



## The Metaphysics of Everydayness and Beyond: Henri Lefebvre – A Critical Reconstruction

Ruhul Amin Mandal

Assistant Professor and Head, Department of English, Sitananda College, Vidyasagar University;  
Visiting Professor, Mahatma Gandhi University; West Bengal, India  
[ramandal042753@gmail.com](mailto:ramandal042753@gmail.com)

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i2.2533>

APA Citation: Mandal, R. A. (2026). The Metaphysics of Everydayness and Beyond: Henri Lefebvre – A Critical Reconstruction. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 8(2).144-159.  
<http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i2.2533>

### Received:

11/01/2026

### Accepted:

28/02/2026

### Keywords:

Metaphysics,  
Locus,  
Everydayness,  
Consumerism,  
Banality

### Abstract

The Study investigates the 'locus' of the elusive and allusive concept of everyday and everydayness and its 'telos' in the fields of metaphysics, cultural study, phenomenology, Marxist socialism, sociology, consumerism and a number of other post structuralism thoughts, by focusing light on marginality and banality of its own state as well as the division of power and distribution of wealth in a particular socio-cultural, political construct in a specified era. The study also explores the conflicting notion of everydayness and questions the truth and validity of its being banal and marginal. The study adopts a qualitative approach, highlighting the fundamental concept of everydayness by drawing on major critical writings in this field, from St. Augustine through Heidegger, Lenin, Althusser, Blanchot, and others to Lefebvre. An analytical study reveals several major issues involving the theory of everydayness, including its elusive nature; conflicting and contradictory 'locus'; Marxist, sociological orientation that paradoxically negates Marxism itself; consumerism, involving the state and its diverse machineries, and the mercantile class's direct involvement in it to facilitate the capitalist class as well as people in power and authority. The study also lays bare the innumerable critical and theoretical threads closely linked to the nature and identity of everydayness, as explicated by Lefebvre, from a philosophical viewpoint. The paper contributes to the field of knowledge through its exploration of the idea and identity of 'everydayness', which introduces a new concept, although it is linked to Marxist and sociological views. The study also unveils avenues for new prospects and ways to fulfill hope, providing this everyday platform with a place of dignity, honour, and adequacy based on equality and justice. At the same time, it highlights the lacuna and shortcomings, the possible improbability of the dreams of equality and optimism in the coming days, as expected by Lefebvre. The study also contributes to basic knowledge through a keen recognition of the metaphysics of everydayness, depicting the inherent dialectical clashes of oppositions, as well as an evasive and ever-shifting paradigm of 'transactions' between everydayness and non-everydayness within the ideological and socio-cultural construct of a society and state in a particular time frame.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The idea of Everydayness has been gaining gradual theoretical base to the critical discourse that ushered in the second half of the twentieth century. The concept of everyday and everydayness has never achieved the status of mainstream critical theory with its illuminating philosophical debates, discussions, analyses, innovations, etc., until Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991), the French philosopher and thinker breaks the myth of its stupendous importance in the

multifarious domains of metaphysics, Marxist socialism, sociology, cultural study and phenomenology. 'Everydayness' connotes the commoners' day passing without questions; without demands for fulfilling any dreams, desires and aspirations; without grievances and demands for justice and right. It denotes a life of submissive acceptance of a system imposed upon the masses by a mechanism dominated and controlled by the people in power, wealth and authority. In this regard, he not only tried to explore its identity, nature and sphere but also to interpret its 'locus' as well as 'telos'. By 'locus' Lefebvre refers to a place and space where social relations, interactions, habits, routines and lived experiences intersect. It's more of a site created than situated by the power structure where everyday life unfolds and is accepted without any question. Similarly, 'telos' refers to the fundamental aims or objectives, underlying every social or ideological constructs embedded with the hierarchy of power structure. This purpose- driven nature of space and social interactions determine the outcome or ultimate end, often resulting in dominance of power and capital in social, political, cultural and even theoretical hierarchy.

The idea of everyday/everydayness is complex, elusive, and 'escaping'. Its nature may be interpreted through 'Derrida's idea of 'self-effacing' formula leading to indefinite, infinite and indeterminate as well as unnumbered, undiscovered probable meanings/ nuances of meaning of an utterance or a 'parole' in linguistic parlance. The study aims at exploring the true identity and nature of everyday, its role and significance to the current critical perspective of thoughts as well as its context of marginal, banal or insignificant trait, commonly attached with it by its own makers or inventors, of course, for no noble purpose but to consolidate the hierarchical structures of wealth and power. Or it may also be denominated as a pattern or matrix or a site where the eternal and spatial play of the paradoxes, of flux and fixity continue to take place. The reading undertakes to find out the evasive, constantly changing panorama of everyday in respect of time, place, position, gender, culture, socio-political context, scientific, economic diversity. The article also lays bare the functional machineries and their motive or mission in the structural framework which is built by the topmost hierarchy to make everyday a platform of their own programmes, to attain maximum interest thereof.

