

New Media Art and a Contemporary Revision of the Term ‘Cultural Industry’ of Theodor Adorno

Claudia Sandoval Romero, University of Applied Arts and Academy of Fine Arts, Austria

ABSTRACT

This article examines some of the ideas that Theodor Adorno elucidated around the term “cultural industry”, compiling mainly the ideas published in the text “Aesthetic Theory” of 1970. The term “cultural industry” is also contextualized in the article with the reflexions that Adorno previously exposed since 1947. A dialog is created with the proposal of the North American theoretician and artist Martha Rosler to understand the chronological development of art before, during, and after Adorno. Regarding the relation between art and autonomy the ideas of Adorno offer elements to understand contemporary art production. This way and closing the article, the author also discusses contemporary new media art manifestations, which are analyzed in key of terms such as autonomy/cultural industry in relation to the proposals of the Brazilian theoretician Arlindo Machado

Keywords: Adorno, Aesthetics, Art, Autonomy of Art, Commerce, Cultural Industry, New Media Art

INTRODUCTION

Since its mere emergency art has been asked about its autonomy in relation with its social role and with the industry. At the same time art has always been the deposit of romantic ideals and the dreamed place from where society is criticized. Theodor Adorno was one of the pioneer authors who reflected about the relation of art industry with communication media such as the TV, which in 1947, time of Adorno’s first reflections, was getting consolidated¹. The time of Adorno appears similar to ours of the consolidation of the internet, making his reflexions pertinent for a critique of the media art of our time.

This way, strongly contemporary Adorno’s ideas about the “hitlerian strategies” (Adorno, 1947, pp. 16-17) of the mass media, help us to understand the idealism of Adorno’s art conceptions, through the approach to his historical moment and his own personal life.

The present article briefly describes what Theodor Adorno reflected about the relation between art and the cultural industry in his posthumous and probably most influential publication “Aesthetic Theory” of 1970.

Subsequently the term is contextualized with previous reflections of the author since 1947.

Together with the research of the North American theoretician and artist Martha Rosler, the ideas of Adorno are shown in a parallel to the moments of art before, during and after Adorno's time.

To conclude, contemporary new media art manifestations are analyzed in the article in key of the couple autonomy/cultural industry, this time in relation to the proposals of the Brazilian theoretician Arlindo Machado.

“CULTURAL INDUSTRY” INSIDE THE “AESTHETIC THEORY” OF 1970

In this first section some of the different conceptions of the cultural industry will be brought together in order to create a compilation of the different ideas that illustrate the complexity of the term proposed by Theodor Adorno.

This way, it will be described the idea of cultural industry as a factor that made possible for art to become a consumer good, understanding art also like the catharsis that the appreciation of an art piece offers.

Cultural Industry and Consumer Goods

Theodor Adorno explains in “a Critic to the Cultural Industry”, section of the book “Aesthetic Theory” published in 1970, that as far as art corresponds to a social manifested necessity, it transforms itself mostly in a business governed by the profit, which persists as long as it is profitable. By doing so, art makes itself aside, confirming being nothing but something already dead (Adorno, 1970, p. 34).

Adorno exposes the means used by the cultural industry in order to transform art pieces into merchandise when he makes clear that the ‘naïve’ people of the cultural industry, avid of merchandise, locate themselves closer to art, perceiving how art is inadequate to accompany the process of social life. Adorno argues that the creation of this proximity to art only intensifies the cultural industry, as well as, at the same time, here the idea of the

immediatism of art to the society is planned to deceive (Adorno, 1970, p. 376). On the other hand, the cultural industry defends that art suffered a process in which it ceases being what it is and loses its specificity becoming consumer goods such as art pieces and catharsis (Adorno, 1970, p. 34).

In the following paragraphs we will then explain how for Adorno the art and its catharsis became consumer goods.

Art Pieces as Consumer Goods

For Adorno indubitable symptoms of the tendency of the cultural industry are the passion for what is palpable, as well as for not letting any work be what it is, accommodating them, while diminishing the distance in relation to the spectator (Adorno, 1970, p. 32).

For the author considering art “vested interests” means to classify subjectively art inside the consumer goods. He specifies the complexity in the relation with art as goods when he hopes that “at least” art was simply consumable, then, this way, the relation with art would be based on the mere relation with the consumer goods. But for Adorno in a time of super production the value of use of art is also problematic since it is submitted to the secondary delight of prestige, of fashion and then, finally, submitted to the own character of merchandise. This way, of the autonomy of art just remains the fetishistic character of merchandise, being this a regression to the archaic fetishism in the origin of art (Adorno, 1970, p. 32).

