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In 1961, in the second volume of *Critique of Everyday Life*, the everyday appeared as the program of capitalism, the organization of leisure, the banality of directed consumption. It is also the ground, the base, the platform on which the edifice of the state and institutions is built. Between the first and the second volume . . . reality was transformed; and, in the third volume, I think I’ll highlight some other transformations of reality, namely the shaking of this ground that no longer solidly supports the superstructures, in classic Marxist language, for example the floors of the administration, of the bureaucracy and of the State. The ground is cracked, all cracks must be perpetually sealed.

(Henri Lefebvre, *Le temps des méprises*, 1975, p. 208)

Some works resonate more than others with their historical moment. This is the case for *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, written in 1967, whose scheduled publication on May 21, 1968 was postponed by
FOREWORD TO THE ROUTLEDGE CLASSICS EDITION

Gallimard to June 12, 1968, according to the Lefebvre archive. Even if it did not directly influence the slogans and watchwords of May 1968, this book condenses the radical spirit of the Occupations, in a more incisive way than Lefebvre’s retrospective, *The Explosion*, published later the same year. Rather than providing a cultural studies treatise on everyday life in the modern world, Lefebvre combines several theses in an extended essay that both elucidates and underpins the revolts then in progress in France.

What is the everyday? It is a residual category of the status quo: “what we are first of all and most often” (Blanchot, 1992 [1962]). It is our “daily bread” of habits and outlooks that folds the glorious potential of each new day under the reality of routine, duties to others, of childcare and getting to work on time. Lefebvre refers to it as a “ground” for all social reality, both a constraint and the foundation to build on. In this book, he develops a critique of the “bureaucratic society of directed consumption,” which produces an alienated culture while concealing its ideological character beneath an everyday status quo dominated by the advertising slogans that purvey a sort of “ready-to-wear” model of the good life. These “terroristic” pressures instill fear and repression as part of everyday normativity. This “terrorist society” produces passivity and prevents any appropriation of everyday experiences as a footing for individual and collective emancipation. Lefebvre calls for a permanent “cultural revolution” whose guidelines trace a set of demands at the heart of the concerns of the time, around the sexual revolution, the urban revolution, and the restoration of the ludic and the festive. This is a matter of transforming taken-for-granted everyday life and realizing the revolution he sought to bring about throughout his life. In the late 1960s, Lefebvre was at the heart of debates to which he contributed through a particularly high rate of publication, in a period that can be considered the peak of his intellectual influence.

Henri Lefebvre was one of the major protagonists of May 1968, as shown by Michel Trebitsch in his Preface to the third volume of *Critique of Everyday Life* (see Lefebvre, 2014, pp. 655–676). Despite his importance at that time, in France his legacy was shrouded in neglect for a
long time. Lefebvre was also familiar with the effervescence of critical theories emerging from the Frankfurt School, and was in contact with transatlantic developments through exchanges with his friend, the translator and contributor to *Monthly Review Press*, Norbert Guterman, who had emigrated to the United States in 1933 and oversaw the English translation of Lefebvre’s *The Explosion* (1969). Long before his success as a social and spatial thinker, whose work contributed to the postmodern theories and cultural studies of American writers such as Frederic Jameson and Ed Soja, it was primarily as a Marxian philosopher that Henri Lefebvre was translated into English. Lefebvre authored a 1939 introduction to *Dialectical Materialism* (1968). Translated into many languages, it became an essential primer for sixties radicals. His 1966 work *The Sociology of Marx* was translated by his friend Norbert Guterman and published in 1968.

*Everyday Life in the Modern World* was published for the first time in English in 1971, in the wake of the first English translations of Lefebvre when English-speaking readers were not yet aware of his critical sociology. This early translation of this work testifies to an effervescence around his work at the turn of the 1970s. This did not lead to an in-depth discovery of his work. In particular, at that time, and including during the reissue of the book by Routledge in 1984, there were no English translations of the three volumes of the *Critique de la vie quotidienne* (see the one-volume translation, 2014 [1947, 1961, 1981]), *Introduction to Modernity* (1995 [1962]), the still-untranslated *Proclamation de la Commune* (1965), or essays on urban sociology to which this book is linked, notably *Le droit à la ville* (1968), which was translated piecemeal under the punning title of *Writings on Cities* (1996). Key concepts have received only isolated analysis in English and clarifications have to be sought is widely dispersed specialty works across many disciplines. Today, when Lefebvre’s work is known worldwide and his works are more available in English than in French, it is possible to resituate the theses of *Everyday Life in the Modern World* in his overall intellectual project.

