Michael J. Lecker
Field: Mass Culture and Urban Space
Chair: Dr. Timothy Gibson
Fall 2010

Mass culture theories vary in their perspective and object choice; each has its own history and trajectory. Within this field I limit my scope to mass culture theorists engaging with the relationship between structures and subjects. Most theorists acknowledge both as pertinent but thoroughly examine only half of the dichotomy. Cultural theorists define subjects' existence and their agency within capitalist produced structures in wildly different fashions depending on which half is studied. Within this discussion, I explore how theories regarding mass culture's production and consumption have informed (and have themselves been informed by) discussions of the production and consumption of urban spaces. In this way, this field recognizes that the discussion of urban space has always played a significant and central role in larger discussions of mass culture, and has recently gained renewed attention within critical and cultural theory. The first half of the field thus focuses on the major arguments within the structure/subject dialogue in mass culture theories. The second half then narrows in on the influences, trajectory, and impact of geographers within cultural studies, particularly around questions of the production, appropriation, negotiation, and transformation of not only cultural commodities, but also urban spaces and places.

I begin with Karl Marx's account of industrial capitalism's rise and the subsequent alienating of subjects from themselves, their labor, and their culture. I move to Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Siegfried Kracauer, and Walter Benjamin of the Frankfurt School and their diverse accounts of the way institutions influence population in order to create the (passive?) masses and situate the public for the exploitation of their labor. Jürgen Habermas breaks away

from this trajectory by showing how reason could but fails to combat the irrationality of the system described by the Frankfurt School. As a backlash against studying structures, the Birmingham School, including Stuart Hall, Dick Hebdige, and David Morley, discuss mass culture as a site of ideological struggle between producers and consumers. Their models consider the consumer as active. Their influence within the field sparked others, most notably John Fiske and Ien Ang, into theorizing and investigating the audience and how they negotiate meaning. From here I examine political economists, such as Mark Andrejevic and Sut Jhally, who discuss how the industry transfers audiences into a source of labor. Other political economists, such as Robert McChesney, Vincent Mosco, and Herbert Schiller argue that economic strategies of monopolization, global saturation, and exportation of products and structures of thinking adversely affect political thought and cultural production.

The theories referenced above can easily be, and often have been, applied to the study of urban space. Capitalists produce both mass culture and urban space to suit its purposes, leaving subjects to navigate, acculturate, or appropriate within the systems provided. Marx, Benjamin, and Kracauer were early commentators on capitalism's impact on space, either altering it to enhance productivity and reduce turnover times, or for the promotion and celebration of consumption. David Harvey draws upon Marxism and critical theory to examine the historical geography of capitalism and the inequalities, which result in the production of space suited to the needs of capital. His work began a long trajectory of other theorists, such as Neil Smith, Sharon Zukin, and Don Mitchell, each of whom examine the production of space and its impact on subjects on a global, national, and local scale. The work of these geographers contributes to questions raised by political economists. Differing in focus, cultural geographers such as Doreen

Massey and Peter Jackson draw on the work of Michel DeCerteau, the Birmingham School, and feminists to examine how subjects navigate and alter spaces that seek to exclude them.

Karl Marx

I begin with Karl Marx not only because he has been the most influential theorist within the study of mass culture, but also because he provides insight into the dramatic impact capitalism has on structures and subjects. He establishes culture as a struggle between classes; capitalists currently dominate the proletariat. The idea of culture as a struggle never leaves the study of mass culture; the amount power thought to be possessed by the proletariat and the bourgeoisie however alters. Marx's first-hand account of the shift toward industrial capitalism shows the capitalist economic structure as weakening traditional (proletariat) culture and subjectivities through false consciousness via social structures and the unifying and pervasive mass culture. His political economic examination and documentation of industrial capitalism and its affects on subjects provided the groundwork for critical studies of mass culture and its subjects and still provokes academics today to debate the detrimental affects of capitalism.

Marx argues that humanity's relationship to labor is its species-being; subjects' relation to labor thus shapes culture. Capitalism, a bifurcated system of wage-laborers and owners of capital, alters this relationship through the imposition of private property, wage labor, and the commodity form. Laborers enter the capitalist mode of production, selling their labor for wages. Their labor joins other commodities in the market, where they relationally define each other's monetary-defined exchange value, instead of being defined by their use value or utility. Through continual selling, labor becomes externalized and alienated from the individual and exploited by

capitalists; laborers become separated from their species-being and become objectified, valued for their reproducible commodified labor. [1] Concurrently, the commodity form, through exchange value, hides the labor that created it, becomes personified, and satisfies newly manufactured wants and desires.[2] Further division of labor creates more severely alienated subjects and distributes the proletariat geographically;[3] this suppresses collectivity and provides capitalists access to more consumers and laborers.[4] The double process of expanding production and consumption within and without the current market destroys older ways of being and replaces them with capitalist ways of living; a process called "subsumption."[5]

In *Theses on Feuerbach*, Marx writes that to understand society, the individual must be understood. Subjects' conscious actions form social structures and states. However, because capitalists own subjects' species-being, the proletariat has a capitalist and false consciousness. In other words, alienation caused by wage labor and division of labor separates subjects from themselves. Because subjectivity is "nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into form of thought," the subject adopts a false bourgeoisie consciousness through living in a capitalist society Thus the ruling class, through creating material conditions, alters society's subjectivity and therefore the dominant ideas of the epoch.[6] In this theorization, Marx gestures that individuals must be studied, but quickly states that subjects are determined because the means of production are not theirs'. [7] He writes, "The mode of production…is a definitive from of activity for these individuals, a definitive form of expressing their life, a definitive mode of life on their part…. What they are, therefore, coincides with what they

---

[1] Karl Marx "Capital," "Theories of Surplus Value," and "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts"
[2] Karl Marx "Theories of Surplus Value" 429-430 and "Capital" 458-462
[3] The proletariat is originally an urban subject.
[4] Karl Marx "The German Ideology" 177-8
[5] Karl Marx *The Communist Manifesto* 248-250
[6] Karl Marx "Capital" 257 and "The German Ideology" 192
[7] Karl Marx "The German Ideology" 171

produce and with how they produce."[8] Capitalist defined subjects continually create social structures and the State through their everyday existence.[9] His focus solely on structures and not the actions and consciousness of the proletariat then seems justified. Social existence can be known by examining the system that places a false consciousness on subjects. Marx's theory makes movements towards the role of other institutions and from within society, but never moves beyond the over-determining power of production.[10]

Mass culture is a product of capitalism; Marx's explanation of capitalism's impact on subjects' world provides a base to critique mass culture as aiding in the production of false consciousness and replicating the ruling class's ideas as *the* ideas. The capitalist mode of production creates contradictions and crises produced by a harmful and over-producing system; mass culture forms suture the contradictions and distract the proletariat from their domination. Marx writes that the fragility and instability of capitalisms will eventually cause its own violent destruction, however he aims to speed the process.[11] For this to happen, the proletariat must unify and overthrow capitalist modes of production. Communists and academics can work for the proletariat by revealing the contradictions in capitalism and commonalities that proletariats have.[12] Theorists of mass culture see mass culture as an avenue to revealing capitalism's damaging, suturing, and distracting work. Exposing mass culture's role in the domination of the proletariat could serve as a catalyst to the revolution that destroys all capitalist ways and allows the natural production-for-self to occur.[13]

---

[8] Idib. 177
[9] Idib. 180
[10] Karl Marx "Grundrisse"
[11] Idib. 422
[12] Karl Marx *The Communist Manifesto* 255
[13] Karl Marx "The German Ideology" 182

The Frankfurt School

The Frankfurt School developed around the idea of "formulating the negative in the epoch of transition (the end of Germany's Weimer Republic and the rise of National Socialism)."[14] To fight against National Socialism impeding victory, they looked to Marx to insight revolt through creating a dialectical relationship between praxis and theory; the unification of the two would create a revolutionary force that worked against capitalism's weaknesses.[15] This process was undergone not by creating a totalizing theory of culture, but through writing a series of critiques of other writers, the philosophical tradition of reason, and culture. They broke away from traditional Marxism, which was more concerned with party politics than a sustained critique of capitalism. They revised and adjusted Marx's theory for the current economic situation of growing monopolies, rising mass culture, and state intervention to secure capitalism.[16] They continued Marx's critique of capitalism's alienating forms (commodity production and waged labor) and bourgeois ideology but contemporized his theory by discussing the cultural industry and modernist aesthetics.

In perhaps their most influential work, *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer critique the enlightenment project, which was meant to liberate subjects from tradition, myth, religion and superstition through a rational and progress-driven exposition of knowledge. Instead rationality of enlightenment is used as an instrumental tool to economically and socially dominate subjects more efficiently and comprehensively. It does so by reducing all subjects to quantifiable terms (and all objects as quantifiably relatable),[17] thus creating an ideology to support the division of labor and the molding of self to the technocratic

---

[14] Horkheimer "Foreword" xxv
[15] Martin Jay *The Dialectic Imagination* 1-4
[16] Idib. 41-44
[17] Subjects and objects are reduced to exchange values.

regime. Enlightenment's gestures towards liberation and human rights sutures and hides the gaps between the ideals of Enlightenment and its practice. By doing this, the enlightenment sustains capitalism's domination and degradation of culture, people, and the planet.[18] The production of subjects and commodities becomes a well-organized process, creating homogeneity and conformity.[19]

As part of this system of "total administration," the culture industry's owners spread capitalism's ideologies because they rely on the power, raw goods, and capital of traditional industries. They reinforce homogeneity and conformity by further destroying traditional culture and replacing it with a unified mass culture that creates sources of identification and integration with the system. All "free time" is now dominated by leisure activities created by industry; the creation of one's own culture is removed from the subject's consciousness.[20] No one escapes mass culture because it is ubiquitous and hails everyone. It becomes the way subjects learn about their world. Industries divert legitimate personal desires to manufactured desires. The industry then supplies products said to satisfy these desires. However, these products never actually satisfy subjects, instead they create a momentary release causing subjects to continually consume false solutions to heart-felt desires for inclusion, identity, and happiness.[21] From here, Adorno and Horkheimer write that hobbies and leisure activities become appendages of work; they sustain and distract the exhausted and defeated subject, allowing the system to be replicated tomorrow. The subject feels satiated by entertainment; it serves to dull his feeling and make him or her feel rested and refreshed.[22]

---

[18] Herbert Marcuse replicates this discussion in *One Dimensional Man,* but relies on Karl Marx's discussion of capitalism's expansion, not Adorno or Horkheimer.
[19] Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno *Dialectic of Enlightenment* 1-13, 28-9
[20] J. M. Bernstein "Introduction" *4-5*
[21] Theodor Adorno "On the Fetish Character in Music and Regression of Listening" *33-5* and "The Schema of Mass Culture" 83 and Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno *Dialectic of Enlightenment* 95-6
[22] Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno *Dialectic of Enlightenment* 94-104

Mass-produced art lacks art's original use value; exchange value destroys art's pre-capitalist function of creating tension within subjects.[23] Art no longer challenges, disturbs, or ceases real emotion within subjects. Instead it satiates false needs and makes subjects feel safe within the destructive capitalist system.[24] This repression of emotion causes subjects to repress what is felt, but is not provided by or created by the cultural industries. Subjects who lose the ability to feel and create on their own also lose the ability to consciously perceive, critically think, concentrate, and imagine; "if no one can speak, then no one can listen."[25] Reified capitalist abstractions become affective responses. Because of this process, subjects cannot or refuse to experience what is not already within the system, thus limiting possibilities. Mass produced art serves to integrate and indoctrinate subjects.

Although Adorno and Horkheimer's theory of the subject within capitalism appears to be overly deterministic, it is not. Instead, their theory provides an examination of capitalism's detrimental effects on culture and subjectivity. Adorno through an empirical study dismisses the deterministic theory as too simplistic. Spectacle are consumed for enjoyment, this is for sure, but they do so with reluctance; "it is obvious that the integration of consciousness and free time has not yet succeeded. The real interests of individuals are strong enough to resist, within certain limits, total inclusion."[26] Subjects, not fully incorporated, can become aware of their subjugated role through the contradictions existing within the system and work towards freedom.[27] Artists can manifest this in cultural products that work against the system by rejecting style,

---

[23] Theodor Adorno "On the Fetish Character in Music and Regression of Listening" 36-8
[24] Theodor Adorno "How to Look at Television" 161
[25] Theodor Adorno ""On the Fetish Character in Music and Regression of Listening" 30
       Herbert Marcuse replicates this discussion in *One Dimensional Man* and focuses on society's ability to hinder social change through inclusion, distraction, and pleasure.
[26] Theodor Adorno "Free Time" 196-7
[27] Theodor Adorno "Free Time" 197

consumption, and form, while highlighting contradictions and injustices.[28] The product of this rejection is a source of contention within the Frankfurt School. Horkheimer and Adorno contend that capitalist technology, when divorced from capitalist relations will not serve subjects; the system mutilates subjectivity and cannot be used to any other use. Herbert Marcuse writes that the irrational system will eventually cease to function. Technology can break from producing capitalism's false needs system to create a process that satisfies real needs and reduces the amount of labor needed.[29] Adorno writes that subjects have the potential to see culture's contradictions and through this reject the system, while Marcuse simply awaits capitalism to collapse on itself. Unlike Walter Benjamin and Siegfried Kracauer, neither fully describes satisfactorily how subjects could free themselves.

Walter Benjamin agrees that industrial capitalism's technological and geographical developments alter cultural landscapes to capture subjects, but explicitly shows how this also provides subjects' the potential to reveal capitalist constructs. The shift from art being produced by a person to art being technologically reproduced destroyed art's aura, the space created by its eternal, original, place-based, and temporally removed-from-the-everyday characteristics. The aura separated the artifact from the masses. Its destruction allows consumers a closer relationship to art, uncritically allowing it to become part of them. The culture industry capitalizes on this by aesthetizing politics to manipulate subjects and invade their everyday lives (a la national socialism in Germany). This, however, is not the only possible result. The aura's demise and arts' commodification can expose capitalism's phantasmagoria by allowing the viewer to stop, examine, and feel capitalism's impact on and destruction of culture, as Eugene Atget's non-

---

[28] Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno *Dialectic of Enlightenment* 103-4
[29] Herbert Marcuse *One Dimensional Man*

reverent photographs do.[30] Similarly, the *flaneur*[31] has potential to maneuver outside of capitalism's intended subject positions. The *flaneur's* position differs from that of a garden-variety window-shopper, because his actions do not reveal capitalism's influence; rather, his actions refute capitalism's attempt to capture his attention; he meanders through the capital-saturated streets, lost in thought. Cultural producers saturate space with advertisements and construct routes of consumption to deter the *flaneur's* unproductive loitering and wandering within the capitalist system.[32] Eventually, argues Benjamin, capitalists captured the *flaneur* by diverting foot traffic into the arcades, which celebrated commodities and disguised fetishization as entertainment. In the walkways, the flaneur became fascinated by the phantasmagoric, becoming a connoisseur and advertiser, making product knowledge desirable and window-shopping a hobby.[33] Benjamin shows how the photographer and *flaneur* both have the potential to reveal or ignore the phantasmagoric, but also potential to serve capitalists' needs.[34] The outcome depends on the subject, who will more likely than not be manipulated by the system.

For his part, Siegfried Kracauer positions subjects as under bourgeoisie domination, which undermines nature and replaces the organic with the calculable subject of the enlightenment. This subject can and does easily fit into the capitalist production process. The subject conforms to the system and never sees the system as a whole, only their part in the

---

[30] Photographs themselves do not inherently reveal phantasmagoria. However, a photographer who produces unsentimental photography can make the natural world stop and allow subjects to see the capitalist construct of the world. This opens a space for critique as every spectator viewing the photograph could be shown capitalism at its most honest. The radical potential that lies within this is that photography, unlike other high arts, could be possessed by the masses (Walter Benjamin "The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility" and "Little History of Photography").

[31] The flaneur is the aimless walker of the early twentieth century streets. In this era, space changing from focusing on the production of goods to selling of goods. This transition to a consumer includes the rise of the consumer spectacle, the phantasmagoric, which became integrated into street and everyday life.

[32] Susan Buck-Morrs "The Flaneur, the Sandwichman and the Whore"

[33] Buck-Morrs gendered Benjamin's flaneur to discuss how women in public feel surveyed, censured, constrained, and were presumed to be or were whores. Buck-Morrs affirms Benjamin's desire to see loitering as a marginal position that allows reflection on and refusal of society, but recognizes the gender privilege (Susan Buck-Morrs "The Flâneur, the Sandwichman and the Whore").

[34] Walter Benjamin *"The Flaneur"* and "Paris"

production process.[35] This fracturing, along with mass culture, overpowers memory and distracts subjects from reality.[36] This fracturing and conforming domination reveals itself in "surface-level expressions," which depict how a culture functions, the economic base, cultural hierarchies, dominant ideals, and subjects as alienated and sacrificing themselves to the larger mechanized order (the reality).[37] Despite cultural domination, Kracauer does not position the subject as passive, but as a molded and still cognizant. Because surface-level expressions reveal more than they conceal, mindful consumers can see past the spectacle and into the injustice and oppression in contemporary life. Yet at the same time, capitalists use sentimentalism and spectacle to make the bourgeoisie position amiable and desirable, hindering this revelation.[38]

Kracauer examines a similar potential in his discussion of space. Different spaces position subjects differently; suburbanites move with purpose due to the distance between spaces, while city dwellers move more aimlessly. Both face rising standardization in the experience of time, space, and commodities available, but location alters their experience and time spent on capitalists' desired routes.[39] The standardization of experience causes alienation from their particularity. Alienation can cause subjects to seek momentary relief through religion, group politics, or commodities, which promise the truth, but ultimately distract.[40] Subjects can avoid these momentary satiations by committing to "hesitant openness," a position of repose and reflection in a system that creates subjectivities and spectacular spaces that attempt to deter contemplation.[41] Certain spaces and moods facilitate hesitant openness, such as the aimless hotel

---

[35] Siegfried Kracauer "The Mass Ornament" 78
[36] Siegfried Kracauer "The Little Shopgirls Go to the Movies," "Photography," and "On Bestsellers and their Audiences"
[37] Siegfried Kracauer "The Mass Ornament" 75-77, 86
[38] Siegfried Kracauer "The Mass Ornament," "The Little Shopgirls Go to the Movies," and "On Bestsellers and their Audiences."
[39] Siegfried Kracauer "Analysis of a City Map" and "Travel and Dance"
[40] Siegfried Kracauer "Group as Bearer of Idea"
[41] Siegfried Kracauer "Those Who Wait," "Boredom," and "Cult of Distraction"

lobby and boredom.[42] Kracauer shows how cultural industries heavily position subjects, but also create potentials to reject that position.