On the other hand, the cultural industry's praxis advocates for a servile respect for empirical details, this is, for the shape, allying this way the praxis of the cultural industry with the ideological manipulation (Adorno, 1970, p. 336). This makes believe that the importance of art lies on its technique, and on its final shape, which is equal to its fetishistic character. And for Adorno, the sublimation of the form is a vehicle of ideology.

For the author a type of art that prevails in the cultural industry establishes its significance on its “value of exposition”,

instead of its “auratical”, “cultuai”, value (Adorno, 1970, p. 73).

At the same time the cultural industry that transforms art in merchandise, also feigns the catharsis in the shape of a consumable aesthetical stimulus, as it will be explained below.

Catharsis as a Consumer Good

For Adorno the catharsis experienced through the appreciation of art pieces is taken and administrated by the cultural industry and, by doing so, the aesthetical experience is no more sublime but one that makes possible its commercialization.

According to the theoretician, the real catharsis of art consists in the loss of oneself in the perception of the own limits and finitude not in a particular satisfaction of the ‘I’ or in the pleasure proposed by the cultural industry. For Adorno the idea of a profound catharsis is nonsense, is madness, for the cultural industry (Adorno, 1970, pp. 364-365).

In the same line of Hegel’s conception about the freedom to the object, Adorno argues that the aesthetical sublimation, guaranteed in the past the dignity of the spectator who, in a spiritual experience, becomes a subject through his/her alienation to the object of art. And this conception opposes the “philistines” aspirations that demand art to give something (Adorno 1970, p. 32).

This “something to give” is understood like the reductionist process in which art becomes a thing and a medium for the use of the psychological processes of the spectator (Adorno, 1970, p. 33).

Secondly, to create a market from art some of the strategies used by the cultural industry are the progressive subjective differentiation of the creators of art, as well as the intensification and diffusion of the domain of the aesthetical stimulus (Adorno, 1970, p. 354). Therefore, art becomes inferior art and entertainment, as well as art is manifested like obvious. This process legitimates the ideology of the cultural industry, an ideology that made art popular and closer to the public. But here for Adorno, the popular art is just a strategy that the cultural industry uses to profit. Conversely to this idea of the art made popular

and closer to the public, the notion of noble art has been, since Baudelaire, an accomplice of the privilege (Adorno, 1970, pp. 354-355).

Lastly, concerning the transformation of the catharsis into merchandise, for Adorno, art transforms itself into a consumable product when, in an effort for not to be a good, it becomes a spiritual matter available at all the levels of life. Being this, as mentioned before, another kind of good that is taken and administrated by the cultural industry (Adorno, 1970, p. 354).

This way, the art pieces turned into consumer goods and developed certain characteristics within the spirit of the cultural industry that Adorno explains as follows.

Spirit of the Consumer Goods

One of the characteristics of art as a consumer good is the ridiculous seriousness. Adorno points to the fact that the cultural industry is nowadays the only space where the spirit of seriousness of art appears, but a distorted seriousness, clarifying that when art is serious is posing of not being modern art, turning art itself into something ridiculous (Adorno, 1970, p. 65). Simultaneously, for Adorno, if art pieces were absolute responsible, it would make art sterile.

The complexity of this hypothesis appears when Adorno exposes that at the same time art cannot be responsible but if it is exclusively irresponsible, art is nothing but a game. This way, for the author, it is only in front of the cultural industry that art keeps its seriousness (Adorno, 1970, p. 65), but a fake new one that makes possible the commercialization of art pieces.

Regarding the irresponsibility of art, Adorno explains that to be delirious is for art a critic to the social praxis, a mimetic residue of art, and the price of art’s impermeability. But in this barbarian moment, the irresponsibility of art transforms it in mediocrity and is only used by the cultural industry as profit in the shape of “the fun” of art; this is, in the shape of a cultivated puerility of art (Adorno, 1970, p. 181). In a cycle, the puerility, which shares the objectives of the anti-intellectualism of art, degenerates directly in cultural industry and is

then fed by this, being, in this movement, preserved (Adorno, 1970, p. 309).

Ergo the question that would follow is: “do we need art?” and if so, then, how to make it possible outside of the cultural industry? this is, autonomous?

The Necessity of Art

According to Adorno, the necessity of art within the context of the cultural industry is a creation of the cultural industry.

For the author, the first time that the masses were confronted with art was through the mechanical medium of reproducibility offered by the cultural industry.

The increase of the necessity of art for the masses becomes thus suspicious, since the cultural industry hides behind it. For Adorno, the fact that the cultural industry validates art, not only raises doubts, but would also not be sufficient to assure the justification of art, since it emerges from an area external to art (Adorno, 1970, p. 34).

In this context, clarifies Adorno, the one who defends art equalizes it to the ideologies of the cultural industry (Adorno, 1970, p. 34).