Henri Lefebvre has often been praised for his visionary spirit, for his ability to identify essential issues of transforming societies
when they were barely perceptible. Detecting transformations did not come spontaneously: it stems from theoretical research that Henri Lefebvre developed throughout his life, and whose principles constitute the distinguishing features of his method. The originality of his way of doing social sciences goes beyond the valorization of the researcher’s intuition and the regressive-progressive (sometimes translated as “retrojective-projective”) method which makes it possible to resituate his objects in a dialectical vision of total history, (see the untranslated work La Somme et le Reste 1959). He broke away from standard social science by developing an “applied sociology” from the end of the 1950s. He proceeded by posing and discussing questions concerning shared frustrations and contradictory experiences in France at the time. In his activity report to the CNRS from 1957 to 1958, preserved in the archives, he describes the functioning of applied sociology working groups which involved protagonists from various professions (“psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, psychologists, information specialists and advertising, educators, industrialists, economists”). They came to present their practical problems, which were seized upon by the sociologists who explored the socio-economic dimensions and developed hypotheses which were then returned to and redeveloped by the invited professionals. His assistant René Lourau went on to develop institutional analysis to understand the conflicts that run through institutions.

For example, Lefebvre is extremely cautious not to hypostatize “everyday life” because it is a field of relations and bodies, not to be reduced to a static concept. The relevance and timeliness of the projects opened by his sociology in the 1960s is undoubtedly in keeping with the spirit of these “live methods.” These seized their time and place by the scruff of the neck, “raw,” so to speak. This included social contradictions as they were developing and being experienced by individuals and collectives. Lefebvre put himself in a position to analyze the movement of the world in the making, which he succeeded in with Everyday Life in the Modern World, a work he wrote in relation to the problems of student youth and which condenses his sociological findings of the 1960s.
This work thus deserves to be included in a collection of classics, not because its findings are timelessly valid at a moment when everyday life is no longer synonymous with boredom, but with urgency and survival for a significant part of humanity in the face of climate change and intersecting structural violences. The socio-economic and political transformations of the beginning of the twenty-first century require rethinking the lines of force of a similar project of cultural revolution. What is “\textit{inactuel}” in it, to use Nietzsche’s term that influenced Lefebvre, is the spirit of this method for tackling social reality head on. Rather, it figures as a chapter in the history of Western popular alienation that, for example, Greil Marcus depicted in \textit{Lipstick Traces} (1989).

***

Critical examination of everyday life is one of the guiding threads of Henri Lefebvre’s heterodox Marxism. It is well presented and contextualized by Michel Trebitsch in his Prefaces to the English translations of the three volumes of \textit{Critique of Everyday Life} (2014 \cite{1947, 1961, 1981}). The addition of the present volume to these translations helps explains the internal monologue that is featured in many sections in which Lefebvre takes up the conclusions of previous volumes and refers many times to work on the third volume of \textit{Critique of Everyday Life}. This text finally appeared only in abbreviated form in 1981. By presenting \textit{Everyday Life in the Modern World} as a reflection on previous work and preparation for further research, a space for experiment and anticipation is opened up.

Lefebvre sought to publish his texts quickly as interventions into social life. Exchanges preserved in the archives indicate that in 1964 he had intended to publish a series of works on “the attitudes of contemporary man [sic] faced with the problems of everydayness,” which were never realized. Lefebvre defends himself to the editor who was unhappy he published some of his research in this book with another publisher. However, this discussion shows that the sociology of everyday life is a laboratory through which he detects and explores social issues, as illustrated by another unrealized project to found an “Institute
for the Study of Everyday Life” in the 1980s. To reinscribe this volume in the broader arc of his critiques of everyday life, we will content ourselves here with retracing the links between the project and the aspiration for a cultural revolution, the essential thesis of *Everyday Life* in the *Modern World*.

