

What is Culture?

- MA in Social Research -

Is the concept of 'the culture industry' an adequate tool with which to think the relationship between culture and the economy?

2006/2007

Marcia Y. Lise

Student Number: *****

**Department of Sociology
Goldsmiths College, University of London**

The concept of 'culture industry' was coined by Frankfurt School philosophers, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer introduced, with the publication of the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* first in 1944 (Schmid Noerr in Adorno and Horkheimer 2002: 217). Their aim was to illustrate how capitalist relations had invaded the cultural sphere. They argued that the 'culture industry' was a mechanism for manipulating individuals as consumers in modern capitalism. Although, their study of 'culture industry' is useful in interrogating the relationships between economy, culture, as well as technology, in capitalist societies, it is somewhat limited in the sense that it offers a centre-peripheral over-generalized model, which is now outdated.

Despite criticisms, various authors have borrowed ideas from or extended Adorno and Horkheimer's concept of 'cultural industry' (Jean Baudrillard 1981, 1983, 1998,; Fredric Jameson 1991; Herbert Schiller 1976). These writers were all concerned with the negative effects of the consumption of mass produced culture. They also offered a rather structuralist model which denied agency of individuals, and neglected the interconnectedness of economy, culture and indeed politics.

Meanwhile, Arjun Appadurai (1990) and Held et al (1999) offer us an alternative tool to analyse the relationship between economy and culture in the contemporary postmodern context. They both emphasised examining the global cultural 'flows' in various spheres such as the finance, media, technology, and immigration. Appadurai in particular manages to offer a flexible theoretical framework which captures fluidity which avoids the subject/object dualism, and gives agency to individuals.

We shall start by examining the main arguments put forward by Adorno and Horkheimer in more detail. This will also include some later writings by Adorno and other authors to compliment our understanding of the 'culture industry'. For Adorno and Horkheim (2002), 'culture industry' was a mechanism for manipulating individuals in capitalist societies. For them, 'culture industry' maintains a standardised system to which everybody must conform. 'Popular culture' is akin to the production of a mass of standardized cultural goods which manipulates individuals into passivity. Such popular entertainment requires no effort on part of the consumer and keeps them docile and happy.

Adorno and Horkheimer saw the 'culture industry' as forming a basis of domination within capitalist societies. In their view, the production and distribution of cultural products via popular entertainment was the central mechanism through which modern capitalist society came to dominate the individuals (Ibid: 94-95). The 'culture industry' functions to sustain a set of homogeneous cultures to which all must conform. They argue that whilst people were made believe to be free, free for example from "choosing an ideology", the 'culture industry' actually aided domination of individuals by denying freedom, since people were only give the "freedom to be the same" (Ibid: 136). This, in their view, obstructs the development of individuals' critical

consciousness, which results in acceptance of standardised cultural products with little resistance (Ibid: 95). Individuals therefore have no sovereignty. In this sense, Adorno and Horkheimer's neo-Marxist standpoint helps us understand why Marx's idea of rupture of socialist revolutions has failed to take place in contemporary capitalist societies. So how does 'culture industry' restrict the development of critical thinking on part of the individuals as consumers?

The culture industry facilitates domination by working on the psychological development of the mass. Adorno and Horkheimer argue that cultural products contain similar characteristics of individuals' working lives which is dictated by standardization and mechanization of the instrumentally rationalised labour process (Ibid: 109) which are necessary for increased efficiency and profit in a capitalist society. So, for instance, an administrator of an academic institution may have to complete a set of tasks either on a daily or weekly basis. Specifically speaking, an administrator may have to respond to similar enquiries everyday perhaps using standardised templates, if responding by email, take minutes of meetings or update websites on weekly basis. Most tasks are repetitive and often mechanised. So there is no longer a distinction between work and leisure as Adorno and Horkheimer suggest -

"Entertainment is the prolongation of work under late capitalism. It is sought by those who want to escape the mechanized labor process so that they can cope with it again. At the same time, however, mechanization has such power over leisure and its happiness, determines so thoroughly the fabrication of entertainment commodities, that the off-duty worker can experience nothing but after-images of the work process itself" (Ibid: 109).