Regarding the necessity of art, Adorno explains that the aesthetical necessity is a concept slightly vague and unarticulated, while at the same time the practices of the cultural industry didn't produce the many changes they want us to believe, and that we are taking for granted.

For Adorno the necessity of art is in great size ideology. For him, it would be possible to live without art, not only objectively, but also in the consumer's psyche, who is suggested – constantly and without cost- to change their taste, since he/she follows the way of the smallest resistant: The shape of culture that matters to the cultural industry is one without complexion and simple enough to be able to profit from it. The cultural goods are here a naïve and affirmative image of the culture (Adorno, 1970, p. 361).

Autonomy of Art

As a solution for the autonomy of art inside the context where the cultural industry reigns, Adorno describes the place of art works as its own. Not the place of art in relation to any social function.

For Adorno when art crystallizes as a specific thing in itself -instead of opposing the existent social rules or instead of qualifying itself as “socially useful”-, criticizes the society because of its simple existence.

This, according to the author, has been reproved for puritans of all confessions because what exists purely, completely structured according to its immanent law, exercises a critic without words, and denounces the degradation of society. This is, the society of exchange where everything exists only for something else.

This way, the asocial aspect of art is a certain denial of a certain society. But furthermore, for the autonomous art applies the idea that from the distance, art leaves intact the society from which it feels horror (Adorno, 1970, p. 253).

At the same time for Adorno, art keeps itself alive only because of its strength of resistance: Its contribution to society is not the communication with society, but a resistance to it (Adorno, 1970, p. 254).

Thanks to the complexity of this context, the autonomy of art is conceived by Adorno as a utopia, considering the fact that art emerges in relation to the manipulation offered by the cultural industry (Adorno, 1970, p. 33).

Even though for the author the autonomy of art is an utopia, the author envisions a solution, a space where the cultural industry cannot reign, when he claims that all these reflections can begin with the fact that, in reality, something aspires objectively to art, beyond the veil woven by institutions and fake necessities. For the author this would be then an art that evidences what the veil hides (Adorno, 1970, p. 34).

Regarding the value of art, although Adorno recognizes that provocative effects of art are quickly dissipated, he moreover identifies that artworks offer a practical effect

in the transformation of consciousness (Adorno, 1970, p. 272).

These possible solutions to the autonomy of art were only conceived by the Adorno of the "Aesthetic Theory" in 1970.

Previous to this text, Adorno pronounced overwhelmingly the relation between cultural industry and art, with less than few possible solutions.

Following, a brief tracking of the term cultural industry will be exposed, as well as some more reflections about the term and its implications that were exposed prior to the significant publication of 1970.

THE TERM CULTURAL INDUSTRY

Brief Trajectory of the Term

The term Cultural Industry didn't appear the first time in Adorno's posthumous publication "Aesthetic Theory", in 1970. As Adorno himself mentions in "Résumé über Kulturindustrie" -a text that was published in 1968 based on the radio conferences broadcasted in 1962 in Germany-, the first time that the term 'cultural industry' was used, was in the book "Dialektik der Aufklärung", published by Adorno and Horkheimer in Amsterdam in 1947(2).

According to Adorno (1968, p. 61), the authors initially used the term 'mass culture' that was subsequently substituted by for 'cultural industry'. And they did so intending to exclude the defenders of the cultural industry who aim it to be a sort of culture emerging spontaneously from the masses.

For Adorno the cultural industry differs from this radically: the cultural industry is the deliberated integration from above, of its consumers. It forces the union of domains, separated since thousand years, of superior art and inferior art, prejudicing both: superior art experience and the frustration of its seriousness, on benefit of the speculation about their effect.

Through civilized domestication inferior art loses its element of resistant and rude nature, inherent to it when the social control is not absolute (Adorno, 1968, p. 61).

The origin of the cultural industry can be located, according to Adorno, from the economical point of view when merchants where looking for new possibilities of application of the capital in more developed countries (Adorno, 1968, p. 63).

In addition to this, Adorno recognizes that authors like Brecht und Suhrkamp reflected in the decade of 1930s about the fact that cultural merchandises of the industry are oriented towards the direction of commercialization and not according to art's own content or adequate configuration (Adorno, 1968, p. 62).

Subject Means Object

Another aspect reflected for Adorno since the text published in 1968 is the concern about the state of consciousness and unconsciousness of millions of people, which is defined by the cultural industry.

In terms of the author, for the cultural industry the masses are nothing but a secondary factor, a calculation element, and an accessory to the machine. The consumer is in this system not a king, as the cultural industry would like to make believe. He/she is not the subject but the object of that industry. And at the same time the cultural industry reinforces the mentality of the masses, by taking this mentality as something given a priori and immutable (Adorno, 1968, p. 62).