The project for the critique of everyday life appeared in 1933, when the young philosopher and Communist Party member developed his critical theory through writing and editing for journals (Burkhard, 2000), and the publication of his first works co-authored with his friend Norbert Guterman. In this period, the fundamental theses of the program are outlined. These aim to identify the contributions of the work of Marx and update them in understanding the modern world, based on the elements of a critique of political economy, a theory of alienation present in particular in the writings of the young Marx, with prospect of a change in life in all its dimensions through revolution. Lefebvre strives to develop a dialectical thought to identify social and political transformations in their historicity.

Such a revolution would not only consist in a transformation of the economy (the capital/labor relationship) or politics (the control of institutions), but in a cultural transformation: “The ‘total cultural revolution’ must result in a culture that is non-alienated, that is to say, lucid, based on liberated labor.” What he means by culture, is “the relationship of individuals to society,” and the “social content of individual self-expression” (Lefebvre, archive of plans on the critique of everyday life, 1933). He does not reduce culture to artistic productions, language and philosophical ideas nor scientific knowledge, even if he constantly resorts to cultural products, in particular literature, to question everyday life and the historical transformations of culture. This critique of everyday life is associated with the materialist project for a phenomenology of individual and collective consciousness. After *La conscience mystifiée* (Guterman and Lefebvre, 1936, untranslated), in which he describes the processes of alienation caused by ideologies, in particular Fascism, he was interested in all the practices which allow humans to appropriate nature and their own nature, or social practice. It is social practice or praxis rather than culture that is at the center of
his thinking in *Dialectical Materialism* (1968 [1939]), and which will be the subject of the development of his sociology thereafter.

The first volume of *Critique de la vie quotidienne* (2014 [1947]) was driven by the hope of renewal immediately after the Second World War. Lefebvre intended to contribute to a revolution as an aspiration to produce the “Total Person” (l’*Homme Total*) based on a sociological study of everyday life, a materialist sociology of culture. The challenge is to “produce” a disalienated everyday life, which cannot be reduced to the liberation of work but concerns social relations as a whole. He does not separate socio-economic reality into “base” and “superstructure.” This project quickly confronts the social and political transformations of the post-war period, even as the Cold War and the future of socialist regimes were transforming all the issues. As early as 1957, in the long Second Preface to the first volume, he bears witness to these new fields of research which were in the process of being formed in industrialized societies: leisure, the media and television, private and family life, women’s press and romance novels, the preservation of archaisms such as horoscopes, and their mythical meaning in modern life. He tries to reformulate what the transformation of everyday life in the modern world could be as technical progress outlines a programming of life and a bureaucratized goal of satisfying manufactured “needs.” He gives these aspirations an imaginary and a style with the essay “Towards a revolutionary romanticism” (1957), which will allow him to forge links with the avant-gardes which were being reconstituted, in particular the Situationist International.

This effervescence and the frictions born of the encounter with the SI are explored in detail by Michel Trebitsch (notably Lefebvre, 2014), who argues that these are crucial to the constitution of a “radical left” at a time when many intellectuals had left the Communist Party in the 1950s, Lefebvre himself being thrown out for his criticism of Stalin. This also corresponds to the growth of a radical sociology, which he developed in contact with students when he arrived as a professor, first at the University of Strasbourg (1962), then at Nanterre (1965). In general, the method of this applied sociology allows a democratic space for deliberation and criticism through sociology to be opened
up that includes diverse social groups. Undeniably, Lefebvre marked the 1960s generation of students and helped shape their outlook. In The Time of Misunderstandings (Les temps des méprises, 1975), he says that “The Proclamation of the Commune” motivated the decision of the students of Nanterre to occupy the Sorbonne in central Paris, in an effort to bring about an urban revolution. His classes explored the concerns of this generation, by experimenting with educational formats that included their own self-expression. For example, he addressed social issues associated with the demand for the legalization of contraception in the course “Sexuality and Society” in 1966–1967, which certain passages of this work echo. Thus, Everyday Life in the Modern World is the culmination of a program of radical sociology set out in the second Critique of Everyday Life (1961), nourished by all the fields of investigation developed in the 1960s.