## **2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study employs a qualitative research approach, to examine and analyses the theory of everydayness, focusing on the fundamental concepts and analyzing the elusive nature of the idea of everydayness through critical interpretation of the major texts in the field. Critical

views, conceptions and diverse perspectives of the thinkers who contributed in the area are polemically placed for bringing out an intelligible and distinctly recognizable shape of the theory of everydayness.

### **2.1. The Idea of Everyday: Consumerism, Banality and Evasiveness**

Contrary to the bullshit idea of banality of everydayness, the study argues for the slogan ‘banal is history’. The platform of everyday is formed by nature and framed by non-everyday human establishment. Natural process is cyclical and undifferentiated as day-night, life-death, summer-winter, darkness-light, sowing-reaping, etc.; man-made process is linear, differentiated, programmed beforehand, applied arbitrarily by a set of rules or persuasive habits and these mechanical set of formulas give shape and life to it. That is the reason Lefebvre announces, “The everyday” is “a product” (Lefebvre, 1987, p.9).

In critical discussion of history, sociology, anthropology or politics the banality of everydayness is indicated by means of indifference, neglect or snobbery from the part of the intellectuals who observe, analyses, interpret and record it. As everydayness is associated with the common, ordinary masses belonging to the subjugated, dominated section of the society, the term ‘banal’ is stitched with everydayness as a term of disregard and dereliction by the so-called intellectual elite. But history is what everyday life records through centuries. This speaks of life and civilization. Power and authority may programme beforehand to frame and impose the regulatory mechanism but they cannot write the ultimate history, the history of everydayness. Now the question comes whose everydayness is spoken of and of what time and of what place? May the idea be of post-war era that has been originated and developed by Lefebvre and de Certeau but the context had always been in past ranging from prehistoric time to premodern era. But that everydayness was not everydayness in the sense of which the term has been applied now. Before the modern era the life of people was diversified by their distinctive originality of form and action. It was ever creative and ramified by means of individuality and its openness to ‘totality’. In past too, society and civilization were mainly regulated by means of power and wealth which ever remain hand in glove with each other. But this controlling was done only by the power of the top of hierarchy and not by the set of rules that regulate contemporary society. In past too, everydayness was that of poor, powerless and the commoners. But the monotony and boredom were not the constituent elements as life was diversified. But the emergence of modernity has brought about a blind, menacing, mechanical force (scientific, technological or industrial) that destroys the diversity and beauty of uniqueness. This diversity of human entity is varied according to culture, class, age, sex, natural resources, climate, profession, etc. Everydayness is allotted for a given society at a particular

period of time where women, unemployed youth, deprived and marginal people are the subject. They are the mechanical players who play their role on the everyday site prompted and persuaded by the capitalist mode of consumerism where the wealthy producer determinates the quotidian life of this masses by means of their productions- industrial, intellectual, scientific or artistic. The diverse systems and subsystems operate in different level to make sure the continuity of everydayness. The system of marketization of products operates by means of advertisement and creating artificial needs; using different mediums of media and narcotizing people's sense and sensibility through the presentation of unreal, fantastic or magical. Movies, radios, televisions, print media, commercial magazines continually propagate and uphold false and untruth to serve the purpose of their capital gaining. Gradually people become silent, indifferent and as a result alienated. Another monstrous force which helps in this process of boredom and monotonousness of everydayness by providing support, legal as well as moral to the capitalist policy of consumerism is the state and its machineries. The idea gets strength and support from the Marxist theorist and politician Vladimir Lenin too. Throughout history, as Lenin says, the state has been "an instrument for the exploitation of the oppressed class." Usually the state is controlled by "the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class. The ancient and feudal states were organs for the exploitation of the slaves and serfs; likewise, the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage-labor by capital." (The State and Revolution, 1917, Chapter – I – Vladimir Lenin). Here State is under critical scrutiny as its diverse machineries continue to act as agents of the capitalist class as well as bureaucrats and politicians who too are strong stake holders in this game of wealth and power. The means of production; the material of production and the output of production and the process of marketization is a long and complex one where a few like the industrialists, merchants and big investors suck and sip the most of the profits of investment, whereas the bureaucrats, administrators and law makers get benefits for supporting and promoting the whole process of marketing the products. The beneficiaries decide the color, texture, pattern, price and design of a product. This will be promoted through a complex and clever process of marketization by advertisement through different mediums of media and government machineries. This is a process of compulsion for the consumers to consume products as envisaged by the production beneficiaries. Where does the marginal and the banal belong then? They belong to nowhere as the state replaces them to non-existent entity. They perform; they produce; they create and recreate. Yet they are none because they get no benefits from the process of production, marketization and consumerism. Banality, therefore, is history that speaks of people who are