The Frankfurt School provides insight into the role of subjects within capitalist structures. They neither create a totally determined subject or a wildly free subject, but a subject within an irrational, powerful, and shifting system that provides potential forms such as photography, walking, loitering, hotel lobbies, waiting, and boredom, to reject, reveal, reflect on, and perhaps disrupt capitalists' intended use of their being. The relative focus on determining structures versus individual agency among individual theorists depends on their focus. Kracauer, Buck-Morrs, and Benjamin focus on sites of consumption more often than Adorno, Horkheimer, and Marcuse and therefore describe in more detail the potential for subjects to reflect upon, and shape, their social context.

Jürgen Habermas and the Public Sphere

Unlike other members of the Frankfurt School, Jürgen Habermas highlights a benefit of bourgeois Enlightenment, by giving an account of the rise and destruction of the "public sphere," a space between the state and the private sphere, where private citizens gather together as a public to rationally discuss politics and economics. Habermas claims, in early bourgeois society, the private and public self was separated, creating an egalitarian subject position—the "public self." This ideological self-splitting was reflected in the organization of domestic and urban space: houses were reconfigured from open spaces into segregated rooms for public reception and private living. Outside of the home, public discussion spaces, such as salons and coffeehouses, were established throughout cities. Additionally, the press, first established to distribute commercial information (i.e., shipping news, etc.), began to distribute political

---

[42] Siegfried Kracauer "The Hotel Lobby"

information and to fuel discussion of matters of state policy. Habermas saw the public sphere as a fundamentally egalitarian way for all citizens—however restrictive the definition of citizenship at the time—to discuss the political and cultural happenings of the time and more importantly challenge the state's authority by speaking out against the unjust.[43]

Over time, however, the press itself became commercialized, allowing privileged subjects to control content for economic gains, ideological manipulation, and restrict access to the newly created public sphere. This refeudalization of the independent bourgeoisie public sphere ended the potential to use rational debate to counter capitalism's irrationality and state power. Instead, the public sphere began to support the views of private subjects. Newspapers no longer served as a space for public debate, but instead were commercial products that positioned the public into identifying with the concerns of those organized interests who had the means to influence and control the tools of mass communication, most notably the state and the economic elite. Further, as the commercialization of leisure replaced the "world of letters" and parlor discussions that had furnished citizens with the tools to engage effectively in public debates, the passive consumer of news-as-spectacle replaced the active debater-citizen.[44] Ultimately, for Habermas, this model replicates the feudal "publicity," where there was no public sphere; the king—represented this time by organized interests with the means to shape the news media environment—*was* publicness and his concerns were the concerns of the people.[45]

While Habermas raises important theoretical and historical evidence surrounding the rise, possibility, and the death of the public sphere, his discussion is problematically built around documenting structures and the experiences of the white, male, wealthy subject. Habermas's preference for structures leads to a simplified and unified version of the public sphere and

---

[43] Jürgen Habermas *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* 27-35
[44] Idib 169-89
[45] Idib. 5-9

subjectivity. This skews his view of the ideal and the real: he writes that most subjects were treated as equals in the public sphere; that the privatization of the structure closes off participation and ends the potential for subjects to act; and he deemed rational/normative language as the ideal and most effective mode of communication.

Numerous theorists use Habermas's seminal work as an entrance point into the public sphere, but critique Habermas's understanding of the public sphere's structure and his reliance on the bourgeois subject model. Craig Calhoun, Nicholas Garnham, and Michael Schudson critique Habermas's dismissal of mass media's many-to-few communication model as determining and destroying the potential for subjects to act; it may be controlled by few, but it does disseminate information to many more subjects than before, creating a more informed and therefore potentially better democracy for the masses.[46] Habermas's adherence to unified public sphere model and a rational subject is another point of contention. Thomas McCarthy believes that Habermas's construction of the "rational subject"—one that suppresses its private being—is impossible. Subjects cannot suppress at will large part of their subjectivity.[47]

Another major critique is that Habermas' rational subject is actually the private subjectivity of the privileged person. Societal norms construct the ideal citizen, who is the basis for public speech and universal notions. This means that to enter the bourgeoisie public sphere and engage in public debate was to take the position of the normative subject.[48] Non-normative subjects able to engage had to alienate themselves from their own experiences, issues, and concerns and take on the position of the privileged. Marginal concerns never become central or

_____

[46] Craig Calhoun "Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere," Michael Schudson "Was There Ever a Public Sphere?", and Nicolas Garnham "The Media and the Public Sphere"
[47] Thomas McCarthy "Practical Discourse"
[48] It should be mentioned that most non-normative subjects would have never been allowed to engage in public debate.

14

mentioned in public debate.[49] This critique becomes central to theorists examining agency. How can the public sphere serve the public when it excludes the majority of the public? Does it not just reinforce the normative ideal established by the state and elite. By exemplifying "rational" subjectivity, Habermas inadvertently rejects marginalized people and creates an unequal ideal.

In a similar fashion, many theorists argue that Habermas's adherence to the importance of one public sphere over many does not reflect the needs of subjects excluded from the dominant public sphere. Multiple public spheres allow marginalized subjects a place to organize and debate issues concerning them.[50] After the form a strategy and a message, they enter the dominant public sphere and contest their exclusion from it. They argue that Habermas's exclusive belief in the bourgeoisie structure erases the important ways the proletariat and women's public spheres challenged the rational and standardized language and subjects, discussed above.[51]

<center>The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies</center>

The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) was an interdisciplinary program that rejected prescriptive study of culture at the University Birmingham; during its more influential period, Richard Hoggart and then Stuart Hall directed it. Similar to the Frankfurt School, they saw culture was an ideological struggle between the owners and proletariat and believed understanding praxis was integral to the study of culture. Both saw mass culture as a threat to a cultural tradition[52] and as a tool of integration into capitalist culture. The difference

---

[49] Nancy Fraser "Rethinking the Public Sphere," Michael E. Gardiner "Wild Publics and the Grotesque Symposiums," and Michael Warner "The Mass Public and the Mass Subject"

[50] Nancy Fraser "Rethinking the Public Sphere," Mary P. Ryan's "Gender and Public Access," James Bohman "Expanding Dialogue" and Lisa McLaughlin "Feminism and the Political Economy of Transnational Public Sphere"

[51] Mary P. Ryan "Gender and Public Access," Michael E. Gardiner "Wild Publics and the Grotesque Symposiums", Ken Hirschkop "Justice and Drama," John Michael "John Stuart Mill, Free Speech and the Public Sphere," and Geoff Eley "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures"

[52] The Frankfurt School saw mass culture as destroying elite art that provoked emotion and throught, while the CCCS saw mass culture as weakening working class culture.

lies in their object. CCCS examined more closely subjects and the practices of subject (especially youth), while the Frankfurt School focused on capitalist structures' impact on subjects and marginal subjects. This causes the greatest difference between the two. The Frankfurt School sometimes pessimistic examinations shows how structures and mass culture dominates, while the CCCS's examination of how subjects navigate and appropriate cultural domination encourages a focus on moments of negotiation, resistance, and struggle.

The unifying thread among CCCS scholars was the conceptualization of "culture" as a lived experience. Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams, and Pierre Bourdieu served as major influences in the shift towards lived-experience. The CCCS utilized Althusser's theory that ideology manifests itself in subjects' practices rather than merely existing as a system of floating ideas. They however disliked Althusser theory of an overly determined subject and unified ruling class. Instead, CCCS scholars like Williams and Hall used Gramsci's idea that alliances, not a unified class, constitute the dominant force. Gramsci's, and later Williams', theory of hegemony provided an account of culture impacted by the economic, but not its direct reflection. Instead, cultural meanings and systems were constantly fluctuating and being contested. CCCS scholars theorize and examine subject's lived experiences to contest reductionist thinking and the long held belief that subjects constitute a unified "mass." The masses are not a unified passive group; each subject's experiences and identities create self-meaning. This position dismisses the idea of a universal subject. Instead of relying on a "direct influence" model, as did media sociologists and the Frankfurt School, CCCS scholars viewed culture as a dominating structure that was always struggling to control subjects and was always

being contested by subjects. Groups struggle over whose ideology or system of meaning is to become hegemonic, the commonsensical worldview.[53]

Antonio Gramsci theorizes culture as how subjects understand their world and live their lives. He, like Marx, is invested in praxis. Unlike Marx, he spends a considerable amount of time detailing the subject and how the subject's consciousness impacts social and economic structures. Subjects create their consciousness and culture through experience, common sense, the organization of life, and more formal knowledge, such as education, morality, and law. Culture, the way of living, is hegemonic, in that it mostly reflects the ideals of dominant groups. Yet at the same time, dominant groups can never exert complete control on the ideas circulating within society. As a result, alternative and oppositional ideas and values always exist and contest the hegemony of dominant ideologies. The incompleteness occurs partly because the ruling class is not a united front; leaders within various institutions or factions reinforce the general dominant ideals, but fluctuate on details and emphasis because they are differently positioned subjects. The focus on praxis does not negate the power of the economic, which is central to praxis but not determinant. Those with economic resources fund cultural institutions and people to proselytize their interests, morality, and thoughts in hopes that this will convert "the masses." Despite this happening, Gramsci reminds us that this does not translate into total control over the debate or the elimination of all alternatives. Indeed, to remain in a position of hegemony (or leadership) the ruling alliance must continually promote and adjust their ideas, incorporating significant elements of alternative and oppositional ideologies, while concurrently marginalizing more radical ideas. Failing to do so could allow alternatives to gain influence and effectively contest the alliance's position of leadership and authority within social institutions. Common sense is the

---

[53]Stuart Hall "Cultural Studies and the Centre" and "Introduction to Media Studies at the Centre" and David Morley "Texts, Readers, Subjects"

exemplar to describe how hegemony works. No one forces subjects to believe in common sense. Though experiences within the system and with other subjects, subjects learn this cultural form, which more-often-than-not reinforces the dominant ideology. Common sense is not imposed, but learned and lived. Gramsci describes ideology as the way certain sets of ideas and assumptions (organizing forces) become dominant material forces in society and become enveloped into hegemony, which is composed of the fractured ideologies of a class at a particular time along with residual and emerging alternatives.[54]

Stuart Hall writes that Gramsci's main contribution to cultural theory and impact on the CCCS was developing the role of leadership in maintaining hegemony. The state and economic leaders maintain the current hegemony through actively creating consensus, which is based upon the vast premises and assumptions that have accumulated in the culture's language and logic. They negotiate struggles through legitimating common sense and assimilating alternatives before they become too powerful. Mass culture promotes the hegemonic position because it supposes itself as representing general (commonsensical) interests. Ideology should not be thought of as imposed, but actively practiced by the people. The economic, political, ideological influences need to be examined, but academics should conceive of ideology as relatively autonomous and not determined.[55] Consent is given to governance because commons sense and civility reinforces it. Additionally, the state provides "benefits," while also disciplining and educating "undisciplined" subjects. This theory of culture allows for structural change and subject potential, but does not forget that economic domination and the state largely control hegemony.[56] Ideology is not economically determined, but tends towards upper-class articulations. Tendencies

---

[54] Bennett, Tony et al. "Antonio Gramsci"
[55] Stuart Hall "The Rediscovery of Ideology" 80-88
[56] Bennett, Tony et al. "Antonio Gramsci"

are inclinations, not absolutes. This degree of difference reintroduced struggle through articulation and re-articulation.[57]

Hall remarks that use of "tendencies" breaks cultural theory away from the earlier Marxists inability to explain consent or agency.[58] Subjects within a coherent system with firm alliances are unlikely going to question the ideologies in place. The contradictions that arise will likely be easily incorporated. It is when the leadership and alliances weaken that meanings can be contested more easily. During these times, subjects gain knowledge of their own subject formation; this occurs when the State resorts to coercion and reveals how power shapes subjects. This knowledge reveals the constructed and unnaturalness of the current conditions. New ideas that promote their position can be created. These new ideas or activities can alter other subjects' perception, causing change within the system. This new understanding of self can become the new common sense. It is with this view of the subject that culture becomes the space of struggle over meaning and praxis; the winning group's values become nearly universal.[59]

As discussed above, the work of Louis Althusser exerted an important influence on the CCCS in its earlier years, particularly in his writings on ideology. In his essay on "ideological state apparatuses," Althusser explores ideology and its role in replicating the means of production, relations of production, and productive forces. The state and societal structures act in the interest of the ruling class through two types of apparatuses: the repressive state apparatus and ideological state apparatuses. The repressive state apparatus predominately uses the threat of violence to curb subjects from transgressing the imposed ideology, which is the manifestation of a class's position. This alone does not effectively repress subjects. Ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) control subjects predominately through indoctrination. This sustains the subject's

---

[57] Stuart Hall "The Rediscovery of Ideology" 80-81
[58] Idib. 85
[59] Bennett, Tony et al. "Antonio Gramsci"

imaginary relation to the means of production and social conditions. The idea of an imposed ideology replicates the manipulation model preferred by the Frankfurt School and rejected by Gramsci.

Althusser further distances himself for Gramsci when he closes the system and states that despite contradictions and multiple perspectives, the ideological system is unified. He writes that it must be unified or the ruling class would quickly lose power. He closes the system further by theorizing subjects as *always already* interpolated by ISAs. Before an individual is born it is made a subject through its family's name. The system hails subjects; subjects recognize their position within the system and comply. This is how ideology manifests itself in the material; individuals believe in the ideology and act in the dictated fashion.[60] If the subject did not, he/she will feel guilt, distraught, or fractured. Althusser's theory is unlike Gramsci's in that the subject appears dominated to the point of being determined. Oddly, Althusser does write that ISAs are the places of class struggle; if a subject refuses to replicate the system then the reproduction of the relations of production could halt.[61] This seems like a gesture towards agency more than anything else; Althusser never mentions a moment where the subject could refuse. The CCCS used Althusser to discuss how ideology works; discourses "produc[e], not knowledge, but a recognition of the things we already knew."[62] Mass culture and other institutions reify the current ideologies and therefore hide their constructed nature. Additionally, the CCCS was inspired by Althusser's concept that subjects' practices (a type of signification) produce ideology continually. It is through doing that ideology becomes real; "Meaning was…conditional on the work of signification being successfully conducted through a social practice."[63]

---

[60] This aspect of Althusser's theory is similar to Gramsci's.
[61] Louis Althusser "Ideology and the Ideological State Apparatus"
[62] Stuart Hall "The Rediscovery of Ideology" 75
[63] Stuart Hall "The Rediscovery of Ideology" 77

Like Gramsci, Raymond Williams intervenes in the base/superstructure narrative that places the superstructure as a strict replication of the economic base. He argues that Marx never actually articulated this flawed model.[64] Instead, Marx argued that subject inevitable enter definitive relations based off the mode of production; the economic structure is the foundation or base of subject's relationality, which shapes their being and society's state. The base sets limits and exerts pressures on the subject's consciousness; a capitalist mode of production creates capitalist relation, which causes subjects to think like capitalists. Out of this process, the superstructure emerges. The superstructure is the collection of solidified institutions and practices (legislative, legal, religious, entertainment, and educational) that reflect subjects' actions and consciousness.[65] Conflicts, contradictions, and struggles within superstructures could appear, but the prevalent capitalist subjectivity hinders subjects' capacity or willingness to contest societal practices. The base/superstructure relationship is an active field of unevenly determining forces.[66] To explain why the base cannot completely control the superstructure, Williams relies on Gramsci's notion of hegemony, the multiplicity of central practices, meanings, perceptions, expectations, and values that saturate subjects' consciousnesses and allows for some alternatives and change. This differs from the Frankfurt's account of subjectivity; it is not ideological manipulation or false consciousness, but perceived reality. An effective hegemony has subjects willingly identifying with the system, despite contradictions and fissure within the system and the subject's numerous experiences and views, which cause tension within the system.[67]

---

[64] In "Capitalism, Communication, and Class Relations," Graham Murdock and Peter Golding, make a similar argument, but focus on how capitalism does not determine, but limits.
[65] Karl Marx "Preface to *A Critique of Political Economy*" 425
[66] Raymond Williams *Marxism and Literature* 75-82
[67] Raymond Williams "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory" 37-40

Williams' approach allows for shifts in dominant culture. Forms (genres, tropes, practices, and ideas) and organizations appear timeless, but must be examined to map change. Forms shape subjects' worldviews and consciousness.[68] Within the cultural field, dominant, residual, and emergent forms (ideas, practices, etc.) coexist. Residuals forms were created in the past, but are still active within the current culture. They are traditions that are not in congruence with the dominant ideology. The residual form can serve as a space to contest the dominant, but usually is not very effective due to elements of it being incorporated into dominant ideology. For example, the ideal of living in a small rural community is no longer practical, however politicians and citizens alike still use this convention to either show authenticity or promote "American values." Emergent forms are new meanings, feelings, relations that continually appear. They exist outside of the dominant ideology and challenge it by revealing the existence of alternatives and exposing contradictions and power relations. It is with emergent forms that the most potential to change meaning and economic relations. Williams notes though that dominant culture incorporates elements of the emergent to de-radicalize its message and further marginalize radicals within the group.[69]

Raymond Williams sees art and literature as key to the promotion and contestation of dominant forms. The dominant class uses its power to produce forms that reinforce dominant "structures of feelings," the way subjects actively lives, through feeling and believing, their worldview.[70] Through this process, art becomes part of the base—in short, an indispensible part of capital accumulation—and not merely an epiphenomenal part of the superstructure. This is

---

[68] Raymond Williams "Literature and Sociology" 16-17
[69] Raymond Williams "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory" 42-45 and *Marxism and Literature* 121-127
[70] Raymond Williams *Marxism and Literature* 132

because art serves a major role in the production of subjects.[71] At the same time, subjects can challenge dominant culture using art and literature to illustrate and spread new structures of feeling.[72] Upon receiving these emergent forms, people could incorporate these new meanings and relations into the subjectivity. This creates a contradiction between themselves and the mode of production, which producing the possibility of contesting the "base" of society.[73]

Interestingly, Williams places the means of communication as a means of production; they are socially and materially produced and produce subjects. The means of control lie within the ability to amplify and expand the duration of messages through controlling access to communication. To illustrate this he documents the rise of advertising and its impact on subjectivity. Advertising organizes subjects into more predictable markets; it alters the dominant subjectivity into a consumer-oriented subjectivity. The activism and power subjects seek is then through consumption; an increase in consumption is thought of as an increase in lifestyle quality; other human needs are ignored. Through this and the gaining power financial power of advertising, advertisers dictate both form and content, reifying dominant values and strengthening exchange value. Yet at the same time, Williams argues that there is the potential for subjects to become frustrated within the always-promising-never-fulfilling system and ask for something else. Through mass-produced and lower costing technology, collectives could form to create and broadcast their own, more democratic, messages, at a lower amplification and

---

[71] For this reason, Williams discounts consumption-based theories examining the impact of texts on consumers. This overlooks the production, form, and conditions of practice, which create the texts. He advocates for historical analysis to discover the political and economic shifts within the system; this allows an examination of where potential for change could have occurred, but was incorporate (Raymond Williams "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory" and *Marxism and Literature.)*

[72] In "The Bloomsbury Faction," Raymond Williams documents the rise of the Bloomsbury faction in mid-nineteenth century England, where a new consciousness within the bourgeoisie formed from professional and cultural reform in England. The Bloomsbury faction discussed the rampant hypocrisy within the country's institutions through current and altered forms creating a new structure of feeling.