For Adorno the interest of the cultural industry in people only takes place when they are considered clients or employees (Adorno, 1947, p. 15).

At the same time, in the publication of 1968, Adorno exposes a diminishment in the spiritual character of art pieces inside the cultural industry, as explained in the next section.

Individualization and the Spirit of Creations

For the theoretician, every practice of the cultural industry transfers the motivation of profit to spiritual creations, and from the moment these merchandises assure the position of its producers in the market, this motivation contaminates the spiritual creations (Adorno, 1968, p. 62).

The products of the spirit, according to the author, once inscribed inside the style of the cultural industry, are not also merchandises but they are integrally merchandises (Adorno, 1968, p. 64). For Adorno the cultural industry forces the spiritualization of distraction (Adorno, 1968, p. 13)

At the same time that in this process, every product is presented like individual, considering this a kind of individuality that contributes to strengthen the ideology (Adorno, 1968, p.62): An ideology that defends the system of the 'vedettes' taken from the individualist art and its commercial exploitation.

In opposition, when it comes to defend themselves from the critics, the promoters of the cultural industry have the pleasure to claim that what they provide is not art but an industrial product (Adorno, 1968, p. 66).

The cultural industry transforms the fabrication of a simple good will in public relations, without the relation with the producers or with any particular object of sales. It looks for a client to sell him/her a total and not critic agreement (Adorno, 1968, p. 64).

Autonomy of Art Seen by the Adorno of 1947 and 1968

Regarding the autonomy of art, Adorno claims since his previous publications to the "Aesthetic Theory" in 1970, that pure art pieces that deny society's mercantile character, because of following its own rules, become also merchandise:

Until XVIII c the protection of the maecenas defended artists from the market, but these artists were instead subjected to the maecenas and his wishes. For the author, the freedom of the great modern artwork lives from the anonymity of the market (Adorno, 1947, p. 21).

The autonomy of art almost never existed in a pure form and was always marked by connections of effect. Nevertheless, with the cultural industry, this autonomy sees itself in the limit of being abolished. And this is a process that occurs with or without the conscious will of its promoters (Adorno, 1968, p. 63)(3).

Critique

The main points of critique distinguished in Adorno's early reflections are, first of all, the exhortation to not to take cultural industry seriously. It is something suspicious, since in the name of the social role of the cultural industry judgments are repressed or eliminated about its quality, its authenticity or falsity, as well as questions about the aesthetical level of its message.

For the author, to take seriously the proportion of its unquestioned role means to take it critically serious and not to curve oneself in front of its monopoly (Adorno, 1968, p. 68).

In our current time authors like Laymert Garcia dos Santos propose the same debate in publications like "To Politicize the New Technologies", 2002, this time in relation with the internet, the digital era, the genetic manipulation and nanotechnology. For the author it is necessary to politicize the debate about technology and its relation with the capital, instead of leaving this debate to the transnational industries, as the establishment prescribes.

For Adorno the justification of the cultural industry is contradictory once the "lawyers" of the cultural industry defend it with the excuse of the "not intention to be art".

Once again, the ideology excuses the responsibility in relation to what maintains the business alive. But at the same time this type of no-art is also referred to the fact that even the worst movie is presented objectively as an art piece inside the cultural industry.

The critique of Adorno focuses in media like radio, cinema and the TV, pointing how the products they offer, like the sentimental mail and horoscope, are intended to be inoffensive and democratic because they obey to a demand. But these demands were previously stipulated.

The defenders also claim that these manifestations bring all kinds of benefits like the diffusion of information and advices, while, at the same time, it acts as a reliever of tension.

But this information is poor or meaningless, like proves a sociological study about the level of political information found in these media (Adorno, 1968, p. 67). At the same time that in case these media disseminate informations, these are simply futilities, or even worse, they are shameless conformist standards of behavior. This all, only concludes for Adorno in the idea that "it is now more real than it never intended to be, that the world wants to be deceived" (Adorno, 1968, p. 68).

As a consequence of these processes, what is firstly affected is the formation of individuals as explained in the next paragraphs.

A Critique to the Lack of Formation of Individuals

In the previous reflections to the text "Aesthetic Theory" Adorno presents a more strengthened connection within the political implications of the cultural industry.

For him, the critique to the cultural industry in relation to the impossibility of creation of individuality is based on the imperative of the cultural industry according to the idea of "you must subjugate", without indicating to what.

This way the cultural industry impels to subjugate to whatever is already given and to what -as a reflection of its power and omnipresence-, everybody, -this is, the other-, thinks.

As a conclusion of this process, through the ideology of the cultural industry, conformism substitutes consciousness, and this conformism is created in key of the cultural industry's ruminations. This means that these are not rules for a happy life, neither a new kind of moral responsibility, but the exhortations to conform to what is behind the interests of the power (Adorno, 1968, p. 69).

