

## **Appendix O. Cultural Studies of the Economy: New Directions**

Embedded inside the larger culture of society is the culture of the market. The American market economy, for example, has values like productivity and efficiency that are different from - and not always in accord with - the values of the larger society. If we want to understand what is happening in this economy we need to study the interface between the market culture and the general society. In this Appendix we will look at cultural studies of the economy as a method of research and theory making.

Cultural studies have no single subject of study or disciplinary affiliation. The definitions of “cultural studies” are often esoteric, like “the explanation of the conditions of possibility for the production and reproduction of subjectivities,” or “the production of oppositional subjectivities.” Some writers describe the approach simply as “the description of experience.”<sup>1</sup>

We will look closely at what constitutes “cultural studies” in relation to the economy and analyze tensions between principles operating in the general culture of capitalist countries like the United States. Such tensions tell us how changes are taking place as capitalism is in tension with the larger culture.

We begin with a review of research and theories in cultural studies, which will lead us to a discussion of dialectical thought that takes us back to ancient times. We will then return to see how cultural studies emerged in the context of post-structuralism and deconstructionalism. We will look at the binaries discussed in A CIVIL REPUBLIC and part of this discussion is a digression into the work of Paulo Freire. Freire wanted sophisticated studies of culture to be practical in real (everyday) life; we see his work

linked to the method of participant observation. There is finally a last word on what is missing in cultural studies today.<sup>2</sup>

### I A Review of Cultural Studies and the Economy

Cultural studies of the economy have begun in many ways. William Tabb, for example, uses the term “cultural economy” when he reports on distinctive features in Japan’s economy. Tabb argues that the separation of economists from the varieties of culture in production and distribution is no longer viable. He sees what economists do not see in Japan: *uniqueness* in the *cooperative relations* of employers and employees. He describes the complex financial-industrial organization known as *keiretsu*. For Tabb, the Japanese culture makes market choices and market institutions that are more constrained than those in the United States.<sup>3</sup>

Other writers use the term “cultural economy” to describe their work. Allen Scott in the Department of Policy Studies and Geography at UCLA, for example, outlines a method to study global cities. He looks at the *stylization of life* and *the aesthetic values* in the markets of different metropolises. He studies the *status of prestigious goods*, *the fashions*, *the method of advertising*, *the nature of mass consumption*, *different corporate cultures*, and *personal identities at work*. Scott describes the intertwining of capitalist production and the *cultural content of its outputs*, as he puts it. He looks at the ways in which these effects make themselves felt in the growth of cities.<sup>4</sup>

The work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu has been foundational to cultural studies, emphasizing class, power, and style of life in markets. Bourdieu distinguishes between material wealth and cultural wealth. Material wealth is the means by which high “culture” adds to status of the elite through styles of clothing and art, cultural

affiliations and organizations. In producing the most sophisticated approach to cultural studies available today Bourdieu sees that the sociological study of culture bears strong similarities to the sociological study of religions.

Bourdieu's cultural studies differ from those social studies of the economy noted in Appendix N. His idea of “social capital,” for example, represents realities based on mutual acquaintance and recognition, a personal asset that provides advantages to people that are better connected than others. Bourdieu’s understanding of social capital differs from the concept used by Robert Putnam, James Coleman and Frances Fukuyama, all of who understand it positively as networks of trust, solidarity and reciprocity. For these latter writers social capital is a community asset. Bourdieu would say that these writers do not pay attention to the unequal distribution of power; he is concerned with the reproduction of inequalities.<sup>5</sup>

Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital departs from the economist’s theory on human capital. An economist’s view of human capital would view education in a positive light. Bourdieu argues that this human capital theory fails to recognize how the educational system is reproducing capitalist structures and inequalities. Schools are sites for legitimizing the cultural capital of middle and upper classes.<sup>6</sup>

Paul Dimaggio and Viviana Zelizer want the concept of culture to be taken more seriously by economic sociologists. Dimaggio says that culture can be a “constitutive or regulative factor” in the economy; the former factor consists of categories shaping thought and the latter consists of norms shaping the market and society. Zelizer has likewise criticized economic sociology for its tendency to reduce everything to social relations, in effect leaving out culture.<sup>7</sup>