[73] Raymond Williams "Literature and Sociology" 42-45 and *Marxism and Literature 121-127*

duration. Human creativity and labor become the way to new forms of relating, communicating, means of production, and structures of feeling.[74]

Later, Raymond Williams discusses why this potential is hardy ever realized. Subjects' social needs, purposes, historical trajectory, precedent, and current uses of technology shape the use of and production of new technology. They create limits on new technology's possibilities. This is why most forms of technology follow the mobile, privatized, and illusionary self-sufficient model and do not cause social upheaval; potentially revolutionary technology will most likely be used to maintain the status quo.[75] Williams created a materialist theory of culture that greatly considered the role of the economy, but did not reduce culture to the mere reflection of the base. He established art, literature, the past, the present, feelings, and subjects as shaping and contesting the dominant ideology and relations of economic exploitation, while never reducing art and culture to a mere epiphenomenal expression of these relations.

Stuart Hall, a leading theorist within the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, examines lived experience within a mass-media saturated world by establishing a foundation to discuss how people read texts. He offers three different reading types, dominant, negotiated, and oppositional. All three reading types depend on the subject, their relation to the text, and their position within society. Producers encode a meaning into the message form (the text). For the embedded meaning to be effective, it must alter lived practice. This may not happen because the message *encoded* in not always the message *decoded*; audiences from different subjectivities will create different types of decoding. Hall quickly interjects that the polysemy occurring is not pluralism; power structures still exist. The dominant decoding, where the encoded message is received, is preferred and institutionalized; it is the ideological reading because it reinforces the

---

[74] Raymond Williams "Means of Communication as Means of Production" and "Advertising: the Magical System"
[75] Raymond Williams *Television*

current uneven power relations.[76] Not only do producers structure texts to create a tendency to the "preferred" interpretation and worldview, but, as Althusser argued, experiences in other ideological institutions (i.e., schools) socialize subjects in ways that privilege some decodings or interpretations over others. A non-privileged or not-fully-integrated subject may cause a different subject position, which allows for misreadings or negotiated readings (some of the dominant message in received, but contradictions are noted). Rarely do people reject the entire meaning, but when it occurs it is deeply political.[77] Subjects who eject one dominant message are more likely to continue reading in an oppositional way, exposing more and more contradictions. Hall theorized a dynamic system that countered opposition readings; the feedback loop is when the audience's reading on the text influences the encoding of future messages. The producers either create more effective forms or the audience can demand different texts/meanings.[78] Fellow CCCS scholars rely on Halls's dynamic model as a theoretical framework to ethnographically study the audience.

The CCCS's commitment to studying culture in concrete ways fostered a heavy reliance on the ethnographic method. It allowed them to see how subjects relate to dominant forms and possibly produce alternative forms. Paul Willis writes that ethnographic work challenges and causes academics to renegotiate or dismiss their theoretic accounts of culture and subjects;[79] it reveals the complexity of and non-uniformity between subjects.[80] For instance, Dorothy Hobson's ethnography of housewives' use and interpretation of media details how gender affects

---

[76] Here, I am relying on John B Thompson's definition of ideology: "the ways in which meaning serves, in particular circumstances, to establish and sustain relations of power which are systemically asymmetrical – what I shall call 'relations of domination'" (John B. Thompson *Ideology and Modern Culture* 7).

[77] In *The Production of Culture*, Diane Crane affirms Hall's theory of encoding/decoding, Bourdieu's concept that media creates and alters tastes, and Negus's description of creative workers impacting cultural products. She adds that social class in only one variance among many that cause audiences to differently interpret texts.

[78] Stuart Hall "Encoding/Decoding"

[79] In *Television, Audiences, and Cultural Studies,* David Morley makes the same argument.

[80] "Paul Willis "Notes On Method"

what texts subjects engage with and how they engage with texts. The disc jockeys they listen to reinforce unequal gender relations. However, women rarely actually carefully listen to the radio; instead they use it as background noise to fight isolation. What is more telling is how women refuse to engage with some forms, such as the news; they dismiss the news as boring and for men. [81] Their lived-experience, as John B. Thompson would describe it, reproduces the "relations of domination."[82]

Similar to Hobson, Phil Cohen uses an ethnographical method to investigate how structural forces, developers' destruction of street and neighborhood culture and creation of isolated private spaces, affects subjects within East London. He explains that the developers actions reflect their middle-class values of property and privacy, not the current residents' working class values of community, collective identity, and extended family. The working-class lacked an organized resistance, since recent factory closures—a product of a more structural deindustrialization in the British economy—also meant that unions disappeared. Youth cultures emerged out of teenagers attempting to create cohesion between their family's Puritanical values and the new hedonistic consumption. Unlike Hobson's housewives, they produced new objects, rituals, and meaning, but similar to the housewives, they could never break free from the contradictions surrounding their lives; the subcultures provided an outlet of expression and little more. Cohen elaborates that the youth culture occurred within this historical moment from this fractured class group; his point is that particularity matters and subjectivity changes. [83]

Similarly, Dick Hebdige investigated the punk subculture's expressive forms, lifestyle, and style, which were appropriated and re-imagined mass-produced symbols. He argues, like Cohen, that working-class youth experience and display the contradictions within culture. They

---

[81] Dorothy Hobson "Housewives and the Mass Media"
[82] John B. Thompson *Ideology and Modern Culture* 7
[83] Phil Cohen "Subcultural Conflict and Working-Class Community"

assault meaning symbols through stripping objects of their original meaning and creating a new

meaning through it or amplifying the already present meaning to show its absurdity. Hebdige

claims that diversity of working-class subcultures after WWII is a demonstration of diverse

subjectivities and positions; again, this claim is similar to Cohen's description of subjectivity.

Hebdige writes that subcultures represent noise; interference in the orderly sequence of dominant

culture that expose the arbitrary system. Despite his celebratory tone, Hebdige writes that

subcultures do not change the system, but attempt to cope with their subjugated position; they

create noise and disrupts but the superstructures still exist and sometime subsume them.[84]

The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies: Audience Studies and Active Audiences

At the same time, the copings mechanism discussed by early CCCS theorists like

Hebdige did not go far enough in conceptualizing active "resistance" for some theorists. Building

off of Hall's discussion of oppositional readings and Michel de Certeau's *The Practice of*

Everyday Life, Paul Willis, Iain Chambers, and John Fiske focus on the consumption of culture

to create a theory that elaborates on the potential for resistance and struggle that lies within

consuming products.

French philosopher Michel de Certeau massively influenced English-reading academics

as *The Practice of Everyday Life* theorizes a bourgeois constructed world where subjects

navigate power structures in order to "make do." He dismisses the idea of passive subjects, who

simply absorb the bourgeois-created world. He writes against theories using only societal

structures to discuss what subjects do; these theories miss subjects' maneuverability and actual

practices. However, subjects are not free to wholly reject the bourgeoisie world and create their

---

[84] Dick Hebdige *Subculture the Meaning of Style*

own system.[85] They function within the system where institutions and companies produce

meanings that saturate urban places. Subjects entering spaces of bourgeois power experience the

texts provided, but do not wholly conform to the meanings within these texts. Consumption is an

active moment of meaning production. Subjects' interests, desires, memories, and failure or

refusal to pay attention block or alter meanings. Their time in a space allows for occupation and

a momentary alteration of spaces and products. The temporal nature of tactics means the

alteration is fleeting. Subjects cannot permanently reside in the fictional reality. It is within the

system that they must negotiate a place.[86]

Drawing on the work of de Certeau, Paul Willis, Iain Chambers[87], and John Fiske[88] focus

solely on consumption and celebrate "tactics of the ordinary," whether it is interpreting texts

oppositionally or whether it is engaging in the "poaching" of fandom.[89] Their subjects create

their own meanings and subversive identities out of texts provided by capitalists. Within this

model, being used alters texts and their contained cultural contradictions. This process disavows

---

[85] Michel de Certeau's *The Practice of Everyday Life* xii-xix

[86] Idib. 29-40

[87] Oddly, Chambers states that popular culture is an exclusively urban phenomenon, perhaps this is because the city is more saturated with commodities than the rural.

[88] John Fiske work is partially inspired by Mikhail Bakhtin concept of the self within the system and Rolland Barthes's claim that the author's authority ended. Bakhtin writes that "I" does not have a solid referent; the subject, in daily life, performs it. "I" exists in the space between the system of language and the unique and particular existence of the speaking person. Fiske derives from this that the system never fully captures anyone, allowing him to theorize a wildly free subject. Barthes claims that the modern text with its multiple genres and inspirations removes the author's authority and instills the reader's power. The author loses their subjectivity in the writing process. Textual analysis that examines the author's intent misses the productive work that reader must string together from the written text; the text comes into existence when it is read (enunciated). Language speaks, not the author. (See Michael Holquist *Bakhtin and His World* and Roland Barthes "Death of an Author")

[89] In *Interpreting Audiences,* Shaun Moores details the approaches of and criticism against the CCCS, but quickly dismisses most criticism because it is aimed at the Fiske camp within the CCCS school of thought. He claims Fiske goes too far into the power of symbolic democracy and critiques Hall and Morley for assuming that they know what the ideological encoded message is. These two critiques show the contradictory and confused theoretical stance Moores has. He believes in an active audience to the degree that he does not want to believe in the power of ideology, but at the same time knows that it is negligent to dismiss ideology; therefore ideology is present, but has no power. This is a symptom of theorists only examining consumption; they tend to create overly active audiences.[89]

the intended meaning producers encode, instead subjects produce a plurality of meanings.[90]

Fiske's analysis explains oppressive systems not as oppressing subjects, but as creating

differently positioned subjects, who can use mass culture to express their oppression or

opposition to norms. To Fiske and Chambers, everything individuals do becomes resistance,

such as using marketing jingles to sexually harass women (Fiske) and riding an Italian Vespa

(Chambers).[91] In other words, for these authors, the encoded meaning never reaches the

audience;[92] "knowledge is no longer monolithic, but (instead) differentiates and nomadic."[93]

Fiske misinterprets de Certeau's "making do,"[94] as a position of radical meaning making, instead

of an act committed by a subject to make life bearable. He expands the momentary power de

Certeau details and gives subjects the ability to occupy spaces for as long as they need. Fiske's

theory overtly amplifies subject's powers over structures, making capitalism, patriarchy, and

racism playing grounds for meaning-making.[95]

     These theorists do not deny that texts are commodities and that commercial media now

saturates subjects' lives. However, they write that the commodity form is subverted when it

becomes a text; it becomes a product derived from the audience. The fact that commodities are

everywhere only means that consumers are more comfortable with using them. Fiske states that

---

[90] This argument comes mostly from Fiske's *Understanding Popular Culture* and Chambers's *Popular Culture.* In *Television Culture*, Fiske states that texts do limit the type of reading that can occur, but then spends the rest of the book arguing against this.

[91] Iain Chambers describes all consumption as a deconstruction and reconstruction of texts.

[92] In *Television, Audiences, and Cultural Studies*, David Morley intervenes on a segment of US cultural studies (postmodernists- he includes Fiske in this) that misinterpret Stuart Hall's encoding/decoding and Morley's work on audiences; this group celebrates audiences as actively resistance and never impacted by ideology. Morley writes that audiences interpret texts differently, however their interpretations are within the preferred readings. He states that this segment fails to recognize discursive, cultural, and economic power. Polysemic readings occur, but they are not all resistant and are more often dominant. Fiske's model justifies the existence of oppressive structures because they have no impact.

[93] Iain Chambers *Popular Culture* 193

Chambers elaborates in his conclusion that patriarchy, colonialism, post-colonialism, and capitalisms structures of power are dying. The proof lives in the Third World themes that are abundant in 1980s popular culture.

[94] De Certeau's theory is discussed below.

[95] John Fiske *Understanding Popular Culture* 24-32

buying a commodity is a productive act because subjects contribute to the circulation of meanings they endorse. Consumption is always active and oppositional.[96] Willis claims consumers actually exploit capitalism; capitalism has produced so many commodities that consumers now have a wide array of resources to create their own cultural meanings.[97] Fiske reiterates this idea when he explains television's pervasiveness provides more meaning systems for more subcultures. Therefore, television can serve as the main site of resistance in the current cultural situation.[98] By focusing on consumption, these theorists dismiss the power of encoded meanings and oppressive societal structures and norms to shape and position subjects to live in the existing order. Fiske validates this dismissal by explaining how capitalism and patriarchy fail to create conformity within subjects or stop opposition. Popular culture is always a reaction to dominant forms, never a reflection. Popular culture is always a site of meaning making, where people always outmaneuver dominant culture. Fiske alters Pierre Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital to speak of a system of meanings and pleasures that serves the interest of the powerless. To differentiate, he calls his concept "popular culture capital." For Fiske, pleasure is always experienced through resistance and never through convention or recognition. This is the major flaw of his argument; it dismisses concepts of distinction and the cultivation of pleasure discussed by Bourdieu.[99]

Although Ien Ang is outside of the CCCS, she mimics their approach by refusing the institutional view of the unified, homogenous, mute, and passive audience and doing ethnographic research. At first, her work seems similar to Willis and Fiske's because it focuses on consuming. However, she tones down subjects' subversive power, while still seeing the

---

[96] Idib. 49-68
[97] "Paul Willis "Symbolic Creativity"
[98] John Fiske *Television Culture*
[99] John Fiske *Understanding Popular Culture* and *Television Culture* 168-183

audience as diverse in identity, use of mass culture, and ideological views. She recognizes that

structures, representation, and relations of domination do matter. A main contention she has with

the institutional view of the audience is that it does not allow theorists to view audiences in an

unrealistic way; it simplifies and dismisses people. Like critics of Habermas, she believes this

creates an abstract and ideal subject, which dismisses most subjects, never allowing them to

speak. Audiences (like subjects) are never complete and always in flux. Like Willis and Fiske,

she states that different people receive different pleasures from cultural products. Giving

pleasure is a cultural product's use-value, not a sign of liberation. However, in Ang's view, texts

are not as pluralistic as Willis and Fiske state. Ang follows Hall's assumption that texts are

polysemic and not pluralistic; there are limitations to consumer's oppositional meaning-

making.[100] Her political move is that a deeper understanding of what audiences are and want

could provide a more democratic and critical dialogue around mass culture.

Unlike most of the previous theorists, Henry Jenkins discusses an audience that produces

something beyond meanings. In his ethnography of fan culture, he shows a group who, like

Willis, Fiske, and Ang's subjects, produces alternative meanings. He differs when he challenges,

and not just misinterprets, de Certeau's idea that tactics are fleeting. Fans who create texts with

alternative or extended meanings do not just go away, but become part of a subculture's library;

fans blur the consumer/producer binary using technology to create new cultural products.[101] Like

Fiske, he shows how fans become consumer activists demanding that shows be un-cancelled or

altered to fit their vision. He goes further though and demonstrates how this creates an alternative

community with its own ethos. He realizes the limitation of this activity (it will not create

societal change), but states that it provides an outlet for overeducated people in unchallenging

---

[100] Ien Ang *Watching Dallas* and *Desperately Seeking the Audience*

[101] Although not discussing fan culture, Raymond Williams hoped that subjects would learn to use technology.

careers and a space to explore alternatives through creating texts that happen to be based on mass culture. He reminds us that fans are the exception, but this exception challenges the idea of a completely passive audience.[102] Later, Jenkins demonstrates how convergence culture expands fan bases and makes the creation of new cultural forms easier. Convergence culture is the product of old and new media colliding to form a new interactive relationship between producers, cultural products, and consumers. This leads to more consumer investment into products causing many instances where fans challenge the producers' decisions; they demand products that fit their desires and needs. The Internet becomes place to form a "collective intelligence" to scour the Internet for the inner workings of popular culture and plots. Jenkins illustrates the contradiction within convergence culture; as fans become more involved, corporations become more vertically integrated and concentrated. Jenkins, unlike in *Textual Poachers*, never convincingly argues that this occurrence has political potential for systemic change. The crux of his argument is that fans spend most of their time invested in media systems, campaigning or learning more about their favorite programs. While technology makes production and distribution cheaper for fans, it has also made them more invested in the capitalist system. In *Textual Poachers*, fans formed new groups with utopian ethics; they left consumer sovereignty. This new model of active consumer is only invested in consumption.[103]

---

[102] Henry Jenkins *Textual Poachers* 277-87
[103] Henry Jenkins *Convergence Culture*

The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies: Reaction Against the Active Audience

Like other CCCS scholars, Angela McRobbie examines culture as a lived process by studying people's experiences with cultural texts.[104] She differs from John Fiske, Iain Chambers, and Paul Willis in that she examines local acts of consumption without forgetting that what is being consumed contains a set of meanings that are meant to sustain the current relations of domination. Her theories more closely resemble Hebdige and Cohen's; all three show how mass culture can be appropriated and re-imagined by subjects to make sense of one's life or create a space for the creation of self, but never amplify local meaning making's power to the level that Willis, Chambers, and Fiske do. Instead, Hebdige, Cohen, and McRobbie show how a subject's situation positions them differently, causing negotiated and sometimes oppositional interaction with mass culture to occur. Unlike Hebdige and Cohen, she does not examine a "radical" or "subversive" group, but studies the much-overlooked population of young girls.

