

# INDUSTRIALIZATION PROBLEM OF CULTURE IN THE PROCESS OF GLOBALIZATION

**Dr. Abamüslim AKDEMİR**

Ataurk University Kazım Karabekir Education Faculty  
Philosophy Department  
akdemir@atauni.edu.tr

**Dr. Erdiñ PARLAK**

Atatürk University Kazım Karabekir Education Faculty  
Department of English Language  
erdincparlak@hotmail.com

**Abstract:**The rapid changes and transformations in science, technology and mass communication have gave way to a new process. This recent phenomenon which made itself felt in almost every part of human life has, at the same time, caused debates in western cultural life on philosophy, literature, architecture, painting under the name of globalization. One of the debates was the one towards modern age under the domination of production and industrial capitalism. The valid value of industrialization, the “production”, has left its place to a new social understanding named “upper-reality”. This has emerged as a result of post-industrial viewpoints. On the other hand, “similarity” replaced the “reality”of modern cultural values. The process of globalization , again, transformed the aesthetic nature of cultural values into commercial meta identity together with post-industrial approaches. As the globalized industrial values made man mere consumer, there emerged the ideology of entertainment industry. This process has both produced meta and created mass culture or popular values before individuality.

The rapid changes in information and communication due to the developments in science, technology and economy have put international borders aside. The world has turned into a large village where common values have been formed. This recent phenomenon which made itself felt in almost every field of life together with the last quarter of 20th century, emerged under the name of “new world order”, “postmodernity”, and “globalization”. It became the focal point of discussions in every field from art to philosophy.

Human rights, also, became one of the main issues of discussion in every area. Globalizataion began to dominate almost all the world with the understanding of human rights, liberal economy and market economy. The political dimension of globalization made the leadership of USA felt, on the other and its economic dimension that of multi dimensional capital. On its cultural basis, the label hegemony of monotonus consumption culture came to the fore as universal and local were presented at the same time (Akdemir, 2004, p.43). This new era was defined by Fredric Jamesan as modernization, post-industrial, consumption society and show society. To him new economic order and social life have formed the beginning of new government in the cultures (Jameson, 1993, p.27). This new case has mingled cultural social and economic to each other with globalization. The borders have become much more ambiguous in culture.

With the process of globalization, the rationalization form of modernity was opened to discussion as meaning, order and content. Direct relationships were formed with the methods of bringing closer diverse lives ontologically not related to each other. According to Benjamin, man has lost his freedom and singleness. Every object is the mirror of another. Those objects eating, drinking, listening, watching the same things have now

started to think and feel the same things exactly. Everybody is the same (Dellaloğlu, 2003, pp.21-22). Within this process, the postmodern view which addresses to the homogenous mass has now created mass culture or popular culture. The products of mass culture do not give rise to creativity.

It has made men an inactive object who can be directed and controlled instead of putting them into a mutual discussion atmosphere. Culture and entertainment have mingled to each other in the fantasy world of mass communication tools (Swingewood, 1996, p.36). Its culture and works of art have now become meta and its function has been only to entertain and has reduced conscious totally to inactivity.

Globalization considers eclecticism as the basis of culture. On the one hand it mixes everything to each other by mass culture and makes them global by loading them with homogenous. It, on the other hand, brings sub-cultures, localization, tradition and differences to the fore. For instance, man begins to listen to reggae music, watches cowboy film on tv, has his lunch at Mc. Donald's, dinner at a local restaurant. He uses Paris perfume in Tokyo, wears redra clothes in Hong Kong (Appignanesi and Garrat, 1996, p.47). Elite and popular culture forms are have migled to each other.

Mass culture has criticized aesthetic sensitivity with the concepts of imitation, irony and pastiche and rejected aesthetic elitism. It has demonstrated a populist attitude with the understanding of "Anything goes". Money is the sole measurement in the lack of aesthetic criteria. Everything that the artist spits is money. There is nobody where everybody is the same. There no longer, exists such a thing as object. All those have been caused by "Culture Industry".

The concept of "Culture Industry" has been used for the first time by the thinkers Adorno and Harkheimer of Frankfurt School taking mass culture criticism as the basis in the "Dialectics of Illumination".

The most widely criticized feature of Adorno's culture industry is its misleading aspect. On the basis of this criticism lies Marx's meta fetishism. According to Adorno, those produced by culture industry are not the works of art that have become as meta but those metas produced for Market from the very beginning. The concept of culture, industry, starting from the time that culture became a thing and money in the classic term became a culture during the late capitalist era, struggles to form a theory of daily life with this concept (Dellaloğlu, 2003, p.23). Culture industry has reduced individuals to a living meta in the name of consuming to consume. The individual has formed a living area with the product. As Adorno says; "The typical cultural existence of culture industry are no longer product but has been turned into product besides other features" (Adorno, 2003, p.72).