As a critic to the conformism that the cultural industry creates, Adorno asseverates that without confessing it, the spectators of these media sense that their lives become intolerable if they don't hold to satisfactions which, truly, are not any satisfaction (Adorno, 1968, p. 68). In this context, the one who doubts of the potency of monotony is a maniac. While at the

same time, as the author provocatively argues, "nobody will be cold or have hunger: whoever feels hunger or cold, will end in a concentration camp". This sentence, emerged from the hitlerian Germany, could "shine as a slogan" of the cultural industry, where to be the outsider is the most serious guilt (Adorno, 1947, pp. 16-17).

The compensatory satisfaction that the cultural industry offers to people when it awakes in them the sensation of comfort, of a world in order, frustrates them in their own happiness, which it deceptively supplies (Adorno, 1968, p. 70).

Adorno concludes about the lack of individualization that impedes the formation of autonomous and independent individuals, able to judge and decide consciously (Adorno, 1968, p. 70). As they constitute the previous condition to democracy, is here easy to imagine what for this is convenient.

In general terms, it is noticeable how the tone and ideas of Adorno in "Dialektik der Aufklärung", 1947, is softened in the text of 1968 "Résumé über Kulturindustrie", and become more abstract in the late "Aesthetic Theory" of 1970. At the same time that the harsh critiques, even more the ones that made a connection between the ideals of the cultural industry and the ones of the hitlerian Germany, tend to dissappear in Adorno's discourse of the last times.

Also, Adorno is important to us because, as it was already mentioned, he is one of the pioneers in interpreting the art industry nowadays as we will explain.

AN APPROACH TO ADORNO

Adorno contributed with tools of analysis to understand the relation between art and industry in the current time. Diverse contemporary authors like Martha Rosler and Arlindo Machado have also reflected about this topic, and this way it is possible to bring them together and complete the trace of history allowing them to dialog and describe the context since 1947 until the present days.

The autonomy of Art: Adorno and Martha Rosler

As a way to complete Adorno's ideas about the autonomy of art, here is exposed the reflexion of the artist and theoretician Martha Rosler, building a past-present-and-future chart in relation to Adorno's time.

Before Adorno's Time

" (...) social negativity was a central element of the Frankfurt School, as exemplified by Adorno's insistence, against Brecht and Walter Benjamin, pointing to the fact that art in order to be appropriately negative must remain autonomous, above partisan political struggles" (Rosler, 2010).

But different to Adorno, for Martha Rosler the alliance between artists and social phenomenon during the Industrial Revolution pointed to the liberation of the media of the time benefiting artistic freedom.

"Artists working in a variety of media and cultural registers, from high to low, expressed positions on the political ferment of the early Industrial Revolution. One might find European artists exhibiting robust support for revolutionary ideals or displaying identification with provincial localism, with the peasantry or with the urban working classes, especially using fairly ephemeral forms (such as the low-cost prints available in great numbers) (...) New forms of subjectivity and sensibility were defined and addressed in different modalities (the nineteenth century saw the development of popular novels, mass-market newspapers, popular prints, theater, and art), even as censorship, sometimes with severe penalties for transgression, was sporadically imposed from above" (Rosler, 2010).

Even though it is a complex labor to define clear limits between tendencies, to this respect, Rosler argues that precisely only a couple of hundred years ago, -"as the old political order crumbled under the changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution, and

direct patronage and commissions from the Church and aristocrats declined"- became possible for painters and sculptors to be independent enough to be critic.

But this criticism would not exclude the fact that a type of "art that exhibits an imperfect allegiance to the ideological structures of social elites has often been poorly received". And this would mean that to step outside the ambit of patronage or received opinion, meant "losing one's livelihood or, in extreme situations, one's life" (Rosler, 2010).

For Adorno the autonomy of art was seen as almost inexistence as far as pure art pieces that deny society's mercantile character, because of following its own rules, become also merchandise (Adorno, 1947, p. 21).

Contrary to what Martha Rosler points, the patronage for Adorno signified a solution for the autonomy of art from the market, which at the same time meant an opposite way of losing its autonomy in order to satisfy the patrons' wills.

For Adorno, until XVIII c the protection of the maecenas defended artists from the market, but these instead were subjected to the maecenas and their wishes. The freedom of the great modern artwork lives of the anonymity of the market (Adorno, 1947, p. 21).

During Adorno's Time

For Rosler the time of Adorno, first half of the twentieth century,

"Consisted on a prodigious industrialization and capital formation, witnessed population flows from the impoverished European countryside to sites of production and inspired millenarian conceits that impelled artists and social critics of every stripe to imagine the future. We may as well call this modernism. And we might observe, briefly, that modernism (inextricably linked, needless to say, to modernity) incorporates technological optimism and its belief in progress, while anti-modernism sees the narrative of technological change as a tale of broad civilizational decline, and thus tends toward a romantic view of nature" (Rosler, 2010).