makers of civilization; formed and framed by ideals or ideas; consolidated and naturalized by diverse systems, agents, groups, parties, organizations; execute or implement the process of making everydayness. Products and resources of modernity, systems, subsystems, style and standards of living- mostly material, are used to cover up the underlying falsity, brutality and monstrosity of capitalist framework of representative democracy. The mechanism is brutal and oppressive undoubtedly but advocates of its implementations involving with varied interests are not without shame. That's why they maneuverer to cover up the strategy and execution of the whole operation that manifests into creation of everydayness in post-industrial scenario.

But the entity and the idea that manifest themselves as philosophy of everydayness is not a static one. Neither it is decisive and definite. The entity and the idea on which it floats do not have a permanent identity; rather the parts of the whole of everydayness often change place and position, very often gaining the place of power of productive means. This leads to a complex notion for forming a fixed paradigm of everydayness. The transgression continues. At the same time, mass of everyday identity is becoming vaster, larger and ever-expanding as days go by. To describe the evasive and elusive nature of everyday, Blanchot proclaims,

“The everyday escapes. Why does it escape? Because it is without a subject. When I live the everyday, it is anyone, anyone whatsoever, who does so, and this any-one is, properly speaking neither me, nor, properly speaking, the other; he is neither the one nor the other, and he is the one and the other in their interchangeable presence, in their annulled reciprocity- yet without there being an “I” and an “alter ego” able to give rise to dialectical recognition. At the same time the everyday does not belong to the objective realm” (Blanchot,1987, pp.12-13).

The objective world, in its totality of material objects like a laptop, refrigerator, sofa set, utensils, water bottle, etc, is utterly inadequate because it is beyond the boundary of definiteness and indeterminate in nature which very often effaces the self and replaces the former by its new entity; in this sense, everydayness is elusive and ever escaping in nature. The interplay of fixity and flux thus inevitably leads to escape or elusiveness. Storey opines that, “Everydayness is per se an incredibly slippery notion. It is at the same time the most obvious and the most elusive of ideas” (Storey, 2014, pp. 2-3). Felski observes everyday life as “the essential, taken-for-granted continuum of mundane activities that frames our forays into more esoteric or exotic worlds. It is the ultimate non-negotiable reality, the unavoidable basis for all other forms of human endeavour.” (Felski, 2000, p. 77). Perhaps, everydayness can be best understood by Lefebvre's own explication of the centralities of the idea,

“Everyday life, in a sense residual, defined by “what is left over” after all distinct, superior, specialized, structured activities have been singled out by analysis, must be defined as a totality. . . . Everyday life is profoundly related to all activities, and encompasses them with all their differences and their conflicts; it is their meeting place, their bond, their common ground. And it is in everyday life that the sum total of relations which make the human—and every human being—a whole takes its shape and its form. In it are expressed and fulfilled those relations which bring into play the totality of the real, albeit in a certain manner which is always partial and incomplete: friendship, comradeship, love, the need to communicate, play, etc. . . . the critique of everyday life studies human nature in its concreteness (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 97).

### **3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The study shows that the theory of everydayness is a an elusive and multifaceted concept central to the understanding of the existence of human beings in a constantly changing socio-cultural contexts. It reveals the divisive operative system in state and society that creates everydayness for grabbing power, wealth and authority through diverse mechanisms in innumerable facets of life and society.