Systematic exposure to standardised entertainment has the effect of keeping its consumers 'happy' and docile. Individuals do not have the opportunity to contribute to the production of the cultural goods and services to which they are exposed to. I must note here that Brian Holmes (2002: 5), extending Adorno and Horkheimer's concept of 'culture industry', suggest how we are made to believe we have choices and for once be a producer by the introduction of personalised services and custom objects (i.e. custom made Gibson guitars) which appears to further the ideology of individualism. This is deception that one can be a producer, having more choices.

Adorno and Horkheimer insist that the form and content of cultural products do not require interpretation on part of the consumer and they put "things out of mind, forgetting suffering ... [which] is indeed escape" (Ibid: 116). As they put it "[e]ntertainment fosters the resignation which seeks to forget itself in entertainment" by presenting "the same everyday world as paradise" (Ibid: 113). This aspect of consuming cultural product, without any doubt, aid individuals to be 'content' and submissive.

Adorno and Horkheimer trace the pacifying effects of cultural products and services in the uniform and repetitive nature of such commodities (Ibid: 108, 115), seeing the culture industry as “the mechanical repetition of the same culture product” (Ibid: 133) which conjures up a factory-like production. For Adorno and Horkheimer, culture “is infecting everything with sameness. Film, radio, and magazines form a system. Each branch of culture is unanimous within itself and all are unanimous together” (Ibid: 94). This means the industry actually derive ideology and information from a very limited pool of culture, resulting in a high degree of uniformity, reproducing the sameness and excluding the new (Ibid: 106).

In this sense Adorno and Horkheimer criticises the culture industry for the conversion of every quality into mere quantity. And of course in a capitalist society, the goal of a ‘culture industry’ is the production of goods that are profitable. The culture industry is after all a means to generate profit like any other private companies. The culture industry is a global, multibillion dollar enterprise, driven, primarily, by the pursuit of profit.

We saw that some of the essential characteristics of products created by the ‘culture industry’ were repetition and standardisation. Although the term ‘culture industry’ was coined in the 1940s, Adorno (2002) had already argued in 1936, in his essay entitled “On Jazz”, that some of the essential characteristics of popular music such as jazz was its standardization and uniformity as well as its limited set of musical styles and themes. So for Adorno, popular music is about familiar and compositionally simplistic musical phenomena, which requires little interpretative effort in its reception of the product on the part of the audience. He even goes onto to say that listeners “are childish ... [and] their primitivism is not that of the undeveloped, but that of the forcibly retarded” (Adorno 1938). He also contrasted popular music with ‘serious’ music which for Adorno was ‘concrete totality’, and unlike popular music, ‘serious’ music did not allow interchangeability. If details were lost the piece fell apart. Although we will not discuss into detail, it must be noted that Adorno also analysed other areas of the culture industry such as newspaper astrology column, film, radio and television (Adorno and Horkheimer 2002).

Examples of cultural products created by the ‘culture industry’ in a sense that Adorno and Horkheimer suggest can be easily be found in contemporary society. To mention a few, these can be *trance/house music* based on repetitive beats often listened in clubs and bars, or *easy-listening jazz* found in cafes, *Hollywood blockbuster films* with a plot which is generally easily understood or even totally predicted and available at most film stores, *high street fashion* which seems to rotate within a span of 10 years, or even how we consume seemingly exotic foreign *food* at Time-Out featured restaurants. All these cultural products are consumed by people who

as a result believe themselves to be “cultured”. But after all these products are standardized which often consist repetitive elements and require little interpretation on the consumer’s part.

While Adorno and Horkheimer constructed a based for a critical study of popular culture, especially popular music, and the mass media, their theory were subject to criticism. Firstly, their idea of standardization of popular music that projects ‘sameness’ implies that popular music remains unchanged across time. In this sense it becomes difficult to apply the concept of ‘culture industry’ to all contemporary contexts. For example new genres of distinctive popular music have been emerging; disco, funk, heavy metal, punk, Indies, R&B, rap, pop, etc. Also the genre of jazz on its own has gone through substantial changes since the 1940s, Latin jazz, jazz fusion, soul jazz, acid jazz and so on. Were these shifts what the ‘culture industry’ had anticipated?