Through ethnography, McRobbie discovers how extremely limited and sometimes over-determined young girls are by dominant gender expectations.[105] Girl magazines reinforce and perpetuate these messages, which have material consequences, as McRobbie demonstrates in her study of young single mothers who cannot conceive of themselves as significant wage earners.[106] However, youth do not simply absorb these texts; they negotiate meanings and use the texts to create spaces for themselves. Some magazines bring sources of self-expression into the lives of young girls, while others obscure the complexity of life and perpetuate coupling as the only

---

[104] In "What is Cultural Studies, Anyway?" Richard Johnson argues the benefits and drawbacks of three major schools of thought within cultural studies, text-based, production-focused, lived-experience oriented. He concludes that the best mode of cultural studies is an integration of production, texts, and how forms influence lived-experience (subjectivity). Texts are distributed and produced within the public; these texts have real implications on how time/space/culture are experienced. It is within the private and the particular that subjects demonstrate the implications. Johnson's call to study the intersection of the private and the public are best demonstrated by McRobbie's studies of school girls and their use of magazines. This work reveals that focusing on one moment in the circuit of commodities hides important features of experience and power.
[105] Angela McRobbie "The Politics of Feminist Research"
[106] Angela McRobbie "Teenage Mothers"

future option.[107] Like Henry Jenkins, she shows how fandom can lead to subcultures, popular aesthetic movements. Subcultures allow for alternative ways of feeling and can shape and steer the trajectory of people's lives. She demonstrates how the punk aesthetic challenged traditional feminine notions, but sustained gender power structures, while zines produced numerous spaces to discuss feminism.[108] Her work is not about challenging the idea of the passive audience, but provides an accurate depiction of people and reveals their suffering in a way that might change policy. By studying a subordinate subjectivity, young working-class girls, McRobbie rejects the free and unstructured audience created by Fiske, Chamber, and Willis, but embraces the idea that they create meanings and spaces for themselves, but are limited by the range of meanings circulating in the culture and their position within wider relations of domination.

As her career progressed, McRobbie began to critique postmodern versions of the audience and their pluralistic readers. She dismisses Fiske's model where consumption allows new subjectivities to be formed; consumption alone is not a libratory act. McRobbie writes that race, class, and gender mark bodies, thus denying them access to the public sphere, where consumption take place, and complicating the process of consumption. She turns away from examining just consumption to seeing how people, particularly cultural workers (or "creative" labor) actually *produce* cultural commodities, and not just produce meanings. This shift allows her to find cultural groups that attempt to work outside of or alongside tradition relations of labor and gender.[109]

These do-it-yourself cultural economies—for instance, independent designers in the fashion trade—retain symbolic, aesthetic, labor, economic, and political freedom, while sometimes giving into economic pressure and compromising their creative ethic by working for

---

[107] Angela McRobbie "Jackie Magazine," "The Culture of Working-Class Girls," and "Jackie and Just Seventeen"
[108] Angela McRobbie "Settling Accounts with Subcultures"
[109] Angela McRobbie "Bridging the Gap"

large companies.[110] They establish meeting spaces outside of the established infrastructure to create and maintain subcultures, new ways of life, and personal relations. These urban cultural economies are under constant threat of extinction due to mass cultures' ceaseless expansion. Within this new model, she closes the gap between cultural studies and political economy.[111] She shows how subcultures create jobs and meanings where deindustrialization occurs.[112] Her later work is not divorced from her earlier work; she is still interested in how women negotiate patriarchy and the relations between "consumption" and "production" in a post-Fordist economy. Her critique of active audiences led her to investigate sites where of sustained cultural creation, outside of just meaning making, where occurring. As with Jenkins, she demonstrates that people can produce their own meaning-systems and economies that work alongside, parasitically, and within the current meaning systems and relations of domination. Their work allows them a degree of freedom to create lives, systems, and products outside the norm. Because these moments produce more than meanings for the subjects, it can hopefully sustain an option for those wanting to opt out of tradition.

Pierre Bourdieu shares the CCCS impulse of anti-determinism and the emphasis on culture as a field of struggle and culture empirical analysis.[113] He places the subject, a "practical operator," in a culture with hierarchically arranged fields, different levels of durable structures that always refer back on the economic field.[114] This matrix positions the subject through

---

[110] McRobbie's account of cultural industries is starker than that of Keith Negus, who claims there is a substantial amount of creative expression within the industry.

[111] Angela McRobbie "Introduction," "Second Hand Dresses and the Role of the Ragmarket," "Shut Up and Dance," "A Mixed Economy of Fashion Design," and "The World's a Stage, Screen, or Magazine"

[112] Angela McRobbie "Shut Up and Dance"

[113] David Hesmondhalgh sees Bourdieau's work as revelatory when applied to political economy; it provides a complex and intricate examination of cultural production, far superior to most empirical sociologists and the political economy strands associated with Herbert Schiller. However, he feels that Bourdieu neglects the power of culture industries; cultural industries have reduced autonomy within fields. (See David Hesmondhalgh "Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production")

[114] Randall Johnson "Editor's Introduction" 5

establishing limitations and possibilities, which are reinforced by subjects already established

within fields. These established subjects enjoy cultural and economic capital and are therefore

content with their positions within the field, its distribution of particular forms of capital, and the

cultural and aesthetic norms that determine what is legitimized. They form alliances to preserve

the field as is (doxa) and exclude those seeking change.[115] Subjects with less cultural and

economic capital or who disagree with an aspect of the field can engage in alliances to change

the structure of the field, the distribution of capital, and the system of valuation privileged in the

field (heterodox).[116] This struggle is not even; those with legitimacy and economical capital are

likely to succeed. Thus, reproduction of the status quo is always more likely than any systematic

transformation of how the field operates.[117] So while this allows for a theory of a subject

navigating a field and not being determined by a structure, it demonstrates culture as always

containing resistance.[118]

In *On Television*, Bourdieu demonstrates how the journalism field works to legitimize a

certain form of news and how the struggle over what is good journalism affects what subjects

outside the field expect and get from news. The struggle within the field is for the values within

journalism and whether the priority should be the gaining of profit and ratings (associated with

television journalism) or the maintaining of "objectivity" and professionalism (associated with

print journalism). Bourdieu argues that the former, through gaining economic capital, is winning

the struggle, causing a depoliticized and formulaic version of the news that denies the public

access to relevant or controversial information.[119] The rising normativity of this new style of

---

[115] Pierre Bourdieu "The Field of Cultural Production" 30-35, "The Production of Belief" 82-6
[116] Pierre Bourdieu "The Market of Symbolic Goods" 118-9
[117] Idib. 120-5
[118] Pierre Bourdieu "The Field of Cultural Production" 30-35
[119] Pierre Bourdieu *On Television* 3-8

journalism begins impacting and shaping print journalism.[120] The ability of one field to affect other fields becomes wildly deterministic in this examination: "In some cases, the choices made on television are choices made by no subject."[121] His belief is the power of fields in the lives of subject becomes deterministic. This seems odd because he repeatedly suggests subjects as navigating within a field, however when applying his theory to a situation, all the subject's power is lost.

Despite Bourdieu's anti-deterministic theorization of subjects within the field as differently positioned and therefore navigating and struggling for control of norms, he fails to provide space outside domination. While he opens up space for agency, the major thrust of his work emphasizes the continuity and reproduction of relations of domination and subjects' active role within this by maintaining the status quo. His theory is inherently conservative because his focus on fields and structures causes an overly determines subject. Angela McRobbie writes that his ideas of inclinations and dispositions end up theorizing subjects as always compliant and always seeking stability via an embracing of norms. When power struggles do occur, the subjects are only trying to assert their uniqueness within the field, not create systemic change.[122] His theorization never allows for a true challenge of the system, but only reform; the margins are always being closed off because "everything is always already inclined toward conformity to the social order."[123]

Lawrence Grossberg, a US Cultural Studies scholar who studied closely with Stuart Hall at the University of Birmingham, defends the CCCS scholars' practices, while recognizing the short comings of active audience scholarship, pointed out by critical theorists and political

---

[120] Idib. 20
[121] Idib. 25
[122] Angela McRobbie *The Uses of Cultural Studies* 125-7
[123] Idib. 144

economists. He begins by rearticulating CCCS's concept of studying the everyday life

experiences, but adds on that this needs to be studied alongside articulations of power and how

power creates repressive means of pleasure. He slides back into the position that the mode of

production does not determine culture because people live "their subordination actively," even if

that means complacently.[124] In his opinion, this is a rejection of political economy and critical

theory's treatment of the subject as completely and passively manipulated. While he agrees that

Cultural Studies needs to investigate capitalism's affect on culture, he argues that political

economic theories rely too heavily on capitalist relations and economic domination to discuss

power; they create an inaccurate and deterministic theory of culture.[125] Grossberg situates the

text, the modes of production, power, context, subjectivity, and distribution as equally important

within cultural studies.[126] One part of culture must not be allowed to determine others and

theorists must recognize that they all play an active role. Cultural studies must be anti-

reductionist; it is about the intersections of power and the making of possibilities. He warns that

we must not use simple terms like resistance, domination, and subordination and instead describe

possibilities.[127] He then turns and criticizes what he believes to be a misinterpretation of the

CCCS philosophy that occurred within the CCCS and is occurring with US cultural studies.[128]

The use of "active audience" as the foundation for theory is harmful. This causes contexts,

power, and meaning to lose all significance. It romanticizes marginality and creates a false sense

---

[124] Lawrence Grossberg "Introduction" 8
[125] Lawrence Grossberg "Introduction" 8-15
[126] In *Media/Theory,* Shaun Moores makes the same argument, but emphasizes the cultural, temporal, and spatial matrix. He states theorists must move beyond the production/consumption dichotomy; however, he focuses solely on consumption. Specifically, he reiterates the importance of understanding the various social, context, and subjectivities, which can alter and create pluralized meanings. His discussion of time and space details an increasing flexibility between work and leisure/domestic time and space. To Moores, this is always positive; he never discusses how work encroaches on leisure more often than leisure time encroaches on work. Doreen Massy describes this movement in "Masculinity, Dualisms, and High Technology."
[127] Lawrence Grossberg "Strategies of Marxist Cultural Interpretations" and "Cultural Studies"
[128] (See John Fiske)

of a resistant audience without describing what they resist. The project becomes one of relativism; the politics are of inertia.[129]

Grossberg writes that cultural studies should describe the cultural practices of individuals within their cultural matrix and dialectical relationship and not remove subjects from what subjugates them. Cultural studies needs to show how subjects are disempowered through meanings, structures, and institutions. This will detach cultural studies from always assuming that the audience is actively resistant and that local power relations are equal to national, capitalist, and cultural institutions' uses of power. Once theorists construct a complex description of power relations, they can more accurately show how subjects can organize and create alliances towards empowerment and possibilities for creating change. Cultural studies should be producing works that describe ways for subjects to be agent without becoming naïve or over-simplifying the current relations of domination. This is why the local should be where research ends and not where research begins.[130]

Political Economy

Political economy works examining mass culture are often discussed as being the antithesis of CCCS's approach. The construction of this opposition is often done by using wildly misrepresentative claims about both disciplines; CCCS equated with uncritical examinations and political economy with overly deterministic economic explanation of culture. In reality the two fields are generally interested in everyday culture and issues of power, domination, and the possibility of alternatives within capitalist stratified culture. The difference between them tends to lie on whether they focus on the production (political economy) or consumption (CCCS) of

---

[129] Lawrence Grossberg "The Context of Audiences and the Politics of Difference" 320-1
[130] Lawrence Grossberg "The Context of Audiences and the Politics of Difference"

mass culture; although, Angela McRobbie's later work demonstrates this as a false choice. Political economic theories examine how "social relations, particularly the power relations… [are constituted] through the production, distribution, and consumption of resources."[131] They work on politics at the site of structures, companies, and institutions, instead of seeing politics as an everyday struggle for meaning making. Although, Grossberg warns against this approach, the latter focus allows for a more optimistic version of politics; changing meaning and making a space for yourself are much easier tasks to achieve than the former's need for the creation of a new political or economic structure, which will bring about a more egalitarian system.

Instead of the primarily examining lived-experience, political economists see capitalism as the fundamental force shaping the conditions within which subjects produce and consume media. Capitalist economies, organized around the institutions of private property, wage labor, and commodity production, thus produce inequalities, distribute power, and limit possibilities. Political economists of communication examine the connection between economic power and the ability to impact, manage, and control entertainment, mass media, and information, which ultimately affects the lives of subjects.[132] For his part, David Hesmondhalgh divides North American/ European political economists in two: the North American tradition including Herbert Schiller, Vincent Mosco, and Robert McChesney and European tradition including Bernard Miège and Nicholas Garnham.

The Schiller-McChesney tradition, as he calls it, examines structures of ownership and control in order to document the enormous amount of power capitalists have and how they use it. Key to their research is examining alliances, concentrations, conglomerations, and mergers within and without the cultural industry. Hesmondhalgh prefers the European tradition or

---

[131] Vincent Mosco *The Political Economy of Communication* 2
[132] Vincent Mosco *The Political Economy of Communication* 2-4

cultural industries approach because it illustrated power as partial and incomplete (not monolithic), thus allowing for an examination of contradictions and failures within the system. They are interested in how the shifting system constantly negotiations its contradictions. Unlike the Schiller-McChesney tradition, the cultural industry approach muddles the line between and examines the complex positions of commercial and "alternative" meaning-makers and the consumption/production divide. Their interest in these activities allows for a rich understanding of how the cultural industries hinder, but never truly capture the creative work of meaning-makers. Hesmondhalgh argues, and I agree, that while the former approach demonstrates a legitimate concern, it tends to obscure the complexity and actual practices within and outside of cultural industries.[133]

Political economist Vincent Mosco argues that to understand society, one cannot reduce its explanation to either economics or culture. He counters cultural theorists' accusation that political economy is always an economic reductionist theory. Political economy is "the study of social relations, particularly the power relations, that mutually constitute the production, distribution, and consumption of resources, including communication."[134] With this system, political economy examines commodification, spatialization, and structuration by focusing on the complex relationships between media firms and consumers, firms and workers, and firms and the state. Mosco's definition resembles cultural studies. The main difference is political economy's focus on structures more than theories of subjectivity. Political economy distances itself from subjectivity because subjects act within structures and its norms; therefore, a radical

---

[133] David Hesmondhalgh *The Cultural Industries* 33-37
[134] Vincent Mosco *The Political Economy of Communication* 2

theory of subjectivity demonstrates a feat of imagination, not the empirical reality of positioned

subjects.[135]

While Vincent Mosco focuses in general terms on establishing the political economy of

communication as a foundational part of media studies, political economist Herbert Schiller

focused more narrowly on how US communication structures and consumer-oriented content

destroy US culture and are being replicated in and exported to other countries. Multi-national

corporations, the US government, and advertising agencies pressure foreign nations into

accepting commercial content and structures. This transaction provides money to the country's

elite and allows corporations access to new markets. Once the global south builds a commercial

communication system, US companies sell programming at drastically low-rates and in bundles.

The native communication systems purchase US programs to stay afloat and to offer their

customers constant programming. This global system leads to the importation of US ideology

and global homogenization. US content rejects the notion of the US as a ruthless empire, whose

economic and military policies keep the global south impoverished; it rejects reality and

facilitates the US's uneven foreign policies and hinders people's desire to oppose the US.[136]

In a following study, Schiller turns his argument domestically to discuss how corporate

power with the US government's aid destroys public expression and space, diversity of thought,

access to information, and the quality non-profit programming Individual expression still exists,

but the constant stream of corporate products overwhelms subjects.[137] In what may be a reaction

---

[135] Vincent Mosco *The Political Economy of Communication* 11-16
[136] Herbert Schiller *Mass Communications and American Empire*
[137] C. Edwin Baker was a US scholar of mass media policy, the constitutional law, and free speech. Like Schiller, he shows how the US government deregulated media and aided media concentration, which lead to a less democratic country. A more democratic communication system allows for diversity, access, and the ability to critique. Dispersal of ownership allows media outlets to fact-check their competitors. Baker suggests tougher government policies to restructure media, partially by hindering media concentration and denying excessive access to national markets (*Media Concentration and Democracy)*. In "Capitalism, Communication, and Class Relations," he argues that control over the material resources of communication is ultimately the most powerful force in cultural production

to John Tomlinson's critique of his earlier work,[138] Schiller argues against scholars who examine the audience and theorize an active audience. The active audience theory minimizes the damaging effects of an ever-growing and ever-intrusive corporate communication system; the destruction of democracy is forgiven because people find pleasure in oppression. Schiller examines culture at the corporate economic scale and thus creates a causal relationship that always has the subject determined by the structure.[139] Schiller's subject is so encompassed that he cannot see a way out; he can only hope that alternative methods for communicating can break the current system.[140]

In an important critique of Schiller's work, John Tomlinson writes that Schiller is an economic determinist, who never actually discusses culture. Tomlinson does not doubt that the US economic policies and corporations have a negative affects on foreign nations. However, Tomlinson writes that ethnographic work needs to be done to examine how these products are being used and what those effects are. They could be indoctrinating people or the texts could serve to reinforce the legitimacy of their culture by showing the extravagance and absurdity of US culture.[141] In *Globalization and Culture*, he elaborates and dismisses the Schiller's claim that a corporate homogenous culture will ever happen due to local contexts and cultures and hybridization.[142]

---

because they exclude marginal voices and produce formulaic material to minimize risk. His ideas work well with Schiller's; they are both interested in the dramatic restructuring of systems in order to create a better system for subjects.

[138] This is discussed below.

[139] Stuart Ewen is a US social historian who examines the relationship between advertising, marketing, and the interests and imperatives of capital. Similar to Herbert Schiller, Stuart Ewen relegates agency to the margins and discusses how the cultural industry creates and amplifies style through image management and saturation. Style through consumption becomes the truth, the political, the relevant, and perception. The power of style overshadows and compensates for substance, information, experience, and democracy. Subjects negotiate a small space within style without affecting larger structures of meaning. The subject's experience is validated or disqualified with its ability to match the dominant style. (See Stuart Ewen *All Consuming Images*)

[140] Herbert Schiller *Culture, Inc.*

[141] John Tomlinson *Cultural Imperialism*

[142] John Tomlinson *Globalization and Culture*

Similar to Schiller, Robert McChesney examines how concentrated media structures, supported by the US government have become an anti-democratic force, destroying the field of journalism and depriving citizens information.[143] Hypercommercialism is key to McChesney's argument. He argues that it erodes the boundary between "content" and "marketing" across all media forms, from movies and television (product placement) to the news (plugola).[144] Their increased concentration limits its ability to serve as a reliable source of information and marginalizes and destroys smaller and non-corporate media outlets. There is no longer any notion that media should facilitate democratic action; instead, it serves corporate advertisers, investors, elites, and owners, who profit and control the political system. This dissolves the line between public life and the commercial realm, turning citizens into consumers who vote with their dollars and rarely, if ever, use democratic action. This type of citizenship justifies the system. If people vote with their dollars and support the system than the current system is the result of citizen's choice and naturalizes the corporate structure. McChesney, despite talking about subject's domination by structures, argues that a broad based democratic left must and can reveal the undemocratic nature of this system.[145]

McChesney's book *The Problem of the Media* documents the 2003 citizen movement against increasing media concentration; citizens demanded that their congressperson reform media policy. This pushed media policy out into national headlines. McChesney writes that exposure alone is a victory; now media policy is on the minds of citizens, who no longer see this system as natural and beneficial.[146] In *Communication Revolution*, he further discusses how a structural change can occur and that subjects can alter the course of media and communications

[143] This is reiterated in Robert McChesney*'s Communication Revolution.*
[144] Robert McChesney *The Problem of the Media* 60-74
[145] Robert McChesney *Rich Media, Poor Democracy* and *The Problem of the Media*
[146] Robert McChesney *The Problem of the Media* 252-297

in the US, creating a more radically democratic system. It is important to act now because the US communication system is at a critical juncture due to new technology, a decreased belief in media's current content's legitimacy, and political turmoil.[147] Despite his productive account of current events, Robert McChesney's discussion of subjects within the system is underdeveloped. He sees subjects as active participants, but only within the certain conditions when the structure is in crisis. It appears, since he wrote these books across several decades, that the system is always in crisis. If that is the case, the urgency and suddenness of his claims and his view of the subject is false. He needs to situate the subject and elaborate on how a subject's position within the system orients them to take action; this would make a more convincing and less universal account of the subject.