#### **3.1. Everydayness: Residue, Alienation and Optimism**

Everydayness as a whole, in its totality is a constantly moving entity. It exists and fundamentally never shifts its locus. Sociological, historical, political, philosophical discussion and analyses may offer its status and locus in the socio-cultural milieu. Whether it progressed to developed stage or degenerated to a lost cause in relation to time, place, state, society, sex, age, etc, that may be a question. But there is no doubt about its existence as a potential platform or concept. Some of the total individual entities with which the totality is made up are constantly shifting to and merging with the non-everydayness but the residual part as a nucleus of everyday permanently remains there and remains unchangeable as operative force. Everydayness remains ontologically, philosophically, theoretically as well as physically belonging to that long- neglected part of humanity which never came to the attention of the mainstream thoughts of theoretical elitism, from the ancient days to the premodern era of our civilization. Lefebvre draws heavily from the Marxist thought to unfold his observations of everydayness although he departs radically from it to establish his own ideas/ideals of everydayness. Quotidian life is mostly indifferent, unorganised, disinterested and reticent. Lefebvre points to “a problem which is fundamental for the critique of everyday life. . . . Many men . . . do not know their own lives very well. . . . Men have no knowledge of their own lives:

they see them and act them out via ideological themes and ethical values” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 92). The mechanism of power controls the platform of everydayness by different intellectual, technological, scientific means using diverse systems and subsystems offered to them by the state and its different machineries to protect their mutual interest. He writes in *Critique of Everyday Life* that “the critique of everyday life involves a critique of political life, in that everyday life already contains and constitutes such a critique: in that it is that critique” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 94). The privileged class and the innumerable interest groups come together on a common platform to implement their agenda. They envisage strategic conspiracy to cover up the potentialities, varieties, individualities and any probable emergence of unified movement against the power groups. In order for fulfilling this purpose all varieties and creativities are levelled down. They bring about everydayness to a matrix of unitarity. In everyday life people begins to depend upon some set of rules, some distinctive types of foods and fashions. Not only this quotidian life is totally controlled by the consumerism, its demand and supply. The mechanism determines which household instruments or objects are to be used at home, which food and drinks are to be consumed, which fashions and styles are to be adopt. Different means of communications, like diverse forms of media and advertisement are tactfully used as tool to reach their goal. The effect of advertisement and media works upon everydayness like anodyne or drugs. The power mechanism presents unreal as real via ideological formation to protect their identity and interest. Lefebvre writes in the 1958 foreword to the second edition of *Critique of Everyday Life: Volume 1*:

“We are now entering the vast domain of the illusory reverse image. What we find is a false world: firstly, because it is not a world, and because it presents itself as true, and because it mimics real life closely in order to replace the real by its opposite; by replacing real unhappiness by fictions of happiness, for example— by offering a fiction in response to the real need for happiness—and so on. This is the “world” of most films, most of the press, the theatre, the music hall: of a large sector of leisure activities. How strange the split between the real world and its reverse image is. For in the end it is not strange at all, but a false strangeness, a cheap-and-nasty, all-pervasive mystery” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 35).

Power groups anaesthetise the sense and sensibility, moral judgement and free thoughts of the majority of people. This people, interestingly enough, are under complete control of that unseen power groups that solely design almost all the aspects of everyday life. Foods, fashions, garments, cosmetics, ‘essential commodities’ of everyday family life, like soap, shampoo, hair colour, tooth paste, tooth brush, shaving creams even the toilet cleaning materials are under the

direct control of the market. From hair pin to safety pin – every commodity of the commoners is pre-fixed by the market as compulsory products which they must have to use. The markets lure consumers by artificially creating their needs by means of advertisements, media ( both print and electronic) and many other agencies and platforms who are in nexus with the power groups to rob the hard earnings of the poor workers and labourers. The beneficiaries supply the chain of products, which may be a bi-cycle, a frying pan or anything that the market pushes in the family households as products they must use. Real concerns of everydayness are buried deep by means of cheap and unreal presentations of life through films and television and even literature meant for selling as product. They are either narcotised to sleep and dream a dream of an unreal and fantastic which will never come as reality and make them ever paralysed, psychologically as well as ideologically. Markets also brain wash continually by providing false and fabricated news and information to make them believe the untruth as truth. This is how the common people forget their own real existence. They forget the price of their labour, they forget to demand their right, they forget their liberty to reject or receive and even which is worse than anything else, they are made to cease think freely and reasonably by that unseen power which consciously and cleverly designs this plan to make everydayness a slave of their own cunning desire of making more and more power and profit.

