colonial is space and time best defined (in the hand... Nkrumah, a freedom fighter, thinker, and later a Ghanaian President) as 'power without accountability' and 'exploitation without redress'.[11] Epistemic insubordination' is the way of social movement and theory in this zodiac; the question is how did the aesthetic theory practice this in the past and how its praxis now and in the future will combat this? Both questions confront us with the problem of conceptualizing the 'futures past' (as Reinhart Koselleck described this).[12]

III 'Mass Culture', 'Educated Philistines' and 'Culture Industry'

It may perhaps be useful to revisit these concepts, albeit briefly here, to understand domination and insubordination. The thought world of Hannah Arendt is mostly engaged here though Theodore Adorno persuasively developed the concept of 'culture industry'. Adorno proposes the term 'culture industry' in place of mass culture; he affirms that the culture industry is a control 'system' which commodifies expression (and even intra-systemic dissent) and creates its own distinctive way of regulating social behaviour and even the production of its norms. He writes:[14]

10 Dipesh Chakravarty, "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of Indian History: Who Speaks for the "Indian" Past?" 37 Representations 1-16 (1992).

11 Kwame Nkrumah, "Introduction" in Neo-Colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism (Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd, London, 1965)" He also said:' A state in the grip of neo-colonialism is not a master of its destiny. It is this factor which makes neo-colonialism such a serious threat to world peace. What Nkrumah describes as neo-colonialism appears to a reader, in times of hyper globalization, neo-liberalism, and austerity in face of 'debt' (and development) crises as illiberal governance and constitutional authoritarianism.

12 Reinhart Koselleck, Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Times (Columbia University Press, 1985).

13 Theodor Adorno, "Culture Industry Reconsidered" in J.M. Bernstein (ed.), The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture 85-92 (Routledge, London, 1991).

14 Id. at 86.

and organised politics, and the ways of pursuing supreme political power. A dialectical enlightenment of enlightenment "discloses each image as script. It teaches us to read from [the image's] features the admission of falseness which cancels its power and hands it over to truth".[18] This observation deserves the status of both a maxim and an enigma: as a maxim it carries a theory of reading and an enigma it reveals both (in Peter Goodrich's words) forms of iconophilia as well as iconophobia. What remains of the image when it is

---

15 *Ibid.*

16 See Francois Debrix, *Tabloid Culture: War, Culture, and Geopolitics* (Routledge, London, 2007); Upendra Baxi, "Reading 'Terror': Reflections on François Debrix, Tabloid Terror: War, Culture, and Geopolitics" 12(3) *Theory and Event* (2009).

17 M. Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford University Press, Stanford 2002, 1947: trans. E. Jephcott) ; Theodor W. Adorno , *Negative Dialectic* (Seabury Press, New York, 1973: trans. E. B. Ashton).

18 *Id., Dialectic of Enlightenment* at 18. See also, *Aesthetic Theory* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1997, 1970: trans. R. Hullot-Kentor); see also, L. Zuidervaart, *Adorno's Aesthetic Theory: The Redemption of Illusion* (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1991).

read as a text? How do we 'read' images in words? What happens to words when images are read through them? And are admissions of falseness also not inherent truths: Is that which we call fake today not yesterday's lived truth?

Hannah Arendt did face this difficult, if not hazardous, last question. While it is true that they were both concerned with the genealogies of Auschwitz and total domination,[19] Arendt confronted such questions differently. In her essay "The Crisis in Culture"[20] she famously put to use the distinction between 'culture' and 'entertainment' *via* categories of mass society and mass culture. Beginning from an etymological explanation-the Roman word 'culture' derives from *colere* (richly meaning to cultivate, dwell, care, tend, and preserve), she contrasted culture with domination, whether of nature or human.[21] However, far from being 'durable' as the standard conceptions of culture suggest, she demonstrated that "durability is the very opposite of functionality, which is the quality which makes it disappear again from the phenomenal world by being used and used up." [22] Therefore, for Arendt, "developing nature dwelling place for a people as well as in the sense of taking care of the monuments of the past, determine even today the content and the meaning we have in mind when we speak of culture".[23]

John Ruskin said a long time ago: "remember that the most beautiful things in the world are the most useless; peacocks and lilies, for example"; Arendt decries 'philistinism' as a notion which "designated a mentality which judged everything in terms of immediate usefulness and 'material values' and hence had no regard for such useless objects and occupations as are implied in culture and art."[24] The difference between a cultured society that "wanted culture, evaluated and devaluated cultural things into social commodities, used and abused them for its own selfish purposes, but did not 'consume' them"[25] and a mass society lay in a philistine disregard for the use values and habits of consumption of the exchange value of cultural products. Cultural

---

19 Dana Villa, "Genealogies of Total Domination: Arendt, Adorno, and Auschwitz" 100 *New German Critique* 1-45 (2007).

20 Hannah Arendt, *The Crisis in Culture: Its Social and Its Political Significance, Between Past and Future* 197-226 (Penguin Books, 1993).

21 *Id.* at 211-212.

22 *Id.* at 209.

23 *Id.* at 213.

24 *Id.* at 201.