Adorno interprets in this context a new death of art as he perceived how through the process in which art persists as long as it is profitable, art makes itself aside, confirming being nothing but something that is already dead (Adorno, 1970, p. 34).

To complete the trace of this aspect for the current time, and in words of Rosler, in 2008 the real estate market brought down much of the world economy, taking the art market with it (Rosler, 2010). What in relation to the capitalized idea of art for Adorno this would mean that what was as well brought down during the economical fall, was not just a market created around art pieces, but the very same art which grew until the current time in relation to its market. It is peculiar to perceive how since Hegel's death of art in the beginning of the XIX century, authors like Adorno and Rosler keep reflecting about new deaths of art.

Martha Rosler's perspective adds clarity to the last years of life of Adorno and the ones that followed his death in 1968. For the theoretician the decade of 1960s consisted in

"A robust moment, if not of outspoken criticality in art, then of artists unrest, while the culture at large, especially the civil rights / youth culture/ counterculture /antiwar movement, was more than restive, attempting to re-envision and remake the cultural and political landscape. Whether they abjured or expressed the critical attitudes that were still powerfully dominant in intellectual culture, artists were chafing against what they perceived as a lack of autonomy, made plain by the grip of the market, the tightening noose of success (though still nothing in comparison to the powerful market forces and institutional professionalization at work in the current art world). In the face of institutional and market ebullience, the 1960s saw several forms of revolt by artists against commodification, including deflationary tactics against glorification. One may argue about each of these efforts, but they nevertheless asserted artistic autonomy from dealers, museums, and markets, rather than, say, producing fungible

items in a signature brand of object production" (Rosler, 2010).

As Rosler manifests, the market forces, as well as the institutional professionalization of the art world, were stronger than the fight against the lack of autonomy. But it was only possible in this context that media art manifestations appeared to question the lack of autonomy. Like in the cycle of "work's production, absorption and neutralization", the search for autonomy is followed by the scope of the cultural industry. Like this, it declares art what was supposed to be anti-art, looking for new means of commerce.

This way, Adorno and Rosler agree with the fact that what was left of the robust political, cultural and artistic manifestations of 1960 was nothing but the development of new strategies of the cultural industry in order to maintain the commercialization of art.

The fact that the cultural industry changes its strategies with time in order to maintain art as a consumer good, which was observed by Adorno, didn't alter after his lifetime. On the contrary it became more complex as explained as follows.

After Adorno's Life

To illustrate the complexity of the autonomy of art after the time of Adorno, it is pertinent to consider what Rosler specifies about the late 1960s when in the United States

"President Johnson's Great Society included an expansive vision of public support for the arts. In addition to direct grants to institutions, to critics, and to artists, nonprofit, artist-initiated galleries and related venues received Federal money. This led to a great expansion of the seemingly uncapitalizable arts like performance, and video, whose main audience was other artists. Throughout the 1970s, the ideological apparatuses of media, museum, and commercial gallery were deployed in attempts to limit artist's autonomy, bring them back inside the institutions, and recapitalize art. (...) Art educators began slowly adopting the idea that they could sell their departments and schools as effective in helping their

students find gallery representation by producing a fresh new line of work” (Rosler, 2010).

With the apparition of new patronages like the own government art becomes more restricted of its autonomy, being this the new faces of the cultural industry. This way its autonomy becomes every time a more intricate dance of interests, at the point that nowadays it is pertinent to ask -without this being a rhetorical question-, like the seminar of Univ.-Prof. Dr. Violetta Waibel at the University of Vienna: “Do artworks exist? How are they possible?”

For Rosler the only possible solution is to consider that “these, then, are not abandonments of art world participation but acceptance that these institutions are the proper – perhaps the only - platform for artists” (Rosler, 2010).

The theoretician finds then a positive general solution on the interpretation of the changes between art and industry that affects not just art, but also the way of actively live in society, based on the fact that the new movements occupy “a middle region between ‘individual and collective’” and so have the possibility of engineering a different relationship to society, state, and capital. For the author the new forms of communication can produce “a radically new form of democracy” (Rosler, 2010).

This conclusion of the present time would be a solution that contradicts what Adorno reflected about the lack of autonomy in the creation of individuals at the end of the 1960s, also in terms of individuals who keep alive the apparatus called democracy without any critical formation, being this maintained by the information spread through the cultural industry (Adorno, 1968, p. 70).