Secondly, Adorno and Horkheimer’s analyses of certain popular culture is under immense scrutiny for failing to recognize the isometric popular and non popular division of culture (Paddison 1982). For example while Adorno in particular criticizes jazz as lacking seriousness, repetitive, and unsophisticated. He concentrated on analyzing commercial big bands and this may have caused him to draw conclusions that would have been different otherwise. It is also worth noting that Adorno paid no tribute to the black origins of jazz. Due to diversity within the genre of jazz, it is dangerous to over-generalise jazz as done by Adorno and Horkheimer. The analysis of jazz was not the only target of criticism. Adorno’s analysis of film was criticized by Diane Waldman (1999) for seeing film as inherently conservative and that the essential nature of film was to reproduce and reinforce ideology, because for her, styles and aesthetics of film vary enormously. All in all, Adorno and Horkheimer’s analyses of cultures were criticized for over-generalizing its content and reducing culture to a product.

The ‘culture industry’ is responsible, in Adorno and Horkheimer’s view, of deciding what sort of cultural goods are to be produced. This is a very much top-down model. The system dictates the production. We must consider, however, the autonomy individuals have as creators of music in the industry. Surely, musicians have some form of control over what they create. Adorno and Horkheimer also projected that the ‘culture industry’ was a mechanism by which individuals were made uncritical, passive, submissive but content. Listeners of popular music were reduced to submissive consumers who cannot think for themselves critically. If this is the case then, following Adorno and Horkheimer’s standpoint, political messages should be absent, complex forms of ‘popular music’ should not exist and even if such popular music exist, it would not be enjoyed by the mass. However it appears that this is not the case. We shall take an example.

The idea that individuals do not have autonomy in the two sense suggested above, can be refuted by taking a look at the music produced by Frank Zappa, who was a composer, guitarist and a singer between the early 1960s and late 1980s. A lot of the pieces of music he composed and played in include political messages. He was skeptical of mainstream social, political and musical movements and despised 'popular music'. Political lyrics included in his music certainly did and does not promote the uncritical consciousness of individuals Adorno and Horkheimer talks about.

Furthermore, Frank Zappa's music is far from repetitive and standardized as Adorno and Horkheimer suggest about 'popular music'. A lot of his musical pieces were complex in rhythmic structure, contained radical changes of tempo and metre, as well as densely arranged short passages contrasted by free improvisations. Yet Frank Zappa's music proved to be a big hit especially during the hippie movement at the end of 1960s.

In this sense, the centre-peripheral model of 'culture industry' suggested by Adorno and Horkheimer fails to capture autonomy amongst individuals, denying agency on part of the individuals. Their idea of 'popular music' as creating docile uncritical individuals can be proved to be wrong in some cases, and the proposal that 'popular music' lacks 'seriousness', and are standardized, repetitive, and simplistic is an over-generalization.

Nevertheless, Adorno and Horkheimer's concept of 'culture industry' is indispensable. They offer a trans-disciplinary approach, emphasizing the interconnections between technology, economy, culture, in capitalist societies. It does provide us a framework that aids us to understand contemporary culture. However an update is desperately needed. We must consider how the term 'popular music' was used by Adorno and Horkheimer when they wrote about 'culture industry'. The term appears to label all music genres outside the 'classical' domain. A redefinition of 'popular music' is required – perhaps we can extract the music genres which apply to their idea of 'popular music', which would probably include music such as 'pop', dance/trance/house music, hip hop, R&B, and any 'easy listening' music etc. However this is not within the scope of this essay so we shall not get into the details of this.