In the *Critique* Lefebvre's prime concern is to redefine the locus of everyday as "other" that always remains outside the big political and economic establishment. This other is always intrinsically connected to the mechanism of power only to boost their power but at the same time remains disconnected to and separated from this marginalized, alienated and neglected entity. The paradox continues to play its double role to deny the adequate freedom and resources of life. In the *Critique* Lefebvre developed his idea by taking refuge to the binary oppositions of reason-based philosophy of Descartes, Kant, Hegel and the existential philosophy of Martin Heidegger, Jean Paul Sartre as well as Edmund Husserl's theory of Phenomenology. To fortify his argumentation against the rationalist metaphysics which dominated western philosophical worldview for centuries, Lefebvre inclined to the revolutionary idea of "lived experience" which strongly operates in Husserl's *Phenomenology and the Crisis of European Sciences*, Heidegger's *Being and Time* and Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*. To subvert the reason-based idea he also used Heidegger's idea of 'alienation'. These observations in reality opened the flood-gates of much of the critical theory and thoughts that started to develop from the sixties and seventies of the last century, including poststructuralism, cultural studies, existentialism and even the theory of 'Deconstruction' developed by Jacques Derrida. Not only this, the 'New Historicist' approach too, to some extent

is indebted to these early critiques which hit on the reason centred European philosophy. In literature this phenomenon is distinctly visible in many of its genre, especially in the ‘Absurd literature’, particularly, drama and the dominance and popularity of ‘magic realism’ in novel, short story, and other forms of literature, including poetry.

When Lefebvre accepts everyday as ‘lived experience’, as ‘concrete’ and ‘alienation’, he accepts and avows Heidegger’s idea of everyday existence. But Lefebvre precisely gives a clear notion of ‘alienation’ and its locus in relation to everyday existence. This idea has very much in common the new historicist notion of the society as a cultural/ideological construct which in reality is a formation by the power structures of the socio-economic, political-intellectual as well bureaucratic hierarchy. The alienated becomes oblivious, disinterested of their self and surrounding. They become engrossed in and obsessed with the imposed thoughts, ideas, languages as well as the material usages of objective reality which are none of their own. The alienated forgets to think, forgets create and forgets to live even. They are shaped and framed to act or react, create or recreate, think or imagine, eat or drink, walk or sleep and even dream as they are intended to by the cultural construct. Where is the freedom then? Where is the life then? The freedom is stolen and the life becomes disorganised, shapeless, chaotic, purposeless. Banal, in this sense becomes boring. Thus, power programmes, operate and achieve its goal.

In spite of the bleak state of affairs for everydayness, it offers hope and optimism. Herein lies the only solace that it’s the only place where upheavals take place; where the sleeping wakes up after century’s slumber; where the lost rises up and the dead walks to meet justice. That’s the reason why we believe the role of hope in everydayness. At the same time Lefebvre does not forget to mention its shortcomings arising out of its internal conflicts and the strange sort of silence to that it is positioned by the power structure or the ideological formations or cultural constructs of a given society in a particular era. Lefebvre observes this “passivity,” rather “organized passivity” in “work, family, private life, leisure.” Lefebvre thinks that this passivity manifests itself most strongly in the area of consumption where “the needs of the consumer (are) created by advertising and market studies” (Lefebvre, 1987, p. 10). He further complains that in *Everyday Life in the Modern World*

“... consumption has become a mystified embrace of symbols: Consuming of displays, displays of consuming. Consuming of displays of consuming, consuming of signs and signs of consuming; each sub-system, as it tries to close the circuit, gives another self-destructive twist, at the level of everyday life. . . . Thus, every object and

product acquire a dual existence, perceptible and make-believe; all that can be consumed becomes a symbol of consumption and the consumer is fed on symbols, symbols of dexterity and wealth, of happiness and of love; sign and significance replace reality, there is a vast substitution, a massive transfer, that is nothing but an illusion created by the swivel's giddy twists" (Lefebvre, 1971, P. 108).

The idea has very much in common with the idea of revisionist Marxist philosopher Luis Althusser who thinks that ideology manifests itself in the discourse of diverse institutions of an era and it functions to position its readers as "subjects" which in reality subjects or subordinates them to the interest of the existing and continuing state machineries and the capitalist class who run the huge machine of the state. Of course, Althusser is more prone to Lacan module of ideology when he points out, "*all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects*" (Althusser, 2001, p. 115). Althusser thinks that ideology functions in "*constituting concrete individuals as subjects*" (Althusser, 2001, p.116). According to him, "individuals are always-already subjects" (Althusser, 2001, p.119) even before our birth. Althusser develops this idea drawing references from Lacan's "Name of the Father". He continues, "it is certain in advance that it will bear its Father's Name, and will therefore have an identity and be irreplaceable. Before its birth, the child is therefore always-already a subject, appointed as a subject in and by the specific familial ideological configuration in which it is 'expected' once it has been conceived" (Althusser, 2001, p.119). His purpose is to emphasise on the basis of ideological formation where everyday functions mechanically according to the prescribed rules of the power structures of socio-economic hierarchy. Lefebvre draws much from this idea of Althusser, though he further develops his idea.