Richard Swedberg agrees. He shows how economic sociology as a “theory group” draws upon the analysis of culture. Alex de Tocqueville, for example, examined the role of culture and its mores on the life of the economy in early America. Max Weber saw culture as “meaning structures” and “values.” He saw special clusters of values in society like a “political sphere” and an “economic sphere” that have their own autonomy. Swedberg says that Weber’s series on The Economic Ethics of World Religions is an inquiry into the impact of the major forms of religion on economic ethics, and on the economy itself.<sup>8</sup>

Jeffery Alexander argues for a “cultural sociology” as a discipline distinct from the “sociology of culture.” He says that to speak of the “sociology of culture” is to suggest that culture is something to be explained by something else entirely separated from the domain of meaning itself. Cultural sociology, on the other hand, says that culture and social structures should be “uncoupled,” allowing a kind of conceptual autonomy. Only within such a “strong” program is it possible to discover how culture intersects with other social forces, such as power and instrumental reason in a concrete world. Alexander contrasts his “strong” program with “weak” ones that have dominated sociology over the last four decades. The best work of the Birmingham School (which we will discuss shortly) offers important insights, but also invokes “abstracted influences” without adequate explanations for empirical social actions. Alexander calls for a basis to make empirical studies.<sup>9</sup>

It is this dialectical relationship between abstract categories (as between society/culture and cause/effect) that we want to investigate. We will examine the dialectics that develop around the notion of “oppositional subjectivities.”

## **II Dialectical Thought**

The notion of dialectical thought began in ancient times with Lao Tse in the East and Plato in the West. Modern philosophers like Hegel and Marx took up the idea in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and this is where we begin. The Hegel/Marx dispute applies to understanding great principles (ideas) in a culture linked to the economy.<sup>10</sup>

We begin with the assertion that great ideas operate dialectically. The economy, as we see it, is embedded in society and conversely, society is embedded in the economy. Culture can be observed with binaries like “society/economy,” “difference/sameness” and “individual/community.” Looking at the tensions and resolutions of such opposing principles is a way to interpret changes taking place in society. This is a starting point to study the principles of an economy that are developing dialectically in society.

G.W.F. Hegel and Karl Marx worked with dialectical principles. Hegel was certain that the world was evolving through a process of opposition and synthesis.<sup>11</sup> Marx was certain that Hegel was wrong and claimed to turn his philosophy upside down; he would get rid of Hegel’s idealism. Marx replaced dialectical idealism with dialectical materialism. Both “isms,” of course, suffered from their “absoluteness” and more. Hegel’s problem was not only his idealism but also in his vision of the state as the ultimate authority of society. Marx’s problem was not only his materialism but also his inability to anticipate the rise of totalitarianism.<sup>12</sup>

The failure of communist states pretty much spelled the end of dialectical thought in this tradition. A protest against “totalism” and “absolutism” began. Literary critics, linguists and sociologists said that philosophy should not tolerate totalistic thinking as

expressed in “grand narratives” such as Marxism that attempted to explain all of society through a singular theoretical lens. They thus rejected dialecticism and also, as we shall see, its expression in structuralism in linguistics and structural-functionalism in the social sciences. A new movement began called post-structuralism, and with it a project called deconstructuralism.

Social philosopher Anthony Mansueto argues that the dialectic is not dead in studies of the economy. It is still relevant to analyses of capitalism in spite of what poststructuralists have suggested. He argues that the dialectical tradition emerged in the West in Ancient Greece as a response to the nihilism and relativism generated by the development of a market. Despite the debate between its idealist and materialist wings, it is possible to trace the significance of this dialectical tradition moving from Socrates, Plato and Aristotle through the medieval Aristotelians (Ibn Sina, Ibn Rusd, Maimonides, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas), up to Hegel, Marx and their interpreters. The dialectic assumes that we can rise (rationally) to principles that serve as standards for value and ethical norms. Such principles function as a means from which to criticize the capitalist market and argue for an alternative allocation of resources.<sup>13</sup>

My position on this matter is similar to Mansueto’s, but also different because I look at how culture is dialectical as it develops in the culture of the economy. Mansueto does not effectively deal with all the challenges that are in movements like post-structuralism, and we need to look at these movements as informative to cultural studies of the economy.<sup>14</sup>

I will propose that philosophies become ideologies (like materialism/idealism) because they systematize one side of great principles. Both these base terms “ideal” and

“material” have significance and should be seen as part of the returning ideational features of culture. Such philosophical binaries, like ideal/real or idea/matter are perennial. These principles are important because they are informative to students on how culture operates dialectically in capitalist societies.