While Adorno and Horkheimer saw the 'culture industry' as a threat, there were writers who praised the mass produced goods and services. Benjamin Walter and Paul Du Gay are two of them. Benjamin recognised that mass production of art ruined the potential of 'serious' culture (to borrow the term Adorno used) but he also saw these cultural commodities as liberating creativity from art and allowed multiplicity of mass produced everyday objects. Barry Smart explains his stance as follows:

“For Benjamin the new forces of artistic production and reproduction hold out the prospect ... of the creation of new social relations between artists and audiences, writers and readers, producers and consumers of text. Technical means of reproduction raise the prospect of art ceasing to be the privilege of a few.” (Smart 1992: 113)

In this sense, Benjamin has a positive outlook on mechanical reproduction of cultural products, resulting in the decline of artwork's character due to standardization. He, thus, sees the new technologies to be progressive.

Furthermore, Paul Du Gay (1997) criticises Adorno and Horkheimer for their denial of human agency, as well as for their claim that mass production leads to the creation of non-serious standardised culture and superficial needs. Du Gay argues that culture industry can be “a less stable and predictable entity” and do not have total control over the means and process of cultural production since production, in his view, is influenced by actual consumption activities (1997: 102).

Gyorgy Lukacs (1971) and Henri Lefebvre (1971) both draw similar conclusions to Adorno and Horkheimer with regards to the link between culture and economy. Their main argument is that capitalism is a distinctive system of production capable of achieving an economic penetration of societies (Lukacs 1971: 62). Lefebvre theorised the consumer society by integrating a theory of signs to the Marxist tradition.

Following Lukacs and Lefebvre, Jean Baudrillard (1998) adapts Marxism and extends it into the postmodern era in his book entitled “*La Société de Consommation: ses mythes et ses structures*” originally published in 1970. The major alteration Baudrillard made was that he incorporated the study of semiotics to his analysis of the culture and economy. Baudrillard suggests that we live in a system of signs where needs become ideologically generated (1981). Commodities become produced as signs and signs become produced as commodities, whereby producing ‘commodity-sign’. Baudrillard suggests that we misunderstand need as genuine and merely represented drive for satisfaction. He argues that individuals place themselves within a system of signs when consuming products or services.

In addition to the integration of semiological study, Baudrillard (1983) also shifts the emphasis from production to reproduction. He argues that the media reproduces signs and images which blurs the distinction between image and reality. As a result, for him, consumer society becomes essentially cultural. He saw that the over-production of signs and reproduction of images lead to

a loss of established meaning and structure. It idealised reality, by which masses were mesmerized.

Fredric Jameson (1991), influenced by Baudrillard's work, sees culture in the postmodern era as the culture of consumer society. He agrees with Baudrillard in the proposition of the contemporary postmodern society as saturated with signs and images. He extends Marxist thinking but does not believe in any hierarchical principle between economy and culture. Jameson's therefore refutes the idea of economic determinism as traditional Marxist perspectives have projected. This allows Jameson to examine the actual processes of consumption in a given society. For him, economic production, or, as Baudrillard has introduced, 'reproduction', itself is a cultural phenomenon and believes that everything is now mediated by culture. He states that there is a "sense of a cultural dominant" (1991: 6). This allows us to think about the culture of economy and its processes, instead of the production of culture.

Following Mandel, Jameson divides capitalism into three stages, and described modernism as the culture of monopoly capitalism and postmodernism as the culture of late capitalism. Jameson emphasizes taking a historical approach and stresses that in order to find the meaning of the present we should relate it to the past as an ongoing story (Ibid: ix). As the title of Jameson's book suggests, "*Postmodernism or the logic of late capitalism*", he views postmodernism as the cultural logic of the third stage of capitalism. He suggests that there is continuity in the underlying principles of capitalism from modernity to postmodernity (Ibid: xix).

According to Jameson at the beginning of the third stage of capitalism - 'late capitalism', the society went through aesthetic and literary changes which were indicative to the shift to postmodern conditions (Ibid: xx). He argues that the current stage of late capitalism or postmodernism is different from the previous stage of capitalism because of the various changes that took place; the rise of transnational businesses, the new international division of labour that shifts production from the first to the third world, and the new forms of media. These changes also brought about social consequences. I must note here that although Jameson did acknowledge new technology as one of the influences of the shift into late capitalism, he was against the thesis of technological explanation of culture (Ibid: 38). He believed that it was the other reality of economic and social institutions beyond technology that gave rise to postmodernity.