### **3.2. Contemporary literature, literary theory and Lefebvrian idea of everyday**

Henri Lefebvre's theory of everydayness has had a pervasive influence on contemporary English literature and literary theory. Special mention may be made of fictional literature where the shadow of Lefebvrian world-view is vividly reflected. There are some major English novels of late 20<sup>th</sup> century and early 21<sup>st</sup> century by such novelists as Peter Ackroyd, Ian Sinclair, Rachel Cusk and Don DeLillo where space, urban stereotype, spatial politics and capitalist consumerism become a strong and fortified site of narrative representation. Of course, intersection of time is a strong idea that dominates novels of all the novelists mentioned above. Ian Sinclair's *London Orbital: A Walk Around the M 25* (2002) strongly reflects almost all the Lefebvrian ideas of everydayness. The text transforms the mundane, peripheral, stereotype, almost neglected and banal space of London orbital motor way into a space of lived experiences

### **The Metaphysics Of Everydayness And Beyond: Henri Lefebvre – A Critical Reconstruction**

where socio-cultural construct is formulated, for a thorough investigation. It also closely follows Lefebvre's theory of unfolding everyday life in the present. The author emphasizes more on the process, the walk, and the way, rather than destination. Sinclair also consciously presents the capitalist urban structure where the play of everydayness is enacted. Similarly in Peter Ackroyd's *Hawksmoor*, London becomes a multi-layered historical site where past and present are very often blurred, showing Lefebvre's idea of a sedimented history. Detective Hawksmoor is the central character of the novel who is a victim of everydayness, the milieu, the repetitive, monotonous social construct who mechanically continues his work of investigation. The novel is also a critique of *linear time* that contrasted with *cyclical, natural time* of Lefebvre, by juxtaposing 18<sup>th</sup> century enlightenment and the history of 1980s. Rachel Cusk's *Outline Trilogy* (Outline, Transit, Kudos), published in 2014 by Faber and Faber, is the most powerful expression of Lefebvre's theory of everydayness. The narrator of the trilogy is Faye whose identity is outlined only by the characters she met, otherwise her identity is almost effaced. The text also reflects Lefebvre's spatial transience by its numerous settings in such places as hotels, rentals, air spaces. The narrator and other individuals in the novels are all alienated individuals whose spaces are hollow spaces filled by outsiders. Apart from fictional literature, Lefebvre has a profound impact on Literary theory and Criticism, especially in the area of spatial theory, urban spaces, Marxist socialism and cultural materialism. Lefebvre is a pioneering figure to initiate the 'spatial turn' to the urban stories and cultural studies. His works influence such great theorists like Fredric Jameson, Doreen Massey, Raymond Williams, Edward Soja, Michel de Certeau and many others. His works continue to influence critics, novelists and theorists who continue to work more and more on spatial fragmentation, space, urbanity, lived experiences, capitalist consumerism, temporality and intersection of time.

### **3.3.Emanation, Transaction, Fixity and Flux**

The metaphysical notion of 'totality' of 'human correctness' of alienated mass and their everydayness comes under critical questions because of the dialectical and paradoxical forces that constantly and perpetually operate which dissipate and destabilize the notion of 'totality' itself. Lefebvre points to this critical aspect while assessing the 'transactional' nature of everyday. This idea of transaction is central to the deconstructive theory of Derrida. While everyday entity remains everywhere in a given society of a particular period of time, it's individual entity constantly exchanges. The flux paradoxically breaks the fixity of 'totality' of 'human correctness' of everydayness. On the other hand, everydayness is not a fix formula containing permanent and unchanging traits or values. The flux and the transactions of individual agents continue throughout and 'escapes' itself constantly. But this is not a 'self-

effacing' formula as denoted by Derrida in the description of meaning of an utterance/ 'parole'/ 'performance' in linguistic parlance. Lefebvre's totality of human correctness, on the other hand, gains and explodes and disintegrate. Its inherent forces as well as the imposed forces of non-everydayness operate through the agents of state and capitalist class of wealth and power. By 'human correctness' Lefebvre indicates the notion of 'friendship, comradeship, love, the need to communicate, play, etc..' which too comes under critical questions. This idea of 'human correctness', characterized by some human attributes as pointed out by Lefebvre, too, comes under critical scrutiny as the human traits of love, hope, communication, fellow-feeling are constantly changing traits as human nature and character are ever changeable and can't be confined as permanent traits of individual at any stage of its locus and milieu. Moreover, the human agents either of everyday or its reverse are never 'correct'. This idea is value-based which is different in different cultures and society and also these values are not universal and timeless. It changes with the change of time, locus and milieu. Therefore, it's a relative concept based on the ideological formation that forms it as it is to be believed. Apart from this, those traits are not exclusively a property of everyday but abundantly found in non-everydayness.