As discussed above, Bernard Miège rejects Adorno, Horkheimer, and Schiller's concept of a singular cultural industry in favor of a more complex model of cultural industries.[148] Cultural industries are not a unified front and never complete the ideological or economic domination of subjects. Different cultural industries use different and competing strategies, modes of productions, and commodities to enter the market. Miège then dismisses the idea that capitalism has only caused damage to culture; it has led to innovations and diversification. This may seem similar to Fiske, Chambers, and Willis, but Miège is not condoning capitalism; he is simply abandoning the defeatism of Adorno and Horkheimer, in favor of model that sees capitalism as imposing itself onto culture and, although affecting the production of culture dramatically, fails to completely determine the realm of ideas. Similar to the CCCS tradition,

---

[147] Robert McChesney *Communication Revolution* 1-16
[148] This is more in line with Gramsci's theory of hegemony than the Frankfurt School's idealogy.

Miège sees culture as a site of struggle, where not all of capitalism's doings are harmful to subjects.[149]

David Hesmondhalgh follows Miège's assertion and examines the complexity and development of the cultural industries. Hesmondhalgh approaches cultural industries in a more historical manner. Since the 1950s, cultural industries have loosened restrictions on their creative workers. At the same time, the industries compensated these workers poorly and maintained strict control of distribution, intellectual property, and circulation of their property. Starting in the 1980s, the market for cultural products widened due to nation's leveling trade boundaries, increased privatization, deregulation, and technology changes. Concurrently, industries tightened control over their product's content to ensure profit and continuity. This tightening of control followed Adorno's comment that cultural industries are smaller than other industries and rely on them for economic support. The expansion of the cultural industries within and without markets means further control of time for more subjects. Against, Fiske's model, Hesmondhalgh states that advertising and promotional material "regulate symbolic creativity to the needs of accumulation."[150] Despite his overwhelming discussion of capitalism's growing encroachment into people's lives, he questions if this matters at the level of texts. The expansion of texts does not mean the production of meaning is different and the battle over culture happens at the level of meaning. Like Miège, he takes the CCCS perspective while studying culture from a political economic approach.[151]

Like Miège and Hesmondhalgh, Nicholas Garnham belongs to the cultural industries approach and therefore is interested in locating the subject within political economy and not just discussing the shifting structures of industries towards economic—and therefore cultural and

---

[149] Bernard Miège *The Capitalization of Cultural Production*
[150] David Hesmondhalgh *The Cultural Industries* 305
[151] David Hesmondhalgh *The Cultural Industries*

political—monopoly, as Schiller and McChesney discuss. However, it is important to note that

he opposes pluralism and the extreme particularism of ethnographic studies.[152] Instead, he, Peter

Golding, and Graham Murdock examine structures and how structural power[153] unequally

positions, coordinates (within space and time), and contains subjects. They do not reduce culture

to the economic, but declare capitalism as strongly affecting meaning within the symbolic, social

relations, and communication (media). Corporations own the material means that allow

communication to travel, be received, and produced. These communication systems are

embedded within wider structures and relations. At each moment, the amount and kind of

content and access given to the population is limited through capitalism's social hierarchies.

These hierarchies determine what can be said and by who. The language though which texts are

interpreted are constructed in capitalist context. This does not determine, but limits

possibilities.[154] All three conclude that citizenship needs to be reconceived outside of a consumer

sovereignty model. Garnham proposes a Habermasian model of a unified public sphere, where

media policies are developed to break up media oligopolies, encourage alternative voices, and

circulate a wider range of ideas, leading to a more democratic system. However, to get there

theorists need to grasp the full impact of global economy instead of discussing the play and

particularities of audiences.[155]

Following in the cultural industries tradition, Keith Negus examines how workers are

hindered, but still retain their creative and innovative, despite the corporate structure.

Specifically, Negus examines how musicians and producers use creativity within the music

---

[152] Nicholas Garnham *Emancipation, the Media, and Modernity* 126-132
[153] They define power mostly in monetary terms, but Golding and Murdock do show how gender restricts access to power.
[154] Nicolas Garnham *Capitalism and Communication* and *Emancipation, the Media, and Modernity* and Peter Golding and Graham Murdock "Culture, Communications, and Political Economy"
[155] Nicolas Garnham *Capitalism and Communication* 104-35

industry. First, genre shapes the way artists make and consumers listen to music. Successful

bands know their genre and recognize and play within its boundaries. Record companies know

this and select which genre content, style, and sound they wish to highlight and which they want

to hinder. Corporations see genres as ways of managing financial risks and establishing their

label's brand. Genres are however unstable in that they cover a range of practices, not simply one

practice. Creativity within this model is not about transgression but about outlets for expression

within the presented means. Negus demonstrates how corporate cultures allow different types of

creativity within the cultural industry and genre, causing diverse products.[156] Negus and Michael

Pickering argue that the cultural industries do not hinder creativity, but actively cause creativity

and innovation at multiple collaborative stages in the production process; creativity is at their

core. Money, copyrights, and success are prime-motivators for producing and distributing

creative pieces. Creativity is currently bound to capitalism and can perpetuate preferred genres

and codes. However, this system does not determine cultural products. Artists and producers can

gain cultural and economic capital within the system to produce the texts they want to or work

outside of the system.[157] With Pickering, Negus wants to move away from political economy

studies as static and predictable. A reductionist model forgets about the people involved at all

levels of culture. Music industries and other culture industries are about meaning production first

and commerce second.[158]

<center>Political Economy: The Audience Commodity</center>

Unlike the Schiller-McChesney approach, cultural industries scholars examine both the

production and consumption of mass culture. Most cultural industries scholars examine how

subjects within the structures make the economic decisions that affect subjects. However, a small

---

[156] Keith Negus *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*
[157] Keith Negus and Michael Pickering *Creativity, Communication and Cultural Value*
[158] Keith Negus *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*

group of scholars focus on how industries create surplus value from the audience and examine the productive work audiences do for capitalists. Several theorists, including Dallas Smythe, Sut Jhally, and Mark Andrejevic, place the audience as central to the system because they produce value. Without the audience, no profit could be gained and therefore no reason would exist for producing mass culture. Where these theorists differ is in their understanding of what role the audience plays in producing value.

As if following Garnham's suggestion, Dallas Smythe argues that to understand society, theorists must look at people and commodities as interrelated. Mass media produces an audience (as a commodity) to sell to corporate advertisers. The program draws an audience and creates a receptive atmosphere and consumer oriented consciousness for the advertisements. Media corporations thus profit from the audiences' unpaid labor (watching a program with commercials).[159] Sut Jhally intervenes in Smythe's work by clarifying that corporations sell the audience's *potential* power to buy, but can only actually sell the audience's time; it is the production of "watching time" (and, more specifically, statistical estimates of audience watching time) which produces profit for advertising-supported media firms. Jhally states that advertisers find programs that stress consumption and their target audience's lifestyle. The meanings are produced within closed systems; the search for large audiences of relatively affluent consumers means that marginal or controversial content are likely to be abandoned. The quality of texts matters little since media consumption becomes obligatory in late capitalism.[160] If studying a text's meanings, theorists must consider that time and feeling are important to producers and advertisers.[161]

---

[159] Dallas Smythe *Dependency Road*
[160] Sut Jhally *Codes of Advertising*
[161] Jhally spends a significant amount of time arguing against the extreme culturist position. He writes that if there are any limitations of readings, which there are, then a materialist methodology must be present.

For his part, Mark Andrejevic updates the political economic view of audiences within interactive technology and the process of digital enclosure, where every online movement become monitored and generates information about the subject, without permission. Instead of selling an audience's time, they sell information on subjects. They sell and use this digital commodity, personal information, to corporations wanting to target audiences and adjust products to a consumer's liking or play into their fears. Interactivity is not radically democratic, but limits citizens' power to consumption. There can be no revolution or politics within the current framework; citizens must restore democratic participation outside the enclosed system.[162]

Political Economy: Autonomous Marxism

Nick Dyer-Witherford takes a radically different approach to the above political economist (except Miège) and the Frankfurt School's view of capitalism's expansion into social space. Part of the recent wave of Autonomous Marxists,[163] Dyer-Witherford sees more micro-spaces of contention, while the theorists above see more spaces of domination. Dyer-Witherford discusses the creative and active subject, which struggles within, but also sustains and is exploited by, global capitalism. Dyer-Witherford documents the numerable moments when workers refuse subjugation and resist capitalism through collective action. To combat this, capitalism re-divides, alters the mode of production, and constantly restructures society; they extend class domination beyond the workplace and into the everyday. Thus extending the class struggle into the "social factory," the everyday spaces where labor and commodities are

---

[162] Mark Andrejevic *iSpy*
[163] Other recent Autonomous Marxists include Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt.

produced, reproduced, and consumed. Dyer-Witherford focused on how technology deskills,

geographically spreads, unemploys, and alienates workers. Concurrently, it provides workers

with intimate access to and knowledge of the "oppressive" tools and leisure time to gain

expertise. Workers can use their technological knowledge to expose capitalism, unite workers,

and possibly liberate themselves from labor.[164] By focusing on the struggles within and

oppression from above, Dyer-Witherford produces an active, non-determined subject, who is

oppressed. Dyer-Witherford examination of culture ties together the strengths of both political

economy (capitalism as a fundament shaping force) and cultural studies (the examination of

lived-experience). The growing interest in Dyer-Witherford and other Autonomous Marxists

may be due to their innovative take on the structure/agency paradox. Yes, the most fundamental

social relationship is capital's exploitation of labor's capacity to create value and wealth, while

all the while diffusing class-consciousness and struggle. However, in the current moment capital

provides labor the technical tools and cultural knowledge that can be re-utilized to raise class-

consciousness and aid in a struggle or a resistance against capital. For example, the internet

provides capital with a communication and monitoring system to link their global assembly line,

it also provides laborers a way to communicate and create a collective struggle.

<div align="center">Discourse on Space</div>

The discussion of space has always existed within mass culture theory. The theories

referenced above can easily be, and often have been, applied to the study of urban space. For

example, Marx, Benjamin, and Kracauer were early commentators on capitalism's impact on

space—either altering it to enhance productivity or to promote consumption. Henri Lefebvre and

David Harvey draw upon Marxism and critical theory to examine the geographical development

---

[164] Nick Dyer-Witherford *Cyber-Marx*

of capitalism and subsequent inequalities, which result in the production of space suited to capital's needs. Their work began a long trajectory of other theorists, such as Neil Smith, Sharon Zukin, and Don Mitchell, each of whom examine the production of space and its impact on subjects within global, national, and local scales. The works of these geographers expand on the theories produced by political economists. Differing in focus, cultural geographers such as Doreen Massey and Peter Jackson draw on the work of Michel DeCerteau, the Birmingham School, and feminist theorists to examine how subjects navigate and alter spaces that seek to exclude them. Similar to the Birmingham School's conception of the media, they see space as a contested arena. The line between studies of mass culture and space intersect, compliment, and challenge each other, as do studies focusing on structures or subjects. Neither should be thought of as completely separate because they have and continue to influence each other.

In *Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre writes that spaces reflect the mode of production because space is a produced object used to distribute products and control subjects. This spatial product is not read, but lived in, and thus fails to completely suppress the subject; as a result, social space is a tensional process between individual movement and thought and imposed structures and ideologies. Space's usage depends on if individuals actively or passively move through space; passive subjects are more likely to follow prescribed uses. Space's use also depends on how people perceive the space to be. Imaginary geography can cause a subject to subordinate capitalists' intended meaning for a space or other people's use of the space. This concept becomes important for geographers looking at perceptions of space.

Numerous contemporary theorists depend on Lefebvre's theorization that certainly space is produced with certain social ends in mind (i.e., accumulation or the exercise of state authority), but, nonetheless, a subject's *perception* of space and their and others' *actions* can also

shape how they experience and interpret space. For example, Wayne Myslik and Jon Binnie

discuss how gay men experience queer spaces as safer than other areas despite anti-GLBT laws

and violence that make those spaces hostile.[165] David Bell, Daniel Woodhead, and Jerry Lee

Kramer discuss how GLBT public sex acts blur the line between private and public spaces and

create a sense of intimacy in spaces devoid of privacy. Through being rejected from public

spaces via laws and norms and private spaces due to a hostile family/roommates or the silencing

caused by "the closet," GLBT people make public/private spaces outside of traditional intimate

spaces.[166] Raymond Williams documents how capitalists and literature shape the ideas "nature,"

"rural," [167] and "urban" to justify and perpetuate the degradation of nature and the people and

land of the rural.[168] Similarly, Elizabeth Blackmar details how capitalist institutions manipulate

imaginary geography to destroy the idea of "the commons" as viable, causing the privatization of

all space to become the rational choice.[169] Leo Marx's *The Machine in the Garden* documents the

United States's central contradiction between the pastoral (originally the rural) ideal and the

technological (city). The pastoral is a shifting spatial signifier, the middle-link and ideal US

space between the corrupting urban and the hideous rural; its slipperiness becomes a tool for

capitalists and governments to shift the pastorals' meaning without altering its connotations

(virtuous and innocent) or culture. This allows for commercial exploitation of the rural and the

abandonment or reconstruction of the city[170] under the guise of civilizing it into its ideal pastoral

---

[165] Wayne Myslik "Renegotiating the Social/Sexual Identities of Places" and Jon Binnie "Trading Places"

[166] David Bell "Perverse Dynamics, Sexual Citizenship and the Transformation of Intimacy," and Daniel Woodhead "Surveillant Gays"

[167] Resistance is found in rural literature that reveals the deformities created by capitalism.

[168] Raymond Williams *The Country and the City* and "Ideas of Nature" (This process is also described in Karl Marx "The Communist Manifesto.")

[169] Elizabeth Blackmar "Appropriating 'the Commons'"

[170] In *The New Urban Frontier*, Neil Smith describes how capitalists and politicians use revanchist language to code poor city dwellers as savages, who stole the city from the middle-class (residents of the pastoral), to justify the violence and destruction of urban cultures that occurs during gentrification (a process which injects the pastoral within the urban).

form. [171] These theorists demonstrate how both developers and subjects in space use imagined space to impact the use of real space. By this I mean that developers and planners create the idea and their intended use and meaning for a space and then attempt to implement them in the physical construction. The material space exists with its encoded meanings, which impacts how subjects use a space. However, some subjects come to a space with different intentions or experiences within the space that alter their image of the space. In some cases, the subject's image of the space can overcome the structure's intended imagined and material existence. This ability does not negate the structure's power; most subjects use a space for its intended purposes. By looking at how perception alter space's meaning, these theorists echo Lefebvre and show how space's production, use, and perception are intrinsically linked.

A major influence on later CCCS scholars (as discussed above), Michel de Certeau theorizes that subjects navigate and use the bourgeois constructed world's power structures in order to "make do."[172] Interestingly, he makes no distinction between subjects' use and appropriation of space and media texts; he treats the use of space, as if one was reading a book.[173] In both cases, he dismisses the idea of passive subjects who simply absorb the world. Instead subjects are like readers, picking and choosing what they focus on, interpreting beyond author's intent, and skipping pages. He writes against theories using only societal structures to discuss what subjects do; these theories miss subjects' maneuverability and actual practices. However, subjects are not free to wholly reject the bourgeoisie world and create their own system. Subjects within powerful institutions construct texts and spaces to create a proper way of using texts and spaces; he labels these exertions of power "strategies." Subjects using these texts

---

[171] In "How Private Interest Take Over Public Spaces" Setha Low demonstrates how this tactic exists contemporarily; governments increase the economic divide between the preferred and newly conceived of "pastoral" suburban residents and those of the city and country
[172] Michel de Certeau *The Practice of Everyday Life xii*
[173] Idib. 92

and spaces have less power than those that created the texts and spaces, but are not powerless. They use tactics to momentarily defer the proper use of the space and texts and instead use it to advance their position or "make do."[174] His main point is that mass culture creates a fictional reality, but does not completely capture or alter the consuming subject.[175] Consumption is an active moment where subjects' interests, desires, and memories produce meanings from the provided texts. Time in a space allows for occupation (creation of space) and a momentary alteration of spaces and products. The temporal nature means alteration is fleeting. Subjects cannot permanently change the social constructs. Interestingly, he proposes three states of being (dying, laziness, and having un-programmed free time) as facilitating a disruption in the meaning system; they refuse to engage within the structure and allow for moments of escape and reflection.[176]

Both De Certeau and Lefebvre consider the subject as embedded within a constructed system of meanings. However, they differ on their theorization of the subject. De Certeau's subject's actions mean little; every action is gone as soon as it happens. No political project can come from this if subjects are powerless to build upon or archive the actions they have committed and meaning they have created. Lefebvre's theory allows for subjects' knowledge of spaces to have a deeper resonance, while still being shaped and circumscribed by capitalist imperatives. Subject navigate space based off their perception of that space, which is heavily influence by the intended meaning, but compounded by the subjects desired use of the space and his/her interaction with others in that space. The difference between the two is that De Certeau models his subject after "readers," while Lefebvre prefers a more performance-based "living in" framework. The reader puts down the book and nothing has changed besides perhaps the reader's

---

[174] Idib, xviii-xix
[175] This argument resembles both Stewart Hall "Encoding/Decoding" and Walter Benjamin "Flaneur."
[176] Michel de Certeau *The Practice of Everyday Life* 190-203

position. The performer enters a space with a motivation and affects how others use this space and imagine this space. The performer creates resonance, while the reader alters nothing.