In the third stage of capitalism, Jameson argues that economic changes reflected cultural shifts. Although Jameson claims that his theory embraces a superstructural approach (i.e. Ibid: 5), he does suggest that culture and economy are interlocking to produce the commodification of culture. For example he writes "the cultural and the economic ... collapse back into another"

(Ibid: xxi), or “every position on postmodernism in culture ... is also an implicitly or explicitly political stance on the nature of multinational capitalism” (Ibid: 3). He also emphasises the “expansion of culture throughout the social realm, to the point at which every thing in our social life ... can be said to have become “cultural” (Ibid: 48).

Jameson also speaks of postmodern ‘depthless’ culture. He believes that the economic changes resulted in postmodernism which in turn brought the ‘depthlessness’, a sort of superficiality (Ibid: 6), placing emphasis on surface appearances (Ibid: 11-2). Depth is no longer relevant, since it is replaced with multiple surfaces, which resists interpretation. We can safely say that Jameson’s notion of depthless aspect of culture is akin to that of Adorno and Horkheimer’s claim of cultural products as consumed with little effort, no interpretation required, on part of the consumer.

Jameson’s postmodern analysis of culture and economy are, again, subject to criticisms (Hutcheon 1989; Kellner 1989). For example, although he claimed to have taken into account history in his analysis, Linda Hutcheon (1989) criticised him to hold a one-sided concept of postmodern culture by overlooking the history and its relationship with popular culture.

Adorno, Horkheimer, Baudrillard and Jameson were all concerned with the negative effect of mass produced culture. It, therefore, may be useful to introduce the concept of ‘cultural imperialism’. Herbert Schiller (1976) coined the idea of ‘cultural imperialism’ referring to the cultural domination of one culture imposing its way of life on another, more specifically to the way in which transnational corporations of developed countries dominate the developing countries.

Schiller argues that developing nations are placed in dependent positions. His analysis of the world is based on economic, political cultural elements. Schiller suggests that society is based on the “dominating stratum [which] is attracted, pressured, forced, and sometimes bribed into shaping its social institutions to correspond to, or even promote, the values and structures of the dominating center of the system” (1976: 9). He saw that the influence of new global economic as well as the cultural flows for example in the area of architecture, fashion, food, entertainment (i.e. film, tv, music) meant homogenization of culture in everyday lives.

The ‘cultural imperialism’ perspective is subject to several criticisms. While Adorno and Horkheimer were mainly concerned with popular culture in Western scenarios, Schiller appears to have analysed the world with a bigger picture in mind. However the cultural imperialism critique is based on the lack of respect for the plurality of a way of life, which is a Western thought (Tomlinson 1991: 5-6). So, the fact that this theory originates from the West automatically implies a Western cultural bias in the groundwork to begin with (Ibid: 14).

Furthermore, the idea that one culture can dominate another, is criticised for being oversimplistic and deterministic. Like the idea of 'cultural industry', the concept of 'cultural imperialism', denies agency on part of the individuals (Liebes and Katz 1990). People still have the capacity to think and choose things on an individual level. For example, audience have the ability to process information and interpret messages differently. So people do act differently and perhaps not the ways in which the supporters of the 'cultural imperialism' critique would anticipate.

Another criticism is that the claim that one culture is imposed on another is difficult to prove. The challenge is: "how a cultural practice can be imposed in a context which is no longer actually coercive" (Tomlinson 1999: 173). So the concept of 'cultural imperialism' fails to establish how cultural domination and cultural loss actually take place.

Finally, some say that the critique of 'cultural imperialism' is actually purely a critique of modernity. John Tomlinson, for instance, says the movement of 'cultural imperialism' are "protests against the spread of (capitalist) modernity" (Ibid: 173) which resulted the "spread of cultural loss" (Ibid: 173).