***

Everyday Life in the Modern World bears the imprint of the political debates of the 1960s in which Lefebvre was engaged through a sometimes tortuous and allusive style of writing. We must read his theses within the effervescence of revolutionary political groups in and around the PCF, the French Communist Party. In 1968, Lefebvre stood in full opposition to the Party’s mainly structuralist readings of Marx represented by Louis Althusser, who had just published his For Marx (1969 [1965]) and Reading Capital (1970 [1965]). These two works partially eclipsed Lefebvre’s work Métaphilosophie (1965), in which he defends the creative role of language or the poetic act.

Everyday Life in the Modern World will show the relevance of his analyses of the Cultural Revolution in relation to the social movements associated with the May 1968 revolts. In 1968, Lefebvre consummated the break with the members of the Situationist International which took place around the publication of La proclamation de la Commune (1965) for which the latter accused him of plagiarism (see Trebitsch in Lefebvre, 2014). In 1967 Guy Debord had just published The Society of the Spectacle (1977) and Raoul Vaneigem his “Treatise on good manners for
the use of new generations” (translated as *The Revolution of Everyday Life*, 1972). They continued to attack Lefebvre whom they denigrated as the “Versaillais” of culture in their review *Internationale Situationniste* (Debord, 1977 [1967]; Vaneigem, 2021 [1967]; Versailles was the city of the former monarchy where the Thiers government retreated during the Paris Commune). The proposal for a “cultural revolution” can be seen as a form of response to his old friends, as Lefebvre imagines a cultural revolution that emphasizes the creativity that must be deployed over a long period for the creation of renewed lifestyles beyond short-lived “happenings,” which the SI refer to as the construction of “situations.”

In the context of 1968, the term “cultural revolution” also directly refers to the Chinese cultural revolution. Lefebvre contrasts his own conception with that of the Maoist and workerist groups who had a strong influence in France at the time. For Lefebvre, a cultural revolution must correspond to a democratic deepening of socialism, which must be reformulated toward worker self-management. For example, Lefebvre participated in the review *Autogestions*, arguing that the Prague Spring of 1968 testifies to the same impetus towards a more democratic reformulation of socialism. Conversely, he considered participatory democracy to be a simulacrum of this aspiration (Lefebvre, 1975). With respect to the alienation and frustrations of everyday life, Lefebvre says that utopia is when “we wish for something different”—a moment of potential revolution (see this volume, p. 77).

April 1968 is also the date of the translation into French of *One-Dimensional Man* (1968 [1964]) by Herbert Marcuse. If Lefebvre praises the relevance of Marcuse’s analyses on the place of *eros* in society, he thinks that his analysis of advanced consumer society is more relevant to the United States and that his influence on May 1968 in France should not be exaggerated. As such, he rejected the claim that what was at stake in the May 1968 revolts was a demand for greater freedom within capitalist society. Instead, Lefebvre’s project of cultural revolution in everyday life is an attempt to correct the absence of possibilities of fully benefiting from such a life, or “appropriation.”

The notion of “appropriation” that he develops in the works of this period is an extension of the principle of self-management in all areas
of life. We find it in the formulation of his urban reform project presented in *Le droit à la ville* (1968). He contrasts “appropriation” with the process of “abstraction” inherent in capitalist modernity (Lefebvre, 1995 [1962]). In *The Production of Space* (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]), the notion of “appropriation” is combined with that of difference and pluralism to support multiple, simultaneous, forms of emancipation through the production of a “differential space.”

***

A little more than half a century later, how can we evaluate these theses on the cultural revolution? After May 1968 Europe saw the forging of a neoliberalism which knew how to disarm social democracy and the democratic revolution then in utero? With *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, Lefebvre articulates social struggles and cultural struggles within a horizon of transformation of the everyday. He does not confine demands for social justice to the horizon of a productivist society, and does not reduce the transformations of living to the adoption of modes of consumption or commodified experiences. However, if Lefebvre has charted a course, the directions a cultural revolution could take today may be quite different from what he anticipated.