Inspired by early geographers and their use of or similarities with cultural studies (CCCS), Peter Jackson and Ian Chambers attempt to more purposefully bring the two traditions together. Peter Jackson attempts to merge CCCS and geography theories by discussing culture and power in a fashion that does not privilege production over consumption, as de Certeau suggests. Jackson regards consumption not as an act of purchasing, but as the act of continually using, appropriating, and transforming a product. Central to his argument is that subjects have multiple identities, which influence and are expressed through consumption. This expression is political. Space affects which and how identity is expressed. Identities and their corresponding norms impact how a person produces meaning from a text; space and one's place within it is central to one's identity formation. He argues that rarely in the spatial constitution of self recognized; this is where geography can intervene in cultural studies.[177] He argues for an ethnographic approach to space and consumption as the only method that can fully address the complexity of the audience. This model has the potential to radically transform geography out of its monolithic theories by considering aesthetics, "ordinary people," and subordinate subjects and provide cultural studies with a better understanding of space or fall into the Fiske model of cultural studies, where consumer sovereignty replaces citizenship, and the battle over meanings is prioritized over structure change.[178]

Following the CCCS's focus on active audience and Fiske's misreading of de Certeau, Iain Chambers theorizes subjects as situated within language and, like language, they are always changing and fluid. Unstable subjects and language creates cities and therefore defies order or

---

[177] Peter Jackson "Towards a Cultural Politics of Consumption" 215-6
[178] Idib, 207-8, 223

control. All subjects within cities are positioned as strangers and migrants, who destabilize intended structures through their hybrid identities and always appropriate space. This instability allows subjects to exist within and through spaces, but refashion them according to their own needs, desires, predicament, and experiences. This alters, interrupts, and re-fabricates all that was imposed, producing a theory of space that ignores power.[179] For example, the Sony Walkman allows subjects to move around the world while listening to music. This music is being placed in situations and juxtaposed to other symbolic goods that the producers could never have intended. This constant decontextualization allows subjects to create new symbolic meanings and impose the music you identify with onto the outside world. As a subject listening to a Walkman travels through space she refashions the world according to her identity and soundtrack.[180]

Similar to Lefebvre and cultural industries political economists, Sharon Zukin approaches space as the primary embodiment of social, political, and economic forces. Zukin uses the term "landscape" to represent the symbolic and social practices (alterations, preservations, and destructions) existing between universalizing market forces and each space's vernacular, the material, social, and expressive uses of space by the powerless.[181] The modernist market attempts to reject and destroy particularities. Vernaculars become less distinct and closer to the market; this reduces tension and gives the market more control over space and culture. Zukin demonstrates that shifts in the market, from focusing on production to consumption, impact landscapes.[182] Zukin never doubts the market's power to shape landscape, in fact she

---

[179] Iain Chambers *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*
[180] Idib, 50-2
[181] Sharon Zukin *Landscapes of Power* 16
[182] Matt Gottdiener documents the shift to consumption through the increase of theming, a combination of fantasy and safety. He relies on Baudrillard's theory that consumption, not production, drives capitalism (See Jean Baudrillard "The Mirror of Production"). Gottdiener destabilizes the opposition between consumption and production; consumption involves the production of meaning. As support, he misreads De Certeau's concept of subjects by amplifying the resistance described. Gottdiener never distinguishes between capitalists' and consumers'

demonstrates it with her analysis of how national trends of de-industrialization combined with

the de-centralization of corporate headquarters dramatically reshaped Westchester County, NY

from a small industrial town into a place of consumption.[183] However, she does not deny

subjects' (vernacular) power to reject aspects of the market, cause business failures, or fight for

access to their own culture or markets.[184] For example, in her latest work, she examines how

community gardeners reclaim their neighborhoods from abject poverty by taking on the

government's role and using political channels, ethical claims, and mass media to maintain their

right to use the land they have occupied for years. Her examination shows how neighborhood

members actively alter the neighborhood and challenge and are sometimes complicit in

government and corporate powers looking to develop areas. Her theory is an interesting

juxtaposition to Jane Jacobs, who sees neighborhood authenticity as static; Zukin sees that use of

authenticity as attempting to exclude those who do not fit the ethnic, class, racial, or norms of the

"traditional" population, which, of course, views itself as "authentic." In other words, instead of

a conceiving authenticity as static condition that is achieved and then (inevitably) lost, Zukin

views authenticity as a rhetorical claim advanced by particular individuals and groups to achieve

particular social and political ends..[185]

Asaf Bayat's theorization of citizenship via Third World cities' marginalized subaltern

within a neo-liberal economy replicates a Lefebvre/Zukin subject, a subject who negotiates their

life through conditions outside their control. Bayat dismisses the post-structuralist idea of

resistance being everywhere (something De Certeau suggests). This, he argues, obscures state

and economic domination. Also, he dismisses the passive citizen model, that CCCS scholars also

production. This leads him to inaccurately describing consumers' power and replicate the mistakes made by Fiske, Chambers, and Willis..

[183] Sharon Zukin *Landscapes of Power* 135-8
[184] Sharon Zukin *Landscapes of Power* and *The Cultures of Cities*
[185] Sharon Zukin *The Naked City* 221-226

oppose, as too simplistic. Instead, [in his analysis of…] he provides the term "quiet encroachment," to describe the slow moving, non-collective actions by individuals who obtain necessities by tapping into dominant institutional resources, such as space, water, and electricity. Once they have taken these vital resources, they defend them collectively.[186] They challenge authority, while still being subjugated to that authority. Bayat sounds almost like he replicates De Certeau's theory of tactics and strategies. However, Bayat's subject can possess and defend what is gained through his or her tactics, while De Certeau only allows tactics to be fleeting, possessed one second, gone the next. His balanced model is more similar to Lefebvre's, but discusses citizens as actively shaping physical space, instead of altering only imaginary geography.

Strategies of Capital through Space

David Harvey breaks from this model of examining the "room for maneuver" of subjects within a capitalist produced space and instead focuses almost solely on how capitalists shape space to reproduce labor and the necessary social conditions to exploit labor, nature, and gain access to new markets.[187] Like Marx, Harvey discusses a dialectical theory of space, but only explains shifting structures and their ability to shape and use space. He uses a dialectical theory to refute the idea that Marx or he are economic determinist;[188] the state and other scales of governments developed capitalism, sustained it by organizing space, creating laws that reinforce capitalism's needed conditions, and unifying the proletariat under capitalistic nationalism. He

---

[186] Asef Bayat "From 'Dangerous Classes' to 'Quiet Rebels'"
[187] David Harvey "On the History and Present Condition of Geography," "The Geography of Capitalist Accumulation," "Capitalism," *Spaces of Hope,* and "The Geopolitics of Capitalism"
[188] David Harvey "The Marxian Theory of the State" 268
Graham Murdock and Peter Golding also argue that Karl Marx's work was never reductionist ("Culture, Communications, and Political Economy").

gestures that citizens affect space's production, but spends little time on them because capitalists

control significantly more power.[189]

The government's power in this process diminishes when the cost to relocate and ship

commodities lowers; capital can flee quickly to regions where labor is cheap and regulations are

lax, thus devastating economies.[190] The enhanced mobility of capital led to a new model of local

and regional governance, "the entrepreneurial city," where the government courts capital by

creating public-private partnerships, tax incentives, and policies that promote the flexibility of

labor; in doing so, they hoped to create jobs, a larger tax base, and expand consumer demand.

The fruits of these policies, Harvey argues, are typically disappointing. Capitalists usually create

few jobs, do not invest in the community, build poor infrastructures, and demand more tax-

breaks and public-investment to stay; they harm rather than help local economies and

governments.[191] Subsequent researchers have discussed this pattern on the state and city scale,

reinforcing Harvey's claims that the entrepreneurial government model fails.[192] The ease of

moving causes some cities to create global advertising campaigns selling their city's image,

while escalating gentrification to attract middle-class consumers and residents. Harvey details

how states and corporations create and emphasize local distinctions within the increasingly

homogenous world to differentiate the city's image.[193] Harvey breaks from his static discussion

of structures when he discusses the advertising of local distinctions and discusses processes as if

---

[189] For example, in *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference,* Harvey writes, "So who and where are the agents of social change? Again, the simplest answer is everyone, everywhere" (106). Agency for Harvey is mentioned only within this chapter and is always theoretical. The rest of the book is spent explaining how capitalist firms and the state shape concepts of space, time, and nature. Instead of being "everyone," agency appear nowhere in the rest of the book.
David Harvey *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference,* "The Geopolitics of Capitalism," *Spaces of Hope,* and "The Marxian Theory of the State"
[190] David Harvey "The Geopolitics of Capitalism" 327-8
[191] David Harvey "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism" and "A View from Federal Hill" and Delores Hayden "Building the American Way"
[192] Kevin Fox Gotham and Jeanine Haubert "Neoliberal Revitalization"(Louisiana), Delores Hayden "Building the American Way" (suburbs), and Vincent Mosco "The Empire at Ground Zero" (Manhattan)
[193] This is an attempt to reclaim the vernacular that Zukin details as being destroyed.

people existed within them. When he recognizes subjects within structures, he notes how the created distinctions can become a rallying point for subjects resisting capitalist intrusion.[194]

Harvey's examination of space usually fails to provide actual accounts of the subject. When he does discuss subjects, he states that their agency is everywhere because the social constitution of space intertwines with power, personal memory, institutions, and material practices. The body is *the* space of contention, which must be considered when discussing all scales.[195] To explore this, he relies on a generic dialectic theory, theorizing that the body is never complete, but relational, just like everything else. While this sounds vaguely like Lefebvre, it reads empty due to the lack of time and effort he devotes toward theorizing bodies. Additionally, he ignores the complexity of bodies by only reading bodies as *classed* – yet another example of the most common critique of Harvey's work, that he foregrounds class above all other social divisions and forms of social power. Nevertheless, he concludes that the ability to think of new possibilities beyond capitalism lies within the body. These bodies must secure space to create an alternative future.[196] He never goes beyond this description and so this gesture, like all his gestures towards subjectivity, falls flat. The error here is that subjects' lives outside of a prescribed class position is always theoretical; actual life is never depicted because the lives of subjects are more complicated than "subjects of capitalism." This is different than other theorists, such as Zukin and Lefebvre, who demonstrate how subjects' conditions are set by capitalism, however determined, resistant, or marginalized subjects can sometime appropriate or take possession of space. They show how subjects can and have, despite the difficulty, actually struggled against companies, developers, and the state.

---

[194] David Harvey "The Art of Rent"
[195] David Harvey *Justice*, *Nature and the Geography of Difference* and *Spaces of Hope*
[196] David Harvey *Justice*, *Nature and the Geography of Difference* and "City and Justice"

Following Harvey and Lefebvre, Neil Smith discusses how capitalism produces space to sustain and perpetuate itself. Smith shows how a universal process of uneven development drives the particular within capitalism. However, examining the particular alone can hide the larger processes occurring. Uneven development is how capitalism conceives and produces space; it partially including some spaces, while fully determining other spaces. By combining Marxism with the geographical tradition, an explicitly historical and political, instead of natural, account of how capitalists produce space, nature, and scales of space in its own image develops, while pushing space into a central element needed to understand capitalism's power. Capitalism not only invests in spaces, but also moves these investments abandoning and altering that space. This pattern is historical and is the premise for all future developments; the pattern is broken in moments of crisis. Within crisis uneven development widens. It is also when there is potential for change ushered in by the working class. Smith writes that he is not an economic determinist; however capitalism has been the most powerful force since 1945. To study something else would be epiphenomenal.[197]

Similar to Smith and Harvey, John R. Logan and Harvey L. Molotch theorize the struggle for urban space in economic terms, as the contention between property's use and exchange value. Entrepreneurs, realtors, government, and corporations view property as a means to gain more capital. Their activities within a neighborhood are solely to increase the exchange value of their property. Growth and the elevation of exchange values disproportionately impact populations, usually benefiting the wealthy and isolating or destroying poorer neighborhoods. Where Logan and Molotch differ from Smith and Harvey (and more resemble Lefebvre and Williams) is in their discussion of use value. Renters, community members, and some home owners are interested in the quality of their life within their spaces, the use value. For example, people

---

[197] Neil Smith *Uneven Development*

interested in use value more than exchange value would be interested in keeping local bars open because they create a more friendly, entertaining, and walk-able neighborhood. Additionally, an open business means people are on the street providing informal security. Those interested in exchange value might contest the existence of local bars because they drive down their property values. Logan and Molotch argue that all space is a result of the unequal struggle between local finance and real estate capital and less powerful community members. In congruence with their political economic approach, Logan and Molotch demonstrate how community members could use a "politics of everyday life," rather than the more obscure politics of consumption to combat capitalist forces. This politics consists of meaning making, lobbying governance, and accessing the public sphere. This places their theory within both CCCS and political economy trajectories.[198]

In his earlier work, Edward Soja warns against postmodern concepts of space, with its overactive, always-productive citizens. This space forgets power and reduces politics to insignificance. He begins his work much like Harvey and Smith, by studying only the classed subject and capitalism's power to create an uneven geography suited to its own needs.[199] At the same time, he gestures that geography must be understood through examining how the subject's body is positioned and produced within temporal and spatial processes. While Soja's theoretical discussions only gesture to non-classed subjectivities, his account of Los Angeles provides slightly more detail into how racial and gender differences affect the way space forms and impacts subjects.

When discussing Los Angeles, he examines how people are positioned and navigate geography not just through classed identities but through racial and gender norms. For example,

---

[198] John R. Logan and Harvey L. Molotch *Urban Fortunes*
[199] Much of this discussion is a repeat of Harvey's arguments.

the influx of wealthy Northerners to Los Angeles in the last two decades of the nineteenth century radically transformed the city's geography to fit the needs of incoming middle-class white protestants. This pushed lower-classed individuals to the outskirts of the city. However, class was not the only positioning identity; Chinese inhabitants in the downtown area were harassed and murdered by white protestant citizens and police officers. Legislation soon joined in on the "anti-Orientalist" sentiment and created restrictions for Chinese business owners, effectively destroying Los Angeles' Chinatown.[200]

In short, like Lefebvre, he examines cities as historical, social, and spatial processes; the events of the nineteenth century are part of contemporary Los Angeles, but do not define it. The definition of a city is momentary and always shifting. Soja's work moves beyond examining the intentionally built forms within the city (such as the moving in of WASP real-estate developers) and examines micro- (citizens murdering Chinese business-owners) and macro- (US federal anti-Chinese immigration laws) scales and real and imagined spaces without privileging one over the other. He argues that subjects experience Lefebvre's real and imagined spaces simultaneously; he calls this space the "lived-in" or third space perspective. This position allows him to theorize how the material and cultural conditions of a space impact and shape a subject.[201]

The shift in Soja's thought marks a larger shift within geography away from universalist accounts of space that Harvey and Smith propose to a more specific and particular view of space. This intervention does not dismiss the larger economic forces of the global market place. Instead, these theorists see how global processes come from particular or local spaces of power and affect various countries, cities, towns, and villages wildly different. The difference stems from power

---

[200] Edward Soja *Postmetropolis* 123-7
[201] Idib, 351-5

not exerted equally upon all places, connectedness to the global differentiates, and local culture

and power alter the impact of global processes.

Doreen Massey is key theorist in the examination of how particular spaces to intervene in

dominant views of space and time. She, like Harvey, Soja, Lefebvre, and De Certeau, writes that

space is dynamic process and defined in relational terms. However, she argues that Harvey never

actually examines the local, creating a theory of space that always favors and explains it as

determined by capital. Massey sees local existence in relation to the national, international, and

capitalism, not determining, but implicating each other.[202] She writes that all spaces are relational

and porous within and between scales. For example, Margaret Thatcher's economic plans

dramatically altered the landscape of British employment, however this alone is not responsible

for the dramatic loss of skilled labor jobs. Long-term shifts within global capitalist structures and

the breaking down of regional companies, which created a connection between the workplace

and community, were already undermining the working class.[203] It is the intersection of all these

global and local movements and occurrences that lead to the *particular* manner in which Britain

has been de-industrialized. By looking at particularities, she rejects the notion that local actors

can effectively create jobs by providing tax and monetary incentives because the local and global

shifts have dramatically changed the terrain.[204] The location of management, financial markets,

and factories within a nation and the world reveals the geography of power and oppression.[205] By

looking at particulars, Massey provides an account of multiple scales, a myriad of identities, and

other factors, such as technology, to impact each other causing restricted or freer movement

---

[202] Doreen Massey "Political Place of Locality Studies" and "Into Place and identity"
Linda McDowell replicates this model in *Gender, Identity, & Place* to show how local studies reveal gender
disparities residing within globalization.
[203] Doreen Massey "The Shape of Things to Come" 67-8
[204] As discussed by Harvey "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism," Vincent Mosco "The Empire at Ground
Zero," and Kevin Fox Gotham and Jeanine Haubert "Neoliberal Revitalization"
[205] Doreen Massey "Uneven Development," "Place called home?," and "A Woman's Place"

through space.[206] She sees this as countering Harvey, who ignores the local and all identities, besides class, but falsely includes them into his call for a universal (masculine) politics at a global scale.[207]

Nancy Duncan, Gill Valentine, Lawrence Knopp, Lydia Johnston, Alison Murray, and Linda McDowell also reject Harvey's universal politics; the universal forces alternatives to conform or remain hidden.[208] They discuss how the heteronormative public/private divide regulates gender and sexuality through informal policing and threats of violence causing different spatial experiences.[209] Gillian Rose and Linda McDowell repeat these sentiments and challenge David Harvey and Henri Lefebvre's split between real and imaginary spaces.[210] Rose and McDowell declare that imaginary spaces are very real to women, who feel excluded or marked through coding and others' actions.[211] Rose dismisses the universal subject by reminding us that although space excludes, it is not monolithic; women experience space differently and can take a masculine position. She thinks of space and theorists knowledge of space as inherently unstable, partially due to the inherent instability of the subject. To claim to know space is to reify the rational masculine subject that Habermas sets forth as an ideal. Instead, feminists are more likely, in Rose's opinion, to show the city as being experienced in radical heterogeneous terms.[212] For instance, Sally Munt uses personal experience within a local context to show how particular spaces foster lesbian flaneurs, who can capture masculine public existence and gain

---

[206] Doreen Massey "Global Sense of Place "and "Space, Place, and Gender"

[207] Doreen Massey "Flexible Sexism"

[208] The division within geography studies between Harvey's universal and Massey and other's particular is almost identical to the divide between Habermas and his critics.