On the other hand Rosler provokes with the idea about “whether choosing to be an artist means aspiring to serve the rich“. With the new global economy relations the idea here exposed by Rosler as typical of the United States can be generalized. But also Adorno explores this axis, noticing that this relation is not new when he claims that the notion of noble art has been, since Baudelaire, an accomplice of the privilege (Adorno, 1970, pp. 354-355). And at the same time, in Adorno’s

words no infamy is softened when it is declared as such (Adorno, 1968, p. 68).

About the autonomy of art, Rosler points to a context where as she explains, “how long can the academy of art success without the galleries?” At the same time, for the theoretician, artists are stubborn and there are always artworks, or art “actions,” that are situated outside the art world or that “cross-list” themselves in and outside the golden ghettos. For the author, the art market doesn’t mean it all: “It is not the market alone, after all, with its hordes of hucksters and advisers, and bitter critics, that determines meaning and resonance: there is also the community of artists and the potential counterpublics they implicate” (Rosler, 2010).

It is important to follow the trace in the search of both authors regarding the autonomy of art, as something superior to a commercial intention; this is, headed towards an intention inside its own manifestation. And it is important because it could give us the clues to understand the complexity of the time we live, ultimate objective of art’s expression.

Finally, since the decade of 1960s and with the apparition of a strong tool like the mass media to control and distribute art, new ways to make art also emerged as a consequence and as a contrary position to this tendency. As Martha Rosler mentions even inside the strengthened cultural industry through the use of the media, also appeared a

“So-called ‘dematerialization’: the production of low-priced, often self-distributed multiples;(…); the development of multimedia or intermedia and other ephemeral forms such as smoke art or performances that defied documentation; dance based on ordinary movements; the intrusion or foregrounding of language, violating a foundational modernist taboo, and even the displacement of the image by words in Wittgensteinian language games and conceptual art; the use of mass-market photography; sculpture made of industrial elements; earth art; architectural deconstructions and fascinations; the adoption of cheap video formats; ecological explorations; and, quite prominently, feminists overarching critique...” (Rosler, 2010).

This strengthen of control of the cultural industry would shape the time that followed Adorno, this is, our current time.

It is then interesting to analyze the relations of the subsequent new media art and cultural industry, as the final stage where this relation is manifested.

The Cultural Industry and the New Media Art

Continuing with the exposition of manifestations after the time of Adorno, the Brazilian theoretician Arlindo Machado reflected about the new media art and its relation with the cultural industry.

Here the analysis is brought to the new media art, considering it a contemporary type of art that deals more accurately with the technological stage of the time, helping us to describe the relation between last manifestations within the art field with the autonomy of art, this is, with the cultural industry.

What was already distinguished by Adorno in relation to the art of his time and the cultural industry does not relieve at the present time. In words of Arlindo Machado, in the case of the art made with new media technology, what promised to be a period of experimentation and discoveries was soon revealed as the trivialization of routines already crystallized in the art history: the return to conformism and integration to dominating values (Machado, 2007, p. 55).

For the new art manifestations the rule seems to be today marked by a strong standardization, by a general uniformity, as if what is at stake is a sort of aesthetic of merchandising, in which every piece must show a merely demonstration of the qualities of the hardware or the potential of the software (Machado, 2007, p. 55).

Adorno already intuited this perspective in the fetishist character of art, which the practice of cultural industry, in a servile way, respects. To be more precise, the process suffered of what was seen by Adorno as the cultural industry admiring the empirical details -or technique-, which allies in a big success with the ideological manipulation

through the utilization of those elements (Adorno, 1970, p. 336).

For Machado, in the art of the new media what seems to happen is, in most of the cases, the subtle but undeniable lose of the more radical perspective of art nowadays. And he adds: today, when one visits any event of electronic art, digital music or interactive writing, as well as when one browses any magazine dedicated to those specialties, it is not necessary a big effort to confirm that the aesthetical discussion was entirely substituted for a technical discussion, and that matters like algorithms, hardware and software, took majorly the place of creative ideas, of subversion of rules and re-invention of life (Machado, 2007, p. 56).

To conclude about the idea of great value given to the empirical details in the new media art, Machado manifests that with the boom of electronic technologies, art seems reduced -except from, naturally, some few powerful and disturbing experiences- to certain professional skills, while at the same time the technical ability took the place of the most radical attitudes. And he completes that in the environment of the relation between art and technology; only few events could overtake the inevitable industrial framing, looking to confront the most profound inquiries of our time (Machado, 2007, p. 56).

For Machado, the description of an artist who, in Adorno's terms, was taken as a "vedette" (Adorno, 1968, p. 66), would nowadays correspond to a generation of uninformed yuppies that today produces multimedia pieces, uses devices of no-linear edition, diagrams its homepages in internet but never saw a movie of Vertov, never read Artaud, never heard about Beckett, or touched a "bicho" of Lygia Clark (Machado, 2007, p. 56).