The notion that the world is dominated by one global culture, in other words cultural homogenization, as we have seen, is challenged by the idea that the world is heterogeneous with diverse national and local cultures interacting with global cultures. Mike Featherstone suggests that:

"[h]eterogeneous cultures become incorporated and integrated into a dominant culture which eventually covers the whole world ... Cultures pile on top of each other in heaps without obvious organizing principles. There is too much culture to handle and organize into coherent belief systems, means of orientation, and practical knowledge" (1995: 6).

Although we can accept that there is a dominant culture in the height of globalization in the contemporary context, we must also consider the existence of national or local cultures which brings heterogeneity. Arjun Appadurai (1990) suggests that the increased interactions between new global culture and local culture meant heterogeneity. The homogenization argument fails to consider that cultures "brought into new societies tend to become indigenized in one or other way" (Ibid: 295). In his view, cultural homogenisation and cultural heterogenisation are always in tension with each other (Ibid: 296).

Appadurai suggests that the “new global cultural economy has to be understood as complex, overlapping, disjunctive order, which cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models” (Ibid: 296) such as that of the ‘cultural imperialist’ critique. He offers to read economic and political phenomena through the lens of the ‘cultural’. Appadurai suggests that there has been “fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture and politics” (Ibid: 296) and in order to examine these disjunctures we ought to look at the relationship between five dimensions of global cultural flow - ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technoscaples, finanscaples and ideoscaples (Ibid: 296).

Ethnoscaples refers to flow of people in movement such as “tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guestworkers and other moving groups” (Ibid: 297). *Technoscaples* refers to the rapidly developing technologies “that moves at high speeds across various kinds of previously impervious boundaries” (Ibid: 297). *Finanscaples* refers to the capital flows as a result of financial trades (Ibid: 298). *Mediascaples* are, on one hand, the medium which create and disseminate information, and on the other hand to the flows of images and narratives of the world created by media (Ibid: 299). Finally, *ideoscaples* are the concatenations of images, ideas and terms, which are political (Ibid: 299).

Appadurai sees these scapes as “building blocks of ... imagined worlds” (Ibid: 296) which are products of modernity. Appadurai says these scapes overlap and interrelate with each other - “the suffix scape allows us to point to the fluid, irregular shapes of these landscapes” (Ibid: 297). In this sense he achieved to create a flexible analytical tool which allows both structure and agency.

Appadurai also gives us an interesting insight as to how we can understand that cultural homogenization, or indeed the so called ‘cultural imperialism’ on a smaller scale. He suggests that this is not purely a global issue as there is a “fear of cultural absorption by ... those that are near by” (Ibid: 295). He says for “people from Irian Jaya, Indonesianization may be more worrisome than Americanization, as Japanization may be for the Cambodians, Russianization for the people of Soviet Armenia and the Baltic Republics” (Ibid: 295) and so on.

Held et al. (1999) consider the global interaction we see in contemporary society as economic, political, ideological and cultural (1999: 432-435). While Appadurai uses the cultural flows to analyse economic and political phenomena, David Held et al (1999) use political economy to discuss cultural globalisation. Like Appadurai, they emphasise the importance of global ‘flows’. However, unlike Appadurai, their starting point is the object / subject dualism. They say globalization is “the movement of objects, signs and people across regions and intercontinental space” (1999: 329). They observe that there ere individuals (the subject) who transmit culture

and the actual cultural forms & ideas (the object) that are diffused through various medium. Held et al's view on the relationship between the subject and the object therefore implies that subjectivity is simply linked *with* the political economy, rather than a by-product *from within* political economy.

Held *et al.* classify global flows into six broad spheres: 1) the military, governance, and law, 2) trade, investment and finance, 3) the global environment, 4) global migration, 5) media and popular culture, and 6) global communications and transport (Held *et al.* 1999: 432). In comparison to Appadurai's scapes, Held et al. add the military, governance and law and the environment into the spheres but misses out what Appadurai calls an 'ideoscape'. They suggest several categories for analysing these global flows: the 'spatio-temporal' and 'organisational' dimensions (1999: 329). While 'spatio-temporal' dimensions refer to the 'extensity', 'intensity', 'velocity' and 'impact' of global movements of culture (Ibid: 329-330), 'organisational' dimensions are the infrastructure that help transmit flows across time and space (Ibid: 330-331). They note that the impact of cultural flows is difficult to calibrate; and not all measurable effects are extremely transformative (Ibid: 328).