### **III Structuralism Post-structuralism, and Deconstructionism**

The term structuralism became part of social thought in the mid-20th century. It began when anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss proposed that phenomena do not occur in isolation, but rather in relation to each other. He argued that all phenomena are related to a whole with a definite, but not (necessarily) fully defined, structure. Structuralists, inspired by Levi-Strauss, then attempted to perceive what this structure was, as well as the changes that such a structure might facilitate in a given culture. They assumed that society shapes its own individual structures and behavior associated with them. This was the beginning of backlash on “theory” itself.<sup>15</sup>

Critics argued that structuralism followed the work of Immanuel Kant too closely. Kant assumed that the mind actively structures perceptions, and critics suggested this type of thinking about the mind influenced the work of Levi-Strauss and others like Jean Piaget. The problem also included sociologists like Emile Durkheim who proposed that the structures of society could explain social action and transformation itself, classifying societies as “mechanical and organic” as though that was sufficient. And it included linguists like Roman Jakobson and Ferdinand Saussure as they inspired structuralism in literary circles.<sup>16</sup>

In the 1960s, some linguists, literary critics and social scientists began to reject the tenets of structuralism. Collectively, this movement became known as “post-

structuralism,” and these post-structuralists rejected any category or master narrative that attempted to totalize an understanding of culture. Previous work like that of Hegel and Marx had this “totalizing” feature, i.e. assuming that a theory could explain everything.

Totalizing, in this sense, means placing all phenomena under one explanatory category, like the Ideal, Material, Reason, or Humanity, or the will of God.<sup>17</sup> Post-structuralism rejected the notion that culture or society could be explained through totalizing theories.

Now we want to look at a method of cultural studies that will see these polar ideas (like ideal/real and same/different) as important without proposing a statement about total reality.

#### **IV The Old and the New: Cultural Studies**

The field of cultural studies began in the 1960s in Britain and grew through the 1990s to where today it has international significance. But scholars have difficulty defining the subject, as we indicated at the beginning of this Appendix

Here is the problem. Richard Hoggart in Britain said that cultural studies have no disciplinary base. Richard Hall in a similar vein said that cultural studies draws on whatever fields are necessary to produce the knowledge needed to understand a project. Richard Johnson said that these studies are a kind of alchemy for producing knowledge in a broad domain of culture.<sup>18</sup>

So then, what is culture?

Sir Edward Tylor in the late 19th century gave the anthropological definition of culture as, essentially, all the products of humankind. By 1952, Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn had cataloged over 100 different definitions of this word. Culture, they said, refers to the cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes,

meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions produced and acquired by people in the course of generations. Culture is all the systems of knowledge shared by people. It is created by symbolic communication and is the totality of what is learned and socially transmitted.

Now a concept that represents everything created by human beings should be difficult to define and dangerous to interpret. It is no wonder that post-structuralists and literary critics had trouble with it. So let us look at what they have said because we need more insight into this field of study. Our method should draw upon the insights of those scholars that wrote in those categories called, typically, modernism, postmodernism, structuralism, and post-structuralism. We want to drop the “isms.”

In other words, we should keep the insights of modern thinkers (e.g. Hegel, Marx, Freud, Habermas, Dewey, and Nietzsche) and those who contributed to postmodernist thought (e.g. Lyotard, Jameson, Baudrillard, Rorty, and Aronowitz) and those in structuralist thought (e.g. de Saussure, Frye, Levi-Strauss, Piaget, and Barthes). We need to keep in mind the insights gained in poststructuralist thought (e.g. Derrida, Foucault, Kristeva, CheeryHolmes, and Weeden). They are the background for talking about methods to study the economy without systematizing any principle alone.

What are the key insights for cultural studies of the economy?

First, we assume that each theorist provides us with some insight into cultural studies of the economy. We gain insight about the danger of overarching rules or reliance on grand narratives such as those that were in structuralism. But we can apply concepts like structure and binaries in studies without assuming that they represent all of reality, or

the complete picture of a culture. We need not assume that everything can be structured into sets of differences. We learn from modernists that dialogue is an important way to interpret cultural phenomena. We learn from postmodernists that a master theme will always exclude something or someone. We learn that one story cannot reveal the truth in all things. Reason and objectivity cannot be the singular basis for interpreting a culture.