25 *Id.* at 204.

objects are preyed upon by mass society, and mass society "will literally consume the cultural objects, eat them up and destroy them".[26]

Not any more considered cultural objects, these "consumer goods serve...to while away time, and the vacant time which is whiled away is not leisure time, strictly speaking – time, that is, in which we are free from all cares and activities necessitated by the life process and therefore free for the world and its culture – it is rather left-over time which still is biological in nature, left over after labour and sleep have received their due.[27] Mass culture's entertainment industries equal in major respects with a consumer's society, in search for entertainment feeding on the cultural objects of the world".[28] Important here is the early beginning of biopower and biopolitics (though these concepts as moulded by Michel Foucault, Gorgio Agamben, and Roberto Esposito were not available to Arendt generation) that erase the distinction between cultural and entertainment industries.

Arendt is still right in the contrast between a cultured society and a philistine one, but she does not urge any underlying distinction between art for the sake of art and non-art. True, she seems to disagree with descriptions of culture which include "room here for Coca-Cola as much as Chopin, for practical knowledge as much as religious symbolism"[29] but she also rejects the "eager and uncritical acceptance of such obviously philistine terms as highbrow, middlebrow, and lowbrow cultures" as "a rather ominous sign". For the only non-social and authentic criterion for works of culture is, of course, their relative permanence and even their ultimate immortality.[30] Her ire is more directed against the 'cultured' or 'educated' philistine who seeks higher status and social advance, and pursues 'perfection' by specializing in the arrival of such 'ominous signs'. The kitsch and the rap, the graffiti as well as the wall and floor paintings and murals, the street theatre and folk music are also mass culture and arts.

However, the post-Arendt accentuation of popular culture as more than merely 'mass culture' may be said to inaugurate a new genre, if only because

---

26 *Id.* at 207; see also, *infra* note 30 at 281-282.

27 *Id.* at 205.

28 *Id.* at 204.

29 Robert Holton, "Globalization's Cultural Consequences" 570 *Annals APSS* 142 (2000) writes in a context wholly different from Arendt's marinating that globalization in its more contemporary forms is hospitable to more hybrid and syncretic cultures and that 'polarization' is inadequate to deal with today's cultural complexities.

30 Hannah Arendt, "Mass Culture and Mass Media" 89 (2) *Daedalus* 280 (1960).

[handwritten: mark the most prominent or imp feature]

the popular culture foregrounded resistance (being mainly works on labour history and art) whereas the mass culture studies emphasized linkages between the market and 'culture'. As the theoretical preface of Michel Denning reveals,[31] Fredric Jameson (launching *Social Text*) and Stuart Hall (addressing historians)[32] who theoretically brought to us respectively the problematic of 'the interpretation of cultural texts' and of 'periodizing cultural transformations'.[33] Both thinkers heighted the specificity of the political. Jameson maintained that culture, "far from being an occasional matter of the reading of a monthly good book or a trip to the drive-in, seems to me the very element of consumer society itself .... Everything is mediated by culture, to the point where even the political and the ideological 'levels' have initially to be disentangled from their primary mode of representation which is cultural."[34]

For Hall, popular culture was not simply "those things the 'people' do or have done ... Pigeon-fancying and stamp-collecting, flying ducks on the wall and garden gnomes but rather one of the sites where [the] struggle for and against a culture of the powerful is engaged .... It is one of the places where socialism might be constituted. ... That... is why 'popular culture' matters. Otherwise, to tell you the truth, I don't give a damn about it"?[35]

[handwritten left margin: modernism is an end of traditional ideas through aesthetic product]

Jameson also suggests "that the works of mass culture cannot be ideological without at one and the same time being implicitly Utopian"; they "... cannot manipulate unless they offer some genuine shred of content as a fantasy bribe to the public about to be so manipulated ... such works cannot manage anxieties about the social order unless they have first revived them and given them some rudimentary expression."[36] *[handwritten: involving / limited to basic principle]*

How about 'commercial culture'? In their distinctive ways both thinkers argue that these cultures are discrete but these also interact. More interesting to them, as Denning explains, "it is the dialectic of containment and resistance, of reification and utopia which defines popular or mass culture that interests Jameson and Hall. Hall emphasizes the battle surrounding the texts, artefacts,

---

31 Michael Denning, "The End of Mass Culture" 37 *International Labour and Working-Class History* 4-18 (1990; hereinafter referred to by the author).

32 Fredric Jameson, "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture" 1 *Social Text* 139 (1979); Stuart Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing 'the Popular', in Raphael Samuel (ed.), *People's History and Socialist Theory* 234-239 (London, 1981).

33 *Id.,* Hall at 5.

34 *Id.* at 6.

35 *Id.* at 5.

36 *Id.* at 6.

[handwritten: uptopian — aiming for a state in which everything is perfect; idealistic.]

ormances-the "continuous and necessarily uneven and unequal
, by the dominant culture, to constantly disorganize and reorganize
r culture and Jameson emphasizes the conflict within the symbolic
themselves".[37]

Hannah Arendt would have welcomed these enunciations as completing
own perspective. She would have also been excited by contemporary
bate on the scope of intellectual property rights, especially the traditional
knowledge of the first nations peoples[38] as carrying forward the debates on
the antinomies of mass society and culture and the vicissitudes of aesthetic
appreciation. And she would have now revised her views on norms of human
rights,[39] although her analysis of stateless persons and refugees would have
held intact, if not grown fierce.

The questions thus thrown up deserve anxious attention from those who
will relate human rights to mass culture. In particular, what are the relations
of affect and effect between mass/popular cultures with human rights cultures?
What are, the 'popular' cultures of human rights and if there are how are
these distinct from the conceptions of mass culture? How are cultural
manifestations of human rights different when these appear in governance
and resistance cultures? To be more specific, what are the diff
police cultures and protest cultures? An
How may we add