As such, we can see that the revolution in sexualities currently under way goes far beyond the sexual liberation to which Lefebvre refers, and that his treatment of women or cis-femininity remains consistent with a heteronormative point of view. Even if he contributed to making the question of the social place of women a central question for social science, the feminist movements with which he was in contact nevertheless showed greater creativity in the way they envisaged gender roles and challenged the damages of patriarchy. The feminist revolution that spans the early twenty-first century seeks to redefine and broaden relationships between individuals, to free them from the culture of rape and from the predominance of the male and heterosexual points of view which have crushed other sexualities.

The urban reform called for by this text has also not taken place, even though the participatory culture resulting from these demands
has informed the urban and regional planning and allowed the entry of broader, if often symbolic, consultation with publics. Today, “the right to the city” remains a rallying cry and a banner for promoting urban democracy.

Finally, if Lefebvre did not believe in the revolutionary potential of political ecology at the end of the 1960s, political ecology worked to establish alternative ways of life to transform everything that sustains and flows through everyday life, from food consumption, manufactured products, mobility and housing to health and care practices, to name a few. Inspired by Lefebvre, the French ecofeminist thinker Geneviève Pruvost has identified an “everyday infrapolitics,” a Quotidien politique (Pruvost, 2021, p. 33), by which deliberate engagement produces everyday life as a “nurturing ground for reality”: “the slightest gesture, the slightest activity, the slightest object which could seem a priori infrapolitical, without consequence, must be re-inscribed as part of a ‘total work’ in the hands of the capitalist industry” (Pruvost, 2021, p. 40). Such developments, actualized in successful ecological struggles in France and other countries, go beyond what Lefebvre could have anticipated in the 1960s, even if his thought provides resources to identify the main issue: daily life as an articulation of cultural and social issues essential for any thought and practice of emancipation. These potentials articulate dwelling, democracy, and emancipation. They favor cultivating knowledge of Henri Lefebvre’s work. The reissue of Everyday Life in the Modern World heralds the 2024 opening of his papers to researchers at the Institut Mémoires des Editions Contemporaines, near Caen in France. His oeuvre has begun to be re-discovered.

Claire Revol and Rob Shields
Grenoble and Edmonton, March 2023
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Imagine that you have before you a complete set of calendars dating from 1900, of which you select one at random that happens to represent a year towards the beginning of the century. Pencil poised, you then close your eyes and make a cross beside a day in this year; you open your eyes and you find that it is the sixteenth of June you have marked. Now you try to discover what took place on this particular day among so many others in a relatively peaceful and prosperous year — for this continent and country at least. You go to the public library and consult the national press for this date; you are confronted with news items, accidents, the sayings of contemporary personalities, a clutter of dusty reports and stale information and some unconvincing revelations concerning the wars and upheavals of the time; but there is practically nothing that might enable you to foretell
(or to suppose that a reasonably perceptive person living in those days could have foretold) any of the events about to take place, those occurrences that must have been silently developing in the hidden depths of time; on the other hand, neither will you find much information as to the manner in which ordinary men and women spent that day, their occupations, preoccupations, labours or leisure. Publicity (still in its infancy), news items and a few marginal reports are all that is now available to reconstruct the everyday life of those twenty-four hours.

Having perused papers and periodicals from this not-so-distant past— noting the familiarity of headlines and the out-of-date typography—you can now give rein to your fancy: might not something have happened on that sixteenth of June which the press has omitted to report? You are indeed free to imagine that it is precisely then that a certain Mr Einstein—of whom nobody at the time had ever heard—had his first perception of relativity in the Zurich room where he inspected patents and toed the narrow lonely path between reason and delirium. Nor can anyone prove that you are wrong if you choose to believe it was that day and no other that an imperceptible but irreversible action (the apparently insignificant decision of a bank manager or a Cabinet minister) accelerated the passage from competitive capitalism to a different form of capitalism thus initiating the first cycle of world wars and revolutions. You might further select this early summer’s day with the sun in its solstice, dominated by the sign of Gemini, for the birth in some quiet village or town of children who, for no obvious reason, would grow up gifted with an exceptional awareness of the times and events.