Even in everydayness there remains innumerable and indefinite layers where human agents involve in clashes and conflicts to promote or upgrade themselves. These layers are formed of diverse components which too are relatively different in nature in regard to its locus. For example, a farm labourer or a factory worker with identical position of rank and file in India and in Japan may belong to everyday in relation to their nature of work but their locus is different as the economic, social, cultural and political conditions are different. Both are same, yet different. Even in a particular society of a given time, there remains multiple differences among individual agents of everyday. The differences are generated by various internal as well as external forces that continually operate to give shape and form of an individual identity' that identity too is not static, rather it is evanescent and ever-changing in nature. Thus, there remains layers and categories in everydayness. At the same time, the individual agents too are made of multiple contradictions and paradoxes which continually war and destabilize the very notion of everydayness as an entity. These internal forces too render innumerable. Intellectual, socio-economic, cultural, familial, religious, linguistic, political and many more. They are one yet different. When an individual agent becomes capable of promoting, he emanates from the whole and becomes a part of non-everyday entity. Similarly, when someone from non-everydayness, falls and loses power and position, he gradually begins to merge with everydayness. But this process is quite strange because human beings, by nature, are prone to power and authority and never accepts his identity after fall. They belong to yet they are not

likely to accept their place in the everydayness. In both cases, individual agents continue to escape or emanate. The external forces are many and they are neither visible nor identifiable. They operate mainly as agents of state machineries and capitalist class. They are political and bureaucratic agents, different power lobbies like the media, judiciary, administrative bodies and a plethora of beneficiaries who belong to non-everydayness, function continually to destabilize and dissipate the integrated notion of everydayness which in reality never remains an integrated whole as identity. These external forces are very strong and they never stop or recede. Therefore, there always remains an invisible war between everydayness and its reverse which never compromise. The objectives of the external forces are very clear and transparent. These forces, being agents of capitalist class, continue to design and maneuver diverse strategies to weaken or break the forces of unity in everyday to preserve the interest of non-everydayness. The process continues. The clash and conflicts continue and amidst all these everydayness remains not only as identifiable entity but becoming stronger day by day as the body becomes larger.

In contemporary modern context the open ended competitive set up is offered to every individual irrespective of its 'locus' and 'milieu'. Of course, this socio-cultural construction is also a 'product', a 'platform' of the political-economic hierarchy that solely sets up, controls, and operates the systems and diverse subsystems. In spite of the volatile nature of everyday, everydayness continues to exist and dominantly declares its all-pervasive presence. Here too the framework is almost similar to that of the postcolonial construction. The matrix of institutional mechanisms constantly lures the differentiated individuals who are gifted with intellectual potency of any fields of knowledge, either technological, scientific or humanistic involving the area of science, arts and social sciences. There's no traffic system to restrict this outflow of everyday essence. On the contrary, some non-everyday human forces too, constantly merge with the everyday. Therefore, the realm of everyday and everydayness is no utopian superstructure, but a living reality, a phenomenon neglected, obscured, repressed and exploited for undefined course of human history. It is real and operative in our time too, and more vigorously than ever.

Wherein lies the hope then? Lefebvre points out the path of optimism by opening an alternative way of reestablishing the interest and sustainability of everyday. He turns his attention to various socio-cultural, linguistic, feminist, political, judicial and humanistic platforms that emerged in the seventies to establish the rights of diverse and different segments of a given society on a particular period of time. Special mention may be made of the continuous feminist movement, the Queer movement and in recent time, the rising farmer's