In Held et al's view, global cultural flows invoke homogenisation (Ibid: 327-328). They say "the centrality of national cultures, national identities and their institutions is challenged" (Ibid: 328). Emergence of various technologies & new medium as well as the formation of mass culture have increased global cultural influences. They also talk about global cultural stratification (Ibid: 330-331). They consider American cultural industries and the English language to be dominant (Ibid: 346-347), which is an idea similar to the 'cultural imperialist' argument as we have seen earlier.

Both Appadurai and Held et al talk about global culture or cultural globalization in terms of 'flows' in order to capture the ever fluid pictures of the global interconnectedness holistically. This type of analysis, examining the 'flows', is sensitive to movements and processes. It escapes the Cartesian notion of linear 'cause and effect' model, whereby the social is determined by the individual or the individual by the social, resulting in the decentering of either the social or the individual (Lise 2003: 2). The centre periphery models such as those offered by Adorno & Horkheimer or Schiller face problems with regards to agency on part of the individual, since their point of enquiry starts from the social, or the 'object'. As Martin Heidegger, a philosopher, suggest, the distinction between the subject and the object is inappropriate since the two are interconnected (Lise 2004: 4). They should not be separated because individuals are being-in-the-world, involved in practical activities. He therefore was concerned with be-'ing', which connotes processes. Appadurai successfully creates an analytical tool which captures the fluidity of the five scapes. We must bear in mind that although Held et al did talk about the

global flows, as he took a subject/object dualistic approach as discussed their theoretical framework can be attributed as rather centre-peripheral.

With the introduction of the concept of 'cultural industry' by Adorno and Horkheimer we saw that the 'culture industry' was an established instrument for controlling individuals, to be docile and content through the consumption of 'cultural products'. Their study of 'culture industry' is useful in interrogating the relationships between economy and culture within the capitalist context, we saw that the theory was associated with limitations – most importantly that it was a centre-peripheral model, which over generalised and over simplified the cultural and the individuals.

We also saw that Baudrillard takes the analysis of the relationship between culture and economy further by combining Marxist theoretical framework and semiology. His analysis takes place within the postmodern context, arguing that contemporary society is based on the system of signs and images that creates ideology. Mass production of 'commodity-sign' lead to a loss of meaning, consequently idealising reality.

Following Baudrillard, as we have discussed, Jameson agrees with him that the society is saturated with signs and images, and that we now live in midst of the culture of consumer society. In his view, the late stage of capitalism, postmodernity, economic changes reflected cultural shifts. However he refuses to take a structural Marxist standpoint, and instead focuses on the processes of cultural phenomena. Like, Adorno, Horkheimer and Baudrillard, he is concerned with the negative effect of mass culture speaking of the postmodern 'depthless' culture.

While a lot of these authors fear mass culture, the effect of globalization is neglected. In this sense, Schiller's idea of 'cultural imperialism' comes handy since it considers the global effect of cultural domination. He suggested that there is a cultural domination of one culture imposing its way of life on another, usually how the developed countries dominate the developing countries. This theory suggests cultural homogenization. However as we shall see, Schiller's theory is refuted by some to be deterministic and over-simplistic.

While Adorno, Horkheimer, Baudrillard, and Schiller all offer a rather centre-peripheral slightly or strictly Marxist model, denying agency on part of the individuals, Appadurai and Held et al offer us an alternative tool to analyse the relationship between economy and culture in the contemporary context. First of all, Appadurai rejects the idea that there has been a homogenization of culture suggesting that cultures blend in with each other creating new cultures. In this sense Appadurai clashes with Adorno and Horkheimer of view economy threatening the culture and individuals' critical awareness. In addition, Appadurai suggests

studying economic and political phenomena through the lens of the 'cultural'. In doing so he proposes five dimensions of global cultural flow - ethnoscapas, mediascapas, technoscapas, financescapas and ideoscapas.