The culture industry is, in the simplest definition, the industrialization of culture and man has become as an industrial product within the industrial society and has become a thing. The individuals have created an area of living with the product. The main reason here is to gain satisfaction by kitch products without aesthetic. The imitation has replaced the real one. The society, on the other hand, consists of individuals totally consumers and of which behaviours have been determined in advance. Adorno explains it as: "Every one should behave suitable for their levels determined before and should move towards the mass production categories produced for certain types of consumers"(Adorno, 2007, p.51). In such a case, consumers have become materials of statistics.

For the individuals, being adaptable has replaced consciousness. Industrial mind suggests workers a model of mental cooperation. It spends effort in order to make them accustomed to the system. Though it seems at first sight that this gives man freedom both in their working life and cultural industry, men (individuals) in such case

have always been a subject (Adorno, 2007, pp. 81-82). Culture industry, consciously, has been a barrier before the development of free individuals.

Though the products of culture industry create a monotonous atmosphere, it has been successful in attracting men by its very nature. Similar and charming products do not allow their customers move out of the circle. As Adorno explains; the men who are now consumers became the ideology of entertainment industry which they cannot get rid of (Adorno, 2007, p.96). Cultural industry imposes an entertainment equal to thinking. Man, unconsciously and with no resistance, accepts this insistence (Adorno, 2007, p.56).

The administrators have, according to Adorno, directed the mass and changed them into the means of propaganda and tourism. Thus, the artistic works that industry of culture created made art object and merchandising. In this context, the best way to merchandise and present all the products to consumption is advertisement.

In the process of industrialization of culture, advertising appears to have formed an area of surrealism. Advertising not only creates desire but it also forms a reality of being an object. Adorno (2007, p. 96) states that advertising is the elixir of life of culture industry. Behind advertisement, the sovereignty of system is hidden. Everything having no mark of advertisement is regarded as meaningless economically. Adorno explains the success of advertising in the domain of culture industry in the light of the fact that though consumers know that advertisement is not true, they continue to purchase the cultural objects and sustain to use them with a strong desire. (Adorno, 2007, p. 107)

While Adorno strongly defends modernist art, he criticizes the mass culture as a result of the industry of culture. He objects to capitalist and socialist totalitarian regimes since they intervene with the human freedom. He regards the culture that was created by means of technological facilities as a tool of mass manipulation. The process of being object that Hollywood, Broadway, Manhattan and Rock'n Roll directed and accelerated Adorno's criticism who migrated to New York during the World War II (Pelvanoglu, 2009). Adorno's criticism towards the cultural industry that global world has created displays how he was contemporary. Culture's industrialization changed it into an object carelessly. The mass culture or popular values towards particularity or individualism came front. The dominance of subject overwhelmingly became restricted and the power between subjectivity and culture declined. (Connor, 2005, p.364). In postindustrial culture, thus, high culture understanding integrated with commercial and mass culture. The standards of culture irresistibly lost and the cultural products made individual an ordinary carrier of the social tendencies. According to Adorno, the industry of culture occurred through the instinct of profit which has always been prevailing. (Adorno, 2007, p. 112). This is the reason that made everything object and the changed the object itself into culture. Therefore, the individual who has become alienated towards effort in the phase of production become also alienated to life and the whole existence through consumption's becoming aesthetic in the phase of consumption.

Adorno's subject which is his object of analysis is not the employee but the customer of consumption society. The subject's meaning that he attributed while using culture industry is different from the meaning that mass culture or popular culture attributed. In mass culture, authentic people is mentioned, people's culture has a role for the mass culture. However, Adorno cannot stand even their implication in that in culture industry people does

not create culture. It includes in the industry culture. It is not the subject but the object. Today people have become more inactive than what Adorno stated. Today's culture industry forces to consume more alienation and forget to be individual in the society. People have changed what they consume into fetishism. Brand sovereignty has occupied people's life space. Thus, Adorno's remark goes back to 50 years turned out to be true.

## References

- Adorno, T. W (2003) "*Kültür Endüstrisini Yeniden Düşünürken*", çev. Bülent O. Doğan, *Cogito*, Sayı: 36, Yaz 2003, pp. 76-84.
- Adorno, T. W. (2007) *Kültür Endüstrisi- Kültür Yönetimi*, çev. N. Ünler, M. Tüzel, E. Gen, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Akdemir, A. (2004) "*Küreselleşme ve Kültürel Kimlik Sorunu*", *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Cilt:3, Sayı:1, 2004, Erzurum, pp. 43-51.
- Apigenes, R. And Garratt, C. (1996) *Postmodernizm*, İstanbul, Milliyet Yayınları.
- Connor, S. (2005) *Postmodernist Kültür*, çev. Doğan Şahiner, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Dellaloğlu, B. F. (2003) "*Bir Giriş: Adorno Yüz Yaşında*", *Cogito*, Sayı: 36, Yaz 2003, pp. 13-36.
- Jameson, F. (1993) "*Postmodernizm ve Tüketim Toplumu*", çev. H. Gülerüz, V. Aytar, *Edebiyat ve Eleştiri Dergisi*, Ocak-Şubat 1993, İzmir.
- Swingewood, A. (1996) *Kitle Kültürü Efsanesi*, çev. Aykut Kansu, Ankara, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.