[209] Nancy Duncan "Sexuality in Public and Private Spaces," Lawrence Knopp "Sexuality and Urban Spacem" Gill Valentine and Lydia Johnston "Wherever I Lay My Girlfriend, That's My Home," Elizabeth Grosz "Bodies-Cities," Alison Murray "Femme on the Streets, Butch in the Sheets," and Linda McDowell *Gender, Identity, & Place* and "Body Work"

[210] Gillian Rose "Masculinist Theory and Feminist Masquerade" and Linda McDowell *Gender, Identity, & Place*

[211] Vera Chouinard and Ali Grant "On Being Not Even Anywhere Near the Project" and Angie Hart "(Re)Constructing a Spanish Red-Light District" discuss how structures and people exclude lesbians and disabled people from gaining access to academics.

[212] Gillian Rose *Feminism and Geography*

social mobility, which is key to accessing sexual alternatives.[213] By examining particular

subjectivities within society, these theorists refute the universal subjectivity regularly used by

theorists only examining structures[214] and provide a more situation-based subject, who can

challenge and reshape the cultural landscape, but at risk; despite this agency, the public sphere is

still a site of class, gender, and racial privilege.

In *For Space*, Massey describes space as uneven and temporally co-implicated.

Globalization is a local event, created in particular spaces. Different places have uneven

experiences and play different roles (or no have no role or experience) within the process.[215] If

globalization were unilateral then time would be determined and closed for marginalized spaces.

For example, if globalization is universal then Malta would eventually experience the same

economic process that the United States is currently experiencing and not experience

globalization based on its own particularities.[216] Instead people, nature, and structures alter and

are altered by time and space; "You are not just travelling through space or across it, you are

altering it a little. Space and place emerge through active material practices. Moreover, this

movement of yours is not just spatial, it is also temporal."[217] Space must not be thought of as

dead or static; it contains surprises, multiple uses, and continually changes depending on a and

other subject's memories and uses and construction of that space, as well as the alteration of

space by things beyond a subject's control (i.e. climate, weather, animal use of space, and so on).

Space is instead an event and no creative force behind that event is stable because nature, people,

---

[213] Sally Munt "The Lesbian Flaneur"

[214] Theorists, such as Harvey, who only examine structures describe subjects as being determined and overly positioned by the structure, thus creating a universal theory of subjectivity.

[215] In *Home Territories*, David Morley, of the CCCS group, argues that the meaning of home is implicated by the meaning of nation. The best way to understand this process is to study media, which connects the seemingly private home to "broader social experience" (3). He uses Massey's concept of the local to discuss the discourses shaping home and the unevenness of globalization.

[216] Doreen Massey *For Space* 81-83. Also discussed in Massey "Place called home?" and "Global Sense of Place."

[217] Doreen Massey *For Space* 118

and social institution are always in flux.[218] This negates a universal experience of space.

Experiencing space and time is an unavoidable negotiation of "throwntogetherness" where

nothing is static. She refutes de Certeau's idea that people use time to momentarily liberate

space. Instead people impact and are impacted by the multiple layers of space, time, other

humans, and nonhumans. While seemingly messy, Massey's *For Space* represents an

extraordinary balance between studying structures and subjects.[219]

Don Mitchell's *The Right to the City* captures Doreen Massey's concept that space's

creation is through a "throwntogetherness" of numerous elements; he complicates the individual-

capitalist binary to show how different structures (the university, government, capitalists, and

military) and people (businesses, citizens, college students, homeless) have different symbolic,

need-based, and economic motivations for the control and use of spaces. He examines subjects

within structures allowing a depiction of systems that does not work independently of people and

that the people are invested in the ideals and future prosperity of their institution, not simply

anonymous capitalists. The complexity of space is best shown through Mitchell's example of the

fight for public space at University of California-Berkeley. Throughout the book Mitchell

chooses very small cases to discuss the battle for public space because, while the fight for free

space is national, it is played out in the local. In Berkeley, People's Park was created by student

occupation (vs. Reagan) in the late 1960s and was left alone for years. Then in the 1990s, the

university and the city decided to redevelop the park in ways that would discourage the homeless

from "camping" on the grounds. This set up a struggle between University administration and

the local government against college students, homeless and non-homeless citizens, and activists

---

[218] Idib. 43-48

[219] Michael Brown study validates Doreen Massey's globalization-as-local model through detailing how HIV prevention professionals across the globe share and alter local strategies to fight a pandemic (See Michael Brown "Sex, Scale and the New Urban Politics")

from the 1960s over the park and notions of who is a citizen, and who should be included in a definition of the 'legit' public.[220] Mitchell's example shows how space develops through the collision of the multiple uses, conceptions of how a space should be used, and who has the right to define its use. This struggle happens at a local level but is affected by regional and national institutions and subjects within and without institutions. He more solidly demonstrates space as an event of actors at all levels colliding at a particular locale.

This dialogue between structural (David Harvey and Neil Smith) and more dynamic (Doreen Massey and Don Mitchell) approaches to space is a central tension in the field of works detailing and theorizing the processes of gentrification. For his part, Richard Lloyd's examination of Chicago's Wicker Park neighborhood offers an analysis of the entrepreneurial governance model detailed by Harvey while focusing, as Massey would encourage, on the distinctiveness of local spaces. Through this he examines how city governments, local businesses, and landowners use artists as gentrifying agents, and how local and national media firms exploit the intensive (but intrinsically rewarding and identity-reassuring) labor performed by local artists. The structures that profit never economically support artists. Instead, artists bear the burden of reproducing and creating products, which produces cultural capital for the neighborhood. This provides a vast, self-training, and eager-to-be exploited reserve labor pool. For income, artists work as cheap laborers in services catering to middle-class gentrifiers and tourists. The labeling of an area as artistic raises its value and rent prices,[221] eventually forcing artists to relocate out of the neighbors they created and sustained.[222] Lloyd's examination of both

---

[220] Don Mitchell *Right to the City* 81-117
[221] Also illustrated in John R. Logan and Harvey L. Molotch *Urban Fortunes*
[222] Richard Lloyd *Neo-Bohemia*

structures and subjects provides insight into how artists, needing money, enter into a cultural process that ends up expelling them.[223]

As Harvey discusses, gentrifying agents use vernacular, which was originally erased, to create a distinct and consumable image of an area, via historical preservation or theming, and additionally turn public spaces into spaces of consumption. These new spaces of consumption are sometimes managed by Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), which blur the public/private distinction. BIDs are non-profit organizations, which have been authorized by state law to collect fees (i.e., taxes) from property owners within a particular district. These revenues are then devoted to services for the district, including trash removal and security. These coalitions shape the use of public land and allow the privatization of public authority (i.e, the governance of public space). This new perspective on space places the property owner as the ideal governor and consumer as the ideal citizens;[224] these studies, while mostly examining structures, provide the groundwork needed to see how BIDs impact various subjects differently.[225] By examining the plight of subjects, particularly homeless people and children, within the city's new BIDs structure, incite is gained into how privately owned, regulated, and policed public spaces exclude some and regulate everyone else into a certain mode of being, while destroying truly public space and institutions.[226]

Jane Jacobs, over fifty years earlier, detailed city planners, capitalists, and local governments' destruction of urban space through monotonous and sterile designs, creating ineffectual parks, and turning sidewalks into unusable spaces. Their policies push people into

---

[223] Lloyd positions artists similarly to how Angela McRobbie positions fashion workers; they work within the system and compromise their creativity to gain money, but are not fully incorporated or indoctrinated into the cultural industries. (See Angela McRobbie "Second Hand Dresses and the Role of the Ragmarket" and "A Mixed Economy of Fashion Design")
[224] This critique parallels political economists who argue against consumer sovereignty.
[225] Setha Low and Neil Smith "Introduction" and David Harvey "The Political Economy of Public Space"
[226] Cindi Katz "Power, Space, and Terror" and Don Mitchell and Lynn Staeheli "Clean and Safe?"

private spaces empty sidewalks causing street culture to vanish, crime to rise, and local

businesses to fail. Street culture makes streets safe for strangers to coexist by establishing a

voluntary network of known strangers, who act as surveillance, norm enforcers, and a sense of

security.[227] While very idealistic, she provides an assessment of multiple structures and their

various impacts on subjects. Jacobs's argument dismisses gentrifiers' claims that diverse cities

and poor neighborhoods are inherently unsafe. William Whyte documents street life similarly to

Jacobs and theorizes the city as a space similarly to de Certeau. Where he differs from both is

that he blurs the boundaries between the typical "good" powerless and "bad" power.[228] He

reminds us that CEOs, police officers, agents of the state, gentrifiers, and security guards can

facilitate the city's dynamic nature. For example, security guards and police officers can be

lenient and not enforce street or location-based codes; they do this because they are friendly with

the vendors, entertainers, teenagers, and homeless who occupy these spaces. This creates an

environment filled with people mutually respecting each other. While sounding utopian (and

therefore fantastical), he provides the anecdote of having only four moveable objects stolen from

a well-used plaza in twenty years. Whyte never forgets that power figures, such as the city

government and businesses, still do attempt to control and hinder street culture. Like Jacobs,

Whyte pushes for a vibrant and livable city, instead of an overly controlled, safe, but still dead,

space.[229]

Through focusing on the particular experiences of gay men in the gentrification process,

Manuel Castells and Lawrence Knopp create a dialogue around whether a subject's marginalized

identity positions them differently within a capitalist institution. Manuel Castells moves far from

Harvey's assertion on gentrification, abandoning political economy, and instead describing the

---

[227] Jane Jacobs *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*

[228] This is similar to political economist Bernard Miège blurring of the good subject /bad capitalism dichotomy.

[229] William H. Whyte *City*

development of gay and lesbian neighborhoods only at the level of sexual identity. This limited

scope allows him to describe this community as marginalized refugees, who sacrifice personal

wealth and safety to revitalize and populate inner cities, which were abandoned by the working

class. Because of his narrow scope, gentrification becomes a cultural expression and survival

strategy.[230] Lawrence Knopp does not deny urban spaces as vital to gay and lesbian cultural,

social, and political strives, but wishes to complicate Castells' heroic narrative by using a

political economic and ethnographic methodology. Knopp implicates class, race, and gender

stratification, social institutions, capital, and geography into the gentrification process.[231] He

explains the gentrification of New Orleans's Marigny neighborhood as white collar, gay, white

men using money to establish a community,[232] which did not serve the advancement of the

larger GLBT community, but instead increased property value and neighboring properties'

exchange value.[233] This created a privileged classed and gendered gay space.[234] By examining

the city's structures and subject's experiences, Knopp complicates Harvey's determined model

and dismisses Castells overtly resistance narrative. He explains that multiple struggles for limited

resources occur within a city and these gay men used what power they had. Several theorists of

gentrification, like Knopp, move away from Harvey's structural model, instead combining

political economy and cultural studies.

---

[230] Manuel Castells *The City and the Grassroots*
[231] Lawrence Knopp "Some Theoretical Implications of Gay Involvement in an Urban Land Market"
[232] Lawrence Knopp "Sexuality and Urban Space" and Jon Binnie "Trading Places" detail how class keeps poor GLBT people excluded from commercial spaces that serve as political and social spaces Although not discussing gentrification, Jerry Lee Kramer's "Bachelor Farmers and Spinsters" provides an ethnographic account of rural communities that could be used to counter the dismissal of consumer-oriented spaces; commercial spaces serve as meeting spaces for GLBT people lacking a visible community.
[233] Tim Davis "The Diversity of Queer Politics and the Redefinition of Sexual Identity and Community Urban Spaces" and Daniel Woodhead "Surveillant Gays" argue that for this reason, GLBT enclaves become stagnant and create complacent subjects.
[234] In "And She Told Two Friends," Tamar Rothenberg interviews residents of lesbian enclaves and discovers that economic and gender inequalities cause them to move into poorer areas and lack commercial spaces; they live near each other to have ensure they have a safe private space, each other's homes.

Knopp's theorization places the subject as an active agent in structural and systemic process of gentrification and not simply as a victim. Using a methodology similar to Knopp, Timothy A. Gibson and John Hannigan make similar movements by showing how subjects are not all position similarly to the system. Some subject benefit and therefore actively participate in the gentrification process, while others, either for economic or symbolic reason, actively oppose or resist attempts to gentrify areas. Gibson and Hannigan demonstrate how governments and capitalists' marketing strategies attempt to lure the middle-class back into the city to patronize gentrified areas or become gentrifies.[235] Through ethnographic methods, the target demographic was shown as receptive and willingly participating in gentrification (not naively) or rejecting the strategy based off memories of the area before gentrification. The two studies read together show subjects as unpredictable agents in the gentrification process.

Lynn Staeheli and Don Mitchell theorize how BIDs complicate the private/public dichotomy by denying some subjects access to public space, which denies them access to claiming publicness and speaking as the public. Access to the public is bound to property-ownership and the relationship between property-owners to other owners and subjects. These relations can change the meanings and uses of space through powers of exclusion and inclusion. While these structures matter, Staeheli and Mitchell examine how excluded subjects defy and challenge their exclusion by transgressing norms, regulations, and "civility." They reclaim and occupy spaces, gaining access to the public and publicity. They contest the norm by being visible; immigrants, queers, homeless, and racial minorities disrupt the dominant idea of the public. By occupying space, they bring awareness to their existence, which creates the possibility for inclusion, which would alter the image of the citizen and impact democracy.[236] The strength

---

[235] Timothy Gibson "City Living, D.C. Style" and John Hannigan "A Neo-Bohemian Rhapsody"
[236] This debate echoes Habermas and his critics and followers line of discussion.

of Staeheli and Mitchell's work is their demonstration of how structures matter, but how subjects can challenge ownership and private property. The boundary is never solid. The public can contest property by using it; privately owned public spaces can become the people's property.[237]

Similarly Susan Ruddick's empirical study of homeless youth in Hollywood details how structures marginalize subjects in and through space, how subjects create identities in and through space, and demonstrates the material power of symbolism. Historically, cities push the homeless into concentrated areas and expel them from wealthier or gentrifying neighborhoods. By marginalizing them to the worst neighborhoods, they make the homeless more marginal. The homeless did not all accept the isolation; young homeless people constructed a social identity and used space in a way that confronted their stigmatized identities. In a clever move, homeless people occupied a public park with a candlelight vigil, showing them as concerned citizens who have the right to occupy a space, challenging their usual depiction. They made material gains though tactics; they shifted services to Hollywood, occupied underutilized spaces to make homes and communities, and created social networks. Their negotiation of spaces impacts the imagined geography of space; it reveals class stratification and the fragmented use of space. The structures and subjects are always dialectical, responding and negotiating. More similar to Jenkins's than de Certeau's theory of tactics, Ruddick shows how tactics can accumulate and allows for change.[238] Similarly, Elizabeth Grosz destroys the causal binary between city and subject's bodies by showing how subjects physically and mentally create space and how space transforms them in the process; subjects are interfaced with spaces. Grosz dismisses the production and consumption divide.[239]

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

---

[237] Lynn, Staeheli and Donald Mitchell *The People's Property?*
[238] Susan Ruddick *Young and Homeless in Hollywood.*
[239] Elizabeth Grosz "Bodies-Cities"

This is not a progress narrative. Some political economists, geographers, and cultural theorists continue to replicate the worst characteristics of their disciplines and have become stereotypes of disciplinary boundaries. However, there are those that reach beyond their disciplinary comforts to account for culture in a more productive, non-reductionist, non-celebratory fashion that neither holds structures or subjects as more important than the other; structures and subjects must be seen as implicated in each other. Capitalist structures possess excessive power, but power is fractured and ideology is never complete and always contradictory. The subject is heavily positioned (and never complete), but actively lives their subordination or transgresses within structures. Both structures and subjects make and use space; it is through space that people become positioned and it is thought constructing an alternative way of being that subjects can alter symbolic and physical space. The subject's activity must be moved beyond consumer sovereignty; this leads to further subjugation or maneuverings within a closed system. Instead of theorizing active audiences, the limitations and possibilities of alternatives must be examined, while remembering power structures. In the words of Raymond Williams, "to be truly radical is to make hope possible, rather than despair convincing."[240]

---

[240] Cited in Philip Corrigan "The Politics of Feeling Good" 44

Works Cited

Adorno, Theodor W. "Free Time." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Ed. J. M Bernstein. London: Routledge, 2001. 187-197. Print.

---. "How to Look at Television." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Ed. J. M Bernstein. London: Routledge, 2001. 158-177. Print.

---. "On the Fetish Character in Music and Regression of Listening." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Ed. J. M Bernstein. London: Routledge, 2001. 29-60. Print.

---. "The Schema of Mass Culture." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Ed. J. M Bernstein. London: Routledge, 2001. 61-97. Print.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and the Ideological State Apparatus." *On Ideology*. Verso, 2008. 1-60. Print.

Andrejevic, Mark. *iSpy: Surveillance and Power in the Interactive Era*. Lawrence, Kan: University Press of Kansas, 2007. Print.

Ang, Ien. *Desperately Seeking the Audience*. London: Routledge, 1991. Print.

---. *Watching Dallas: Soap Opera and the Melodramatic Imagination*. London: Methuen, 1985. Print.

Baker, C. Edwin. *Media Concentration and Democracy: Why Ownership Matters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.

Barthes, Roland. "Death of an Author." *Image-Music-Text*. Hill and Wang, 1978. Print.

Bayat, Asef. "From "Dangerous Classes" to Quiet Rebels": Politics of the Urban Subaltern in the Global South." *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context*. Ed. Timothy A. Gibson & Mark Lowes. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 177-198. Print.

Bell, David. "Perverse Dynamics, Sexual Citizenship and the Transformation of Intimacy.." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. -263. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "Litte History of Photography." *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*. Ed. Michael William Jennings, Brigid Doherty, & Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008. 274-298. Print.

---. "Paris, capital of the nineteenth century." *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999. 3-13. Print.

---. "The Flaneur." *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999. 416-445. Print.

---. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility." *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*. Ed. Michael William Jennings, Brigid Doherty, & Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008. 19-55. Print.

Bennett, Tony et al. "Antonio Gramsci." *Culture, Ideology and Social Process: A Reader*. London: Batsford Academic and Educational in association with the Open University Press, 1981. 191-218. Print.

Bernstein, J. M. "Introduction." *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. London: Routledge, 2001. 1-28. Print.

Binnie, Jon. "Trading Places: Consumption, Sexuality, and the Production of Queer Space." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. 200. Print.

Blackmar, Elizabeth. "Appropriating 'the Commons': The Tragedy of Property Rights Discourse." *The Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006. 49-80. Print.

Bohman, James. "Expanding Dialogue: The Internet, the Public Sphere, and Prospects for Transnational Democracy." *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Ed. Nick Crossley & John Michael Roberts. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004. 131-155. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *On Television*. New York: New Press, 1998. Print.

---. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed." *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993. 29-73. Print.

---. "The Market of Symbolic Goods." *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993. 112-144. Print.

---. "The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods." *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993. 74-111. Print.