Meanwhile, as we saw, Held et al use political economy to study cultural globalisation. They categorize global flows into six broad spheres which includes all of the flows suggested by Appadurai plus 'the military, governance, and law' and 'global environment' spheres. They suggest viewing these global flows in terms of 'spatio-temporal' and 'organisational' dimensions.

Appadurai and Held et al, escape from the centre-peripheral top-down model by examining the cultural global flows, giving agency to individuals. This allows a flexible, and perhaps an ambiguous, tool to analyse the relationships between politics, economy, and culture elements in contemporary societies. It captures fluidity, interconnectedness, and elasticity of issues on agenda.

All in all, whilst the concept of 'culture industry' gives us an insight as to how the 'cultural' and economy are related, it was established that its ideas were deterministic, over-simplistic, dualistic which did capture the processes of the relationship between culture and economy. While various authors attempted to extend Adorno and Horkheimer's theoretical work, they have all resulted in creating a centre-periphery model. Baudrillard and Jameson makes an effort to examine the relationship in a postmodern context but fails to give agency to individuals and overlooks the interrelatedness that Appadurai and Held et al examine. The flexible analytical tool provided by Appadurai and to some extent Held et al attempts to capture the global cultural flows in contemporary society. This provides us a good alternative analytical tool to the concept of 'cultural industry' in order to examine the relationship or rather inter-relationship between the culture and economy.

Bibliography

- Adorno, T. W. *On the fetish-character in music and the regression of listening*. <http://music-cog.ohio-state.edu/Music839B/Approaches/Adorno.html>, 1938 (Accessed 12 January 2007)
- Adorno, T. W. *Essays on Music*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002
- Adorno, T. W. & Horkheimer, M. *Dialectic of enlightenment: philosophical fragments*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002
- Baudrillard, J. *For a critique of the political economy of the sign*. New York: Telos Press, 1981
- Baudrillard, J. *For simulations*. New York: Semiotext, 1983
- Baudrillard, J. *The consumer society: myths and structures*. London: Sage Publications, 1998
- Du Gay, P. *Production of culture / cultures of production*. London: Sage Publications, 1997
- Featherstone, M. *Undoing culture: globalization, postmoderism and identity*. London: Sage Publications, 1995
- Featherstone, M. *Global culture: nationalism globalization modernity*. London: Sage Publications, 1990
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999
- Holmes, B. *The flexible personality: for a new cultural critique*. <http://www.16beavergroup.org/pdf/fp.pdf>, 2001 (Accessed 10 January 2007)
- Hutcheon, L. *The politics of postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1989
- Jameson, F. *Postmodernism or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. London: Verso, 1991
- Kellner, D. *Postmodernism, Jameson, Critique*. Washington: Maiseonneuve Press, 1989
- Liebes, T. and Katz, E. *The export of meaning: cross-cultural readings of "Dallas."* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990
- Lise, M. *What does Durkheim's argument in Suicide say about the relationship between the individual and the social?* <http://www.angelfire.com/falcon/sociology>, 2003 (Accessed 28 December 2006)
- Lise, M. *The Cartesian distinction between the thinking thing and object make no sense*. <http://www.angelfire.com/falcon/sociology>, 2004 (Accessed 28 December 2006)
- Lukacs, G. *History and class consciousness*. London: Merlin Press, 1971
- Paddison, M. *The critique criticised: Adorno and popular music*. *Popular Music*, 1982, vol. 2, 201-218.
- Smart, B. *Modern conditions, postmodern controversies*. London: Routledge, 1992
- Schiller, H.I. *Culture, Inc.: The corporate takeover of public expression*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989

Tomlinson, J. *Cultural imperialism*. London: Pinter Publishers, 1991

Waldman, D. *Adorno and 'the culture industry'*. *New German Critique*, 1977, vol. 12, 39-60.