truth and the return to Philosophy*. Continuum, 2004.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the College de France 1981–1982*, Trans. by G. Burchell, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Ghosh, Pothik. "Literature in Use: The Mukribodh Alibi." *The Deeds of Words: Two Considerations on Politics of Literature*. Aakar Books, 2016.
- Holloway, John. "Beyond Power?" *Change the World Without Taking Power*. Pluto Press, 2005.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 1*, edited by Frederick Engels. Trans. by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, Progress Publishers, 1986.
- . *The German Ideology*. International Publishers, 1986.
- Muktibodh, Gajanan. Madhav. *Muktibodh Rachnawali: 5*. Edited by Naimichandar Jain, Rajkamal Prakashan, 2011.
- . *Muktibodh Rachnawali: 4*. Edited by Naimichandar Jain. Rajkamal Prakashan, 2011.
- . *Muktibodh Rachnawali: 2*. Ed. Naimichandar Jain, Rajkamal Prakashan, 2011.
- . "In The Dark." *Hindi: Language, Discourse, Writing*, vol. 2, issue 1. Edited by Rustam Singh. Trans. by Krishna Baldev Vaid. April-June 2011. pp. 51–90.
- . "Gajanan Madhav Muktibodh." *Signatures: One Hundred Indian Poets*. Edited by K. Satchidanandan, National Book Trust, 2017.
- Nawal, Nand.Kishor. *Niraala Aur Muktibodh: Char Lambi Kavitaen*. Radhakrishan Prakasahn, 1983.
- Pavon-Cuellar, D. "Marx in Lacan: Proletarian truth in opposition to capitalist psychology." *Annual Review of Critical Psychology* vol. 9, 2010, pp. 70–77.

Sharma, Ramvilas. "Muktibodh Ka Aatmsangharsh aur Unki Kavita." *Nayi Kavita Aur Astititvwad*. Rajkamal Prakashan, 2010.

Žižek, Slavoj. "The Politics of Truth, or Alain Badiou as a Reader of St Paul." *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. A.B.S Publishers, 2007.

---. "How Did Marx Invent the Symptom." *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. Navayana, 2013.