In cultural studies, we would not assume an absolute position or, on the other hand, offer any strong anti-absolutist position. And we would not assume that “hyperreality” (as Jean Baudrillard might say) is the best way to make an analysis, or even that it should be a primary form of thinking in cultural studies. We gain insight from poststructuralist thought but should not assume that history (historicity) is the basis of all meaning. And we do not assume the impossibility for any complete “self-knowing.” We respect the possibility. Such assertions of “impossibility” again suggest absolutism.

Put another way, we learn from structuralists that the use of binaries is helpful to understand a culture but any systematic use of them has limits. We learn from poststructuralists that every explanation is partial. We learn that explanations and stories should show evidence of hierarchical relationships but as we shall see, there are also equitable relationships. A hierarchy exists between people in systems of stratification as well as in a culture of themes that are dominant and subdominant, but these conditions can also be viewed without hierarchy. Thus, we need to be watchful of any single worldview or any overarching belief that explains human events. We are informed about the limits of absolutism and relativism as cultural studies is at best an ongoing process of critical self-reflection.

**More on this Assessment for Cultural Studies**

Poststructuralists tend to see the world as fragmented, diverse, tenuous and culture-specific. They contrast their work with structuralism and speak favorably of tropes, like irony. It is my suggestion, however, that this posture only leads to more binary problems. The use of irony as a trope, for example, is understandable for scholars who see themes in opposition, as in hierarchy vs. equality (e.g. between equality as an ideal opposed to the reality of hierarchy), or the universal vs. the particular, the fragmented vs. the whole, the diverse vs. the coherent, etc. Irony and contradiction are obvious in history when we interpret the details of events against those overarching principles. But there is a problem in emphasizing contradictions alone or history alone in cultural studies.

So I point to a special task ahead for students of culture and the economy. It is to search for the relationship between concepts that appear in opposition. For example, when Marxists emphasize the substructure of the economy as opposed to a superstructure, we need to look at the mutual involvement between these opposing components of society, as some Marxists have done. It means also searching for the mutual relation between *matter* and *thought*, or the *brain* and *consciousness*. These are binary contradictions, but they also express a certain mutuality and commonality in their differences.

The problem for cultural studies today is to look at mutuality in binaries as well as differences, searching for links between binary principles. Such an effort should focus on finding the relationships between polarities, like body/mind, individual/community, and economy/society. It means looking at the “mind-in-the-body” and conversely, “the body-in-the-mind.” It means looking at the individual in the community and the community in

the individual. It means looking at the economy in society and conversely the society in the economy.

The relevance of this notion of searching for mutuality applies to all binaries in the ideational features of culture. The task for cultural studies is to find the subject in the object and the object in the subject, to find sacred in the secular and conversely the secular in the sacred. It is to search for the ideal in the real and conversely the real in the ideal.

This guideline for cultural studies takes away the centrality of one side of a polarity in favor of the other side. It emphasizes a method that leads to description, not simply to explanation alone, and leads to depiction more than conviction.

Deconstructionists propose that any construction of meaning will privilege some meanings and de-privilege others. This insight is important, but it is not altogether true, nor is it the end of the story. They claim that there will be traces of the de-privileging or the suppression of some experiences. By looking at the “cracks, the silences, the discontinuities” as they put it, which conventional studies attempt to smooth over, deconstructionists would demystify conventional meanings. They look at texts (for us, “market contexts”) in terms of tropes and construct meaning in terms of genres. They show us how meaning is “pre-channeled” as they say. They reveal what is hidden within what is seen in the construction of meaning.

All this is important to remember in cultural studies of the economy but this is not all we need to remember. One problem that deconstructuralists face is their vocabulary, which is obscure, dense, loaded with esoteric terminology, implying even a superior outlook, which is like an irony within ironies. For our purposes, the pointing out of how

shadows exist in all studies is nevertheless an important contribution. It is a strong reason for pursuing the elaborate (intellectual) problems they address.