As well as Adorno saw a conflict when he perceived that the technique made possible that even the worst movie were presented objectively as an art piece (Adorno, 1968, p. 68), for the present time the same consideration is applicable:

According to Machado we must define with more severe and rigorous criteria to separate the weed from the wheat in the slippery territory of the technological aesthetics, in order to differentiate and privilege works that mark our time, works that bring an effective contribution and gilder, works that, finally, point to perspectives of invention, freedom and knowledge (Machado, 2007, p. 56).

And, as well as Adorno pointed to the danger of declaring art every manifestation done inside the cultural industry, for Machado, the challenge of the new media art doesn't lay in a mere naïve apology of the current possibilities of creation. New media art, on the contrary, must trace a clear difference between what is an industrial production of pleasant stimulus for the mass media, and on the other side, the search for an ethic and an aesthetic for the electronic age (Machado, 2007, p. 17)

More precisely, regarding the difficult production of autonomous art inside the new media, it is important to point to the fact that nowadays manifestations like the net.art or web art are cheaply produced and freely exposed to the public of the wide spectrum of the virtuality. Art is being produced like never before, and without the intervention not only of interests of the cultural industry and also of the artistic institution.

This way, the ultimate solution for the most radical shapes of art can exist only inside its non-commercial character, as it was exposed in Martha Rosler's, as well as in Adorno's ideas.

And by doing so it questions more effectively not just the cultural industry but in a broader extension, the whole society, being this the role that art is called to play.

CONCLUSION

The question "How can there be poetry after Auschwitz, or, indeed, pace Adorno, after television?" (Rosler, 2010) is explained by the similarity that Adorno found between the hitlerian ideals and the television (Adorno, 1947, pp. 16-17), as well as with the art emerged within the cultural industry.

It will not be enough to keep mentioning the importance of the context in which Adorno produced his critiques to art of the cultural

industry: His context is the one of a person who lived and thought Auschwitz and who even lost his friend and intellectual partner Walter Benjamin in 1940, who committed suicide in the border between Spain and France, trying to escape from the Nazis (Gagnebin, p.1982).

In this personal context of Adorno, it is intuitively understandable how his search for a place for art turned to be a capital search for answers to oppose the horror of human cruelty. Doing so, Adorno insisted in the autonomy of art, maintaining it as a manifestation that emerges pure from any human dimension, apart in its own character and justified by its mere existence.

Perhaps trying to find a place where to rest from the horror, Adorno fought for a utopian untouched place called art.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (1968). *Résumé über kulturindustrie*. In Adorno, T. W. (Ed.), *Ohne leitbild- parva aesthetira* (pp. 60–70). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Adorno, T. W. (1970). *Ästhetische theorie*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1947). *La industria cultural. Iluminismo como mistificación de las masas*. Retrieved June 26, 2011, from <http://www.cholonautas.edu.pe/modulo/upload/Adorno%20Horkheimer.pdf>
- Gagnebin, J.M. (1982). *Walter Benjamin os Cacos da História*. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Editora Brasiliense s.a. (Translation German to Portuguese Sônia Salzstein our translation to English)
- Machado, A. (2007). *Arte e mídia*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Jorge Zahar Editor.
- Rosler, M. (2010). *Take the money and run? Can political and socio-critical art 'survive'?* e-Flux Journal, 12. Retrieved June 26, 2011, from <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/view/107>

ENDNOTES

- 1 Electromechanical broadcasts began in Germany in 1929, but were without sound until 1934, according to Wikipedia.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_television
- 2 I will deepen in the last ideas reflected by Adorno since 1962 that were published in the text “Résumé über Kulturindustrie”, 1968, and I will disregard the first manuscript because

assumedly, it was enoughly revisited until the last ideas of the author.

- 3 As an isolated aspect, Adorno mentions in 1947 the political implication of an art being produced inside a system that supports the investments in technical effects, but which, at the same, doesn't find the resources for the abolishment of hunger (Adorno, 1947, p. 11).

Claudia Sandoval Romero is a Colombian artist and theoretician currently installed in Vienna, Austria. She is a social communicator and journalist of the Valle University, Colombia, and a master in multimedia arts for the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil. She is also a candidate for the title of Doctor at the University of Applied Arts in Vienna with a dissertation about Benjamin and the Aura in the new media art, and a candidate to the title of Master in Critical Studies at the Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna. Claudia Sandoval Romero has published her inquiries about art in the current time, as well as about photography, in both academic and cultural magazines in Colombia, Spain, Mexico, England, Germany, the USA and Brazil. As an artist, she works with photography and web art and has participated in exhibitions in Germany, Brazil, Colombia and Serbia.