Brown, Michael. "Sex, Scale and the New Urban Politics: HIV-prevention Strategies from Yaletown, Vancouver." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. -263. Print.

Buck-Morss, Susan. "The Flâneur, the Sandwichman and the Whore: The Politics of Loitering." *New German Critique* 39 (1986): n. pag. Print.

Calhoun, Craig J. "Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 1-50. Print.

Castells, Manuel. *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. Print.

Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. 1st ed. Cambridge, MA: University of California Press, 2002. Print.

Chambers, Iain. *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

---. *Popular Culture: The Metropolitan Experience*. London: Routledge, 1988. Print.

Chouinard, Vera, and Ali Grant. "On Being Not Even Anywhere Near the Project: Ways of Putting Ourselves in the Picture." *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London: Routledge, 1996. 170-193. Print.

Cohen, Phil. "Subcultural Conflict and Working-Class Community." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 66-75. Print.

Corrigan, Philip. "The Politics of Feeling Good: Reflection on Marxism and Cultural Production." *Popular Cultures and Political Practices*. Ed. Richard Gruneau. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1988. 43-50. Print.

Crane, Diana. *The Production of Culture: Media and the Urban Arts*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications, 1992. Print.

Davis, Tim. "The Dviersity of Queer Politics and the Redefinition of Sexual Identity and Community Urban Spaces." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. -263. Print.

Duncan, Nancy. "Sexulaity in Public and Private Spaces." *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London: Routledge, 1996. -74. Print.

Dyer-Witheford, Nick. *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999. Print.

Eley, Geoff. "Nations, Pulics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 289-340. Print.

Ewen, Stuart. *All Consuming Images: The Politics of Style in Contemporary Culture*. New York: Basic Books, 1988. Print.

Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. London: Routledge, 1988. Print.

---. *Understanding Popular Culture*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989. Print.

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actual Existing Democracy.." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 109-142. Print.

Gardiner, Michael E. "Wild Publics and the Grotesque Symposiums: Habermas and Bakhtin on dialogue, Everyday Life, and the Public Sphere.." *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Ed. Nick Crossley & John Michael Roberts. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004. 28-48. Print.

Garnham, Nicholas. *Capitalism and Communication: Global Culture and the Economics of Information*. London: Sage Publications, 1990. Print.

---. *Emancipation, the Media, and Modernity: Arguments About the Media and Social Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.

---. "The Media and the Public Sphere." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 359-376. Print.

Gibson, Timothy A. "City Living, D.C. Style: The Political Economic Limits of Urban Branding Campaigns." *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context*. Ed. Timothy A. Gibson & Mark Lowes. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 83-110. Print.

Golding, Peter, and Graham Murdock. "Culture, Communications, and Political Economy,"." *Mass Media and Society*. Ed. James Curran & Michael Gurevitch. London: E. Arnold, 1991. 350. Print.

Gotham, Kevin Fox, and Jeannie Haubert. "Neoliberal Revitalization: Prison Building, Casinos, and Tourism in Louisiana." *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context*. Ed. Timothy A. Gibson & Mark Lowes. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 25-40. Print.

Gottdiener, Mark. *The Theming of America: Dreams, Media Fantasies, and Themed Environments*. 2nd ed. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 2001. Print.

Grimshaw, Roger, Dorothy Hobson, and Paul Willis. "Introduction to Ethnography at the Centre." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 61-66. Print.

Grossberg, Lawrence. "Cultural Studies: What's in a Name? (One More Time)." *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995. 245-271. Print.

---. "Introduction: 'Birmingham' in America?." *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997. 1-32. Print.

---. "Strategies of Marxist Cultural Interpretation." *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1984. 103-138. Print.

---. "The Context of Audiences and the Politics of Difference." *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1989. 320-342. Print.

Grosz, Elizabeth. "Bodies-Cities." *Sexuality & Space*. 4th ed. Ed. Beatriz Colomina. Princeton Architectural Press, 1996. 241-253. Print.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. The MIT Press, 1991. Print.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 2-35. Print.

---. "Encoding/Decoding." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 117-127. Print.

---. "Introduction to Media Studies at the Centre." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 104-109. Print.

---. "The Rediscovery of Ideology: Return of the Repressed in Media Studies." *Culture, Society, and the Media*. Ed. Michael Gurevitch. London: Methuen, 1982. 56-90. Print.

Hannigan, John. "A Neo-Bohemian Rhapsody: Cultural Vibrancy and Controlled Edge as Urban Development Tools in the "New Creative Economy"." *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context*. Ed. Timothy A. Gibson & Mark Lowes. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 61-82. Print.

Hart, Angie. "(Re)Constructing a Spanish Red-Light District: Prostitution, Space, and Power."

    Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London:

    Routledge, 1995. 214-228. Print.

Harvey, David. "A View from Federal Hill." *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*.

    1st ed. Routledge, 1992. 128-157. Print.

---. "Capitalism: the Factory of Fragmentation." *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical*

    Geography. 1st ed. Routledge, 1992. 121-127. Print.

---. "City and Justice: Social Movements in the City." *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical*

    Geography. 1st ed. Routledge, 1999. 158-207. Print.

---. "From Managerialism to Entreprenerualism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in

    Late Capitalism.." *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. 1st ed. Routledge,

    1989. 345-368. Print.

---. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell Publishers,

    1996. Print.

---. "On the History and Present Condition of Geography: An Historical Materialist Manifesto."

    Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography. 1st ed. Routledge, 1984. 108-120.

    Print.

---. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000. Print.

---. "The Art of Rent: Globalization and the commodification of culture." *Spaces of Capital:*

    Towards a Critical Geography. 1st ed. Routledge, 2001. 345-368. Print.

---. "The Geography of Capitalist Acculation: A Reconstruction of Marxian Theory." *Spaces of*

    Capital: Towards a Critical Geography. 1st ed. Routledge, 1975. 237-266. Print.

---. "The Geopolitics of Capitalism." *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. 1st ed.

    Routledge, 1985. 312-344. Print.

---. "The Marxian Theory of the State." *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. 1st

    ed. Routledge, 1976. 267-283. Print.

---. "The Political Economy of Public Space." *The Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006. 17-34. Print.

Hayden, Dolores. "Building the American Way: Public Subsidy, Private Space." *The Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006. 35-48. Print.

Hesmondhalgh, David. "Bourdieu, the media and cultural production." *Media Culture Society* 28.2 (2006): 211-231. Web.

---. *The Cultural Industries*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications Ltd, 2007. Print.

Hirschkop, Ken. "Justice and Drama: On Bekhtin as a Complement to Habermas." *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Ed. Nick Crossley & John Michael Roberts. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004. 49-66. Print.

Hobson, Dorothy. "Housewives and the Mass Media." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 93-103. Print.

Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Horkheimer, Max. "Foreward." *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. Ed. Martin Jay. University of California Press, 1996. xxv-xxvi. Print.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Continuum, 1997. Print.

Jackson, Peter. "Towards a cultural politics of consumption." *Mapping the futures*. Ed. Jon Bird. Routledge, 1993. 207-228. Print.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Modern Library, 1993. Print.

Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. University of California Press, 1996. Print.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. Updated and with a new afterword. New York, 2008. Print.

---. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans & Participatory Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
Print.

Jhally, Sut. *The Codes of Advertising: Fetishism and the Political Economy of Meaning in the
Consumer Society*. Reprint. Routledge, 1990. Print.

Johnson, Randal. "Editor's Introduction: Pierre Bourdieu on Art, Literature, and Culture." *The
Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia
University Press, 1993. 1-26. Print.

Johnson, Richard. ""What is cultural studies, anyway?"." *Social Text* 16 (1986): 38-80. Print.

Johnston, Lynda, and Gill Valentine. "Wherever I Lay My Girlfriend, That's My Home: The
Performance and Surveillance of Lesbian Identities in Domestic Environments."
Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London:
Routledge, 1995. 99-113. Print.

Katz, Cindi. "Power, Space, and Terror: Social Reporduction and the Public Environment." *The
Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006.
105-122. Print.

Knopp, Lawrence. "Sexuality and Urban Space: A Framework of Analysis." *Mapping Desire:
Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995.
149-161. Print.

Kracauer, Siegfried. "Analysis of a City Map." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed.
Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "Boredom." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass:
Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "Cult of Distraction." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin.
Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "On Bestsellers and their Audiences." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y
Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "The Group as Bearer of Ideas." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "The Hotel Lobby." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "The Litte Shopgirls Go to the Movies." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "The Mass Ornament." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "Those Who Wait." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

---. "Travel and Dance." *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Ed. Thomas Y Levin. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995. 403. Print.

Kramer, Jerry Lee. "Bachelor Farmers and Spinsters: Gay and Lesbian Identities and Communities in Rural North Dakota." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. -213. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1992. Print.

Lloyd, Richard. *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City*. 1st ed. Routledge, 2005. Print.

Logan, John R, and Harvey Luskin Molotch. *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987. Print.

Low, Setha. "How Private Interest Take Over Public Spaces: Zoning, Tazes, and Incorpartion of Gated Communities." *The Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006. 81-103. Print.

Low, Setha, and Neil Smith. "Introduction: The Imperative of Public Space." *The Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006. 1-16. Print.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964. Print.

Marx, Karl. "Capital." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. David McLellan. Oxford:

    Oxford University Press, 2000. 452-546. Print.

---. "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed.

    David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 83-121. Print.

---. "Grundrisse." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford

    University Press, 2000. 379-423. Print.

---. "Preface to A Critique of Political Economy." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed.

    David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 424-428. Print.

---. "The Communist Manifesto." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. David McLellan.

    Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 245-272. Print.

---. "The German Ideology." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. David McLellan.

    Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 175-208. Print.

---. "Theories of Surplus Value." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. David McLellan.

    Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 429-451. Print.

---. "Theses on Feuerbach." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. David McLellan. Oxford:

    Oxford University Press, 2000. 171-174. Print.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. 35th ed.

    Oxford University Press, USA, 2000. Print.

Massey, Doreen. "Masculinity, Dualisms, and High Technology." *BodySpace: Destabilising

    Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. 1st ed. Ed. Nancy Duncan. Routledge, 1996. 109-

    126. Print.

Massey, Doreen B. "A Global Sense of Place." *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis:

    University of Minnesota Press, 1991. 146-156. Print.

---. "A Place Called Home?." *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota

    Press, 1992. 157-174. Print.

---. "Flexible Sexism." *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,

    1991. 212-247. Print.

---. *For Space*. London: SAGE, 2005. Print.

---. "Spaces, Place, and Gender." *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of
      Minnesota Press, 1992. 177-184. Print.

---. "The Political Place of Locality Studies." *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University
      of Minnesota Press, 1991. 125-145. Print.

---. "The Shape of Things to Come." *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of
      Minnesota Press, 1983. 67-85. Print.

---. "Uneven Development: Social Change and Spatial Divisions of Labour." *Space, Place, and
      Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988. 86-114. Print.

Massey, Doreen B, and Linda McDowell. "A Women' Place?." *Space, Place, and Gender*.
      Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. 185-190. Print.

Massey, Doreen B, and Richard Meegan. "Industrial Restructuring Versus the Cities." *Space,
      Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978. 19-24. Print.

McCarthy, Thomas. "Practical Discourse: On the Realtion of Morality to Politics." *Habermas
      and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 51-72.
      Print.

McChesney, Robert Waterman. *Communication Revolution: Critical Junctures and the Future of
      Media*. New York: New Press, 2007. Print.

---. *Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communication Politics in Dubious Times*. Urbana:
      University of Illinois Press, 1999. Print.

---. *The Problem of the Media: U.S. Communication Politics in the Twenty-First Century*. New
      York: Monthly Review Press, 2004. Print.

McDowell, Linda. "Body Work: Heterosexual Gender Performances in City Workplaces."
      Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London:
      Routledge, 1995. 75-95. Print.

---. *Gender, Identity, and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. 1st ed. Univ Of
      Minnesota Press, 1999. Print.

McLaughlin, Lisa. "Feminism and the Political Ecnomy of Transnational Public Space." *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Ed. Nick Crossley & John Michael Roberts. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004. 156-176. Print.

McRobbie, Angela. "A Mixed Economy of Fashion Design." *The Blackwell Cultural Economy Reader*. Ed. Ash Amin & N. J Thrift. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. 3-14. Print.

---. "All the World's a Stage, Screen, or Magazine: When Culture is the Logic of Late Capitalism." *In the Culture Society: Art, Fashion, and Popular Music*. London: Routledge, 1999. 22-30. Print.

---. "Bridging the Gap: Feminism, Fashion, and Consumption." *In the Culture Society: Art, Fashion, and Popular Music*. London: Routledge, 1999. 31-45. Print.

---. "Introduction." *In the Culture Society: Art, Fashion, and Popular Music*. London: Routledge, 1999. ix-xii. Print.

---. "Jackie and Just Seventeen: Girls' Comics and Magazines in the 1980s." *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'just Seventeen'*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991. 135-188. Print.

---. "Jackie Magazine: Romantic Individualism and the Teenage Girl." *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'just Seventeen'*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991. 81-134. Print.

---. "Second Hand Dresses and the Role of the Ragmarket." *The Subcultures Reader*. Ed. Ken Gelder & Sarah Thornton. London: Routledge, 1997. 191-199. Print.

---. "Settling Accounts with Subcultures: A Feminist Critique." *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'just Seventeen'*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991. 16-34. Print.

---. "Shut up and dance: Youth culture and changing modes of femininity." *Cultural Studies* 7.3 (1993): n. pag. Web. 13 Nov. 2009.

---. "Teenage Mothers: A New Social State." *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'just Seventeen'*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991. 220-242. Print.

---. "The Culture of Working-Class Girls." *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'just Seventeen'*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991. 35-60. Print.

---. "The Politics of Feminist Research: Between Talk, Text, and." *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'just Seventeen'*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1991. 61-80. Print.

McRobbie, Dr Angela. *The Uses of Cultural Studies: A Textbook*. 1st ed. Sage Publications Ltd, 2005. Print.

Miege, Bernard. *The Capitalization of Cultural Production*. International General, 1989. Print.

Mitchell, Don. *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. 1st ed. The Guilford Press, 2003. Print.

Mitchell, Don, and Lynn Staeheli. "Clean and Safe? Property Redevelopment, Public Space, and Homelessness in Downtown San Diego." *The Politics of Public Space*. Ed. Setha M Low & Neil Smith. New York: Routledge, 2006. 143-175. Print.

Moores, Shaun. *Interpreting Audiences: The Ethnography of Media Consumption*. London: Sage, 1993. Print.

---. *Media/Theory: Thinking About Media and Communications*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Morley, David. *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

---. *Television, Audiences, and Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

---. "Texts, Readers, Subjects." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 154-166. Print.

Mosco, Vincent. "The Empire at Ground Zero." *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context*. Ed. Timothy A. Gibson & Mark Lowes. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 199-216. Print.

---. *The Political Economy of Communication*. First Edition. Sage Publications Ltd, 1996. Print.

Munt, Sally. "The Lesbian Flaneur." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. 114-125. Print.

Murdock, Graham, and Peter Golding. "Capitalism, Communication, and Class Relations." *Mass Communication and Society*. Ed. James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, & Janet Woollacott. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage, 1979. 478. Print.

Murray, Alison. "Femme on the Streets, Butch in the Sheets." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. 66-74. Print.

Myslik, Wayne. "Renegotiationg the social/sexual idnetites of places: Gay Communities as safe havens r sites of resistance?." *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London: Routledge, 1996. 278. Print.

Negus, Keith. *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Negus, Keith, and Michael Pickering. *Creativity, Communication and Cultural Value*. 1st ed. Sage Publications Ltd, 2004. Print.

Roberts, John Michael. "John Stewart Mill, Free Speach and the Public Sphere: A Bakhtinian Critique." *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Ed. Nick Crossley & John Michael Roberts. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004. 67-87. Print.

Rose, Gillian. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993. Print.

---. "Masculinist Theory and Feminist Masquerade." *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London: Routledge, 1996. -74. Print.

Rothenberg, Tamar. "And She Told Two Friends: Lesbians Creating Urban Social Spaces." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. 166-181. Print.

Ruddick, Susan M. *Young and Homeless in Hollywood: Mapping Social Identities*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Schiller, Herbert I. *Culture, Inc.: The Corporate Takeover of Public Expression*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. Print.

---. *Mass Communications and American Empire*. 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992. Print.

Schudson, Michael. "Was There Ever a Public Sphere? If So, When? Reflections on the
American Case." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge,
Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 143-163. Print.

Smith, Neil. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. Routledge, 1996.
Print.

---. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. Oxford, UK: B.
Blackwell, 1991. Print.

Smythe, Dallas W. *Dependency Road: Communications, Capitalism, Consciousness, and
Canada*. Ablex Publishing, 1981. Print.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*. Oxford: Blackwell
Publishers, 2000. Print.

---. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London:
Verso, 1989. Print.

Staeheli, Lynn, and Donald Mitchell. *The People's Property?: Power, Politics, and the Public*.
Routledge, 2007. Print.

Thompson, John. *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass
Communication*. 1st ed. Stanford University Press, 1991. Print.

Tomlinson, John. *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction*. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins
University Press, 1991. Print.

---. *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. Print.

Valentine, Gill. "(Re)negotiationg the heterosexual street." *Bodyspace: Destabilizing
Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London: Routledge, 1996.
278. Print.

Warner, Michael. "The Mass Public and the Mass Subject"." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*.
Ed. Craig J Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992. 377-401. Print.

Whyte, William H. *City: Rediscovering the Center*. Reissue. University of Pennsylvania Press,
2009. Print.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." *Culture and Materialism*. Verso, 2006. 31-49. Print.

---. "Ideas of Nature." *Culture and Materialism*. Verso, 2006. 67-85. Print.

---. "Literature and Soiology." *Culture and Materialism*. Verso, 2006. 11-30. Print.

---. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford [Eng.]: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.

---. "Means of Communication as Means of Production." *Culture and Materialism*. Verso, 2006. 50-66. Print.

---. *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. 3rd ed. Routledge, 2003. Print.

---. "The Bloomsbury Faction." *Culture and Materialism*. Verso, 2006. 148-169. Print.

---. *The Country and the City*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1975. Print.

Willis, Paul. "Notes On Method." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London: Hutchinson, 1992. 76-83. Print.

---. "Symbollic Creativity." *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader*. 2nd ed. Ed. John Storey. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998. 546-553. Print.

Woodhead, Daniel. "Surveillant Gays: HIV, aspce and the consitituion of Identities." *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. Ed. David Bell & Gill Valentine. London: Routledge, 1995. 231-244. Print.

Zukin, Sharon. *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. University of California Press, 1993. Print.

---. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2009. Print.

---. *The Cultures of Cities*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1996. Print.