movement across Europe, especially in France as well as in different states of Indian subcontinent. The demand of equality, social justice, legal and constitutional safeguard, economic and religious freedom by different humanistic platforms and NGOs are randomly gaining grounds. In more recent years, the social media has become very much powerful and vibrant to articulate the demands of different organizations. The hope of everydayness according to Lefebvre, remains here. But evidences of past show that this hope is nothing but will-o'-the-wisp. Very often these socio-cultural platforms disintegrate due to diverse inherent reasons of its own changing ideological constructs as well as the transaction of its individual agents to non-everyday either by force or fraud or allurements. This process continues whatever may be the optimist's dream of a socio-cultural set up based on equality, justice, equity and mutual respect.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Henri Lefebvre began to expand his theoretical notion of everyday and everydayness radically departing from the diehard Marxist ideology after the second world war. His harsh criticism to the Marxist hierarchy of French communist party resulted with his expulsion from the party in 1958. This gives him further space and opportunity to turn his attention to sociocultural phenomenon of prevailing inequality persisting strongly in cosmopolitan French society as well as "sociocultural transformation occurring within France and other Western industrial societies in the postwar era, including the impact of technology, the mass media, and consumerism" (Gardiner, 2000, p. 74). After the student revolt in 1968, his attention is more strongly drawn to the possibility of filling up the gap of inequality between those who fills the street and others. Lefebvre thus, continues to articulate the voice of the obscured and suppressed who continues to proclaim its presence beyond the observation of the power machineries of state and the wealthy capitalist. The study highlights these dark and obscured corners of everyday where the common, unprivileged, neglected, reticent human entity lives. These 'life fields' or 'lived experiences' in general are Lefebvre's concern. Though mainstream western philosophical thoughts almost ignored this theoretical existence of everyday as banal, insignificant vagaries of ideas for so many years, the idea of everyday and its prominence are rapidly gaining grounds among the intelligentsia. Lefebvre hopes to bring about a balance by opening up the ways and means of eradicating all the elements of inequality between everydayness and its opposite. Undoubtedly, he discerns the locus, covered up by falsity and unreal. But his optimism can't bring about balance between everyday and its reverse based on the ideal of justice, equality and equity. Day by day the gap is widening instead of closing as the apparatus and machineries of non-everyday forces becoming reckless, ruthless, insensible

and even beastly to execute all the means of power and authority to dominate and degrade everyday entity. Shorn of conscience, humanity and humility this demonic force almost levels down the human entity of everydayness.

Yet the theory of everydayness is gaining ground everyday as it is firmly rooted on the soil of humanity, love, justice and equity. From the very dawn of civilization, the game of power and wealth continues and very often apparently power gains the upper hand, dominating, ruling and exploiting the common masses, but the ultimate victory comes with humanity, defeating all the conspiracies hatched by the agents of state and wealthy capitalists. Everydayness is suggested by means of interactions and lived experiences of a reticent, undisturbed, uninspired, narcotized life of the vast majority of people living in a particular society in a specific time period without any action or stir. Lefebvre's bold exposure of the reality and truth enkindles this sleeping masses bringing consciousness and knowledge to recognize their own plight. Democratic resistance or any other form of resistance, if needed, is the way to restore people's right and equity. Everydayness, as it connotes in the present context, is far more deplorable than wretchedness. The 'locus' should be a state free from imposition and confinement with adequate means of civilized livelihood, ensured by the state. That everydayness would not be addressed as banal, attaching the stigma of contempt and neglect, but would be a real existence and the only existence that can comprise history. Lefebvre's optimism shines brighter with the hope of a liberated mankind. The negative sense of everydayness and its recognition, as depicted by Lefebvre, dazzles with glowing pain and a dizzy sense of humiliation which may ignite the fire of protest and purification, leading to a free and brighter world of peace and prosperity in days to come, as dreamed by every human soul.

### REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). Monthly Review Press. (Original work published 1965)
- Blanchot, M. (1987). Everyday speech. *Yale French Studies*, 73, 12–20.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2930194>
- Felski, R. (2000). *Doing time: Feminist theory and postmodern culture*. New York University Press.
- Gardiner, M. (2000). *Critiques of everyday life: An introduction*. Routledge.

Lefebvre, H. (1971). *Everyday life in the modern world* (S. Rabinovitch, Trans.). Harper and Row.

Lefebvre, H. (1987). The everyday and everydayness (C. Levich, Trans.). *Yale French Studies*, 73, 7–11.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *Critique of everyday life* (J. Moore, Trans.). Verso. (Original work published 1947)

Lenin, V. I. (1917). *The state and revolution*. Progress Publishers.

Storey, J. (2014). *From popular culture to everyday life*. Routledge.

### **AUTHOR'S BIO**

*Dr. Ruhul Amin Mandal is an academician, a scholar par excellence, and a creative poet. He has a keen interest in poetry and recent critical theory. He has been teaching English Literature and language as Assistant Professor from April 2015, to till date. He has published research articles in many distinguished journals. His poetry is published in such prestigious magazine as Muse India and Nandan. An anthology of Bengali verse is also published by Dr, Mandal in 2001.*

.