Thus it is by chance and not by chance that this particular day—a sixteenth of June at the beginning of the twentieth century—was significant in the lives of a certain Bloom, his wife Molly and his friend Stephen Dedalus, and as such was narrated in every detail to become, according to Hermann Broch, a symbol of ‘universal everyday life’, a life elusive in its finitude and its infinity and one that reflects the spirit of the age, its ‘already almost inconceivable physiognomy’, as Joyce’s narrative rescues, one after the other, each facet of the quotidian from anonymity.¹

The momentous eruption of everyday life into literature should not be overlooked. It might, however, be more exact to say that readers
were suddenly made aware of everyday life through the medium of literature or the written word. But was this revelation as sensational then as it seems now, so many years after the author’s death, the book’s publication and those twenty-four hours that were its subject matter? And was it not foreshadowed already in Balzac, Flaubert, Zola and perhaps others?

The answers to these questions may contain a lot that is unexpected, but before attempting them we would like to point out some of the main features of one of the most controversial and enigmatic works of its time. *Ulysses* is diametrically opposed both to novels presenting stereotyped protagonists and to the traditional novel recounting the story of the hero’s progress, the rise and fall of a dynasty or the fate of some social group. Here, with all the trappings of an epic – masks, costumes, scenery – the quotidian steals the show. In his endeavour to portray the wealth and poverty of everyday life Joyce exploited language to the farthest limits of its resources, including its purely musical potentialities. Enigmatic powers preside. Bloom’s overwhelming triviality is encompassed by the City (Dublin), the metaphysical speculations of ‘amazed’ man (Stephen Dedalus), and the spontaneity of instinctive impulses (Molly); here is the world, history, man; here are the imaginary, the symbolic and the prophetic. But in making use of all the potentialities of speech a twofold disruption of language, both literary and general, was inevitable; the inventory of everyday life implies the negation of everyday life through dreams, images and symbols even if such a negation presupposes a certain amount of irony towards symbol and imagery; the classical object and subject of philosophy are found here in concrete form; that is to say, things and people in the narrative are conceived in terms of the object and subject of classical philosophy. But they are not static, they change, expand, contract; the seemingly simple object before us dissolves when subjected to the influence of acts and events from a totally different order; objects are super-objects, Dublin, the City, becomes all Cities, the River stands for all rivers and waters, including the fluids of womanhood; as to the truly protean subject, it is a complex of metamorphoses, of substitutions, it has discarded the substantial immanence-transcendance
of the philosophers, the ‘I think that I think that I think . . . ’ and unfurls through the medium of interior monologue. During these epic twenty-four hours in the history of Ulysses (Odysseus, Otis-Zeus, man-God, essential common man, the anonymous and the divine made one) the I merges with Man and Man is engulfed in mediocrity.

This subjectivity which unfurls is time in its dual aspect of man and divinity, the everyday and the cosmic, here and elsewhere; or in the triple form of the man, the woman and the other, waking, sleeping and dreaming, the trivial, the heroic and the divine, the quotidian, the historical and the cosmic. Sometimes ‘they’ are four: four wayfarers who are also the four Old Men, the four Evangelists, the four Corners of the Earth, the four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. Time is the time of change – not localized or particular change but the change of transition and the transitory, of conflict, of dialectics and of tragedy; the River is the symbol in which reality and dream are one and which is without form. The writing captures the world of desire and the narrative is dreamlike in its matter-of-factness (precisely in its matter-of-factness); in no way contrived, it reproduces the flowing image of a cosmic day, leading the reader into the turmoil of a linguistic carnival, a festival of language, a delirium of words.

Time – the time of the narrative, flowing, uninterrupted, slow, full of surprises and sighs, strife and silence, rich, monotonous and varied, tedious and fascinating – is the Heraclitean flux, engulfing and unifying the cosmic (objective) and the subjective in its continuity. The history of a single day includes the history of the world and of civilization; time, its source unrevealed, is symbolized over and over again in womanhood and in the river; Anna Livia Plurabelle, the flowing Liffey, Molly and her impetuous dream-desires in the boundless, unpunctuated realm between sleeping and waking, merge, converge and mingle.

Before pursuing our investigation let us summarize the preceding observations:

a) This narrative has a referential or ‘place’, a complex that is topical, toponymical and topographical: Dublin, the city with its