Post-structuralists are experts in language and discourse. They assume that language organizes all meaning but, as we shall see, even that assertion has limits, as vital a proposition to cultural studies it remains. Moreover, for post-structuralists, meaning is inevitably contextual, constructed through signs and governed by the rules of discourse. This assertion, however, has limits, as vital as that proposition remains.

Post-structuralists further assert that each discourse context is related to other contexts through association; every context should be understood in relation to other contexts. But this does not mean that all reality is contextual, rather, that *context* as an idea has its opposition in *reason* or *principle* or *theory*. So we know that everything is contextual as it is constructed through discourse, with rules found through symbols and grammars, but not everything is contextual. We cannot expect a focus on contexts to be the last word, like Kant's problem of a precept without a concept. Precept and concept are an ever-present difference in the ideational features of culture.<sup>19</sup>

Theodore Adorno (Negative Dialectics, 1966) insists that ever-present concepts, like the universal and particular, have a danger in that one (e.g. the former) will subsume the other. He speaks about the inadequacy of conceptual opposites, and a dialectic that never results in a synthesis or closure. He recognizes the continuing tension between ideas. His central term "nonidentity" is similar to Jacques Derrida's term "difference" in acknowledging the disjunction between the concept and its referent. This brings Adorno to philosophize in "constellations" or "models," where the concepts and oppositions of traditional metaphysics (e.g. subject and object, the universal and the particular) are in a

linked perspective of both their truth and falsehood. He denied the possibility of any synthesis.<sup>20</sup>

But is this denial true? We see the idea of “synthesis” as a vital part of cultural studies. Great ideas, like universal/particular or analysis/synthesis, may not be finally joined together with a loss of their separate meanings, but their attributes do become integrated as levels lower than philosophical principles. In the Marxist tradition, the gross (philosophical) principles of Capital vs. Labor could not be synthesized but much of what they represented in their attributes, or what we will call “allied concepts” (see below) was brought together in new ways. This last century has shown a thousand ways in which capital and labor, these roughly hewn theoretical principles, have joined through *allied concepts*, as in labor-management agreements like “co-determination,” “employee ownership,” “worker self-management,” etc.

Looking further at the debates over “synthesis” that are ongoing, in the debate between libertarians and communitarians we see how the great principles of Individual and Community cannot be synthesized at their level of abstraction. However, their allied concepts in everyday life are being linked, constantly, and being integrated (e.g. the individuality of a child into a family) and brought together in new ways. As we shall see below, synthesizing the allies of great binaries becomes important in cultural studies of the economy.

In sum, cultural studies are about symbolic discourse in relation to a physical context, like a market. People live in history but the interpretation of that history is contingent, as they say. Recognizing binaries in these contexts allows for revised interpretations, i.e. new depictions and descriptions. What we learn is how cultural

studies can examine “taken-for-granted forms,” for example beliefs about capitalism. Cultural scholars demystify public assumptions about reality, creating an approach that is different from science.

Science links empirical inquiry with social theory. Cultural studies, on the other hand, evoke symbolic inquiry, not just an empirical inquiry based on sense experience. Not all symbols are rooted in sense experience. Concepts such as beauty or wisdom can be interrogated for their symbolic meaning without an empirical survey.<sup>21</sup>

So, cultural researchers need to see how binaries are symbols operating at a rather abstract level. This binary relationship provides insight into how the economy is structured in its cultural life. If this seems clear we can then look in more detail at those binaries that I discussed in A CIVIL REPUBLIC.<sup>22</sup>

## **V Binaries in a Civil Republic**

A binary is a pair of abstract terms (principles, ideas, symbols) distinguished by (apparent) opposition to one another. Examples in the history of language include yin/yang, light/dark, masculine/feminine, up/down, and social/economic. Binaries are part of the way we conceive the world. And many of them are part of common dialogues of people in a market. At the same time, they are not the identical to the material world itself, as Marx would say.

Structuralists relied on binary oppositions underlying cultures to interpret their data. They argued that such oppositions are found in all cultures, and that explaining the binary oppositions is fundamental to meaning itself. But deconstructionists challenged the way these oppositions were interpreted. Their alternative was proposed in three steps. The first step is the revelation of asymmetry in the binary opposition, suggesting an

implied hierarchy. The second step is the reversal of hierarchy. The third step is the displacement of one of the terms of the opposition, often in the form of a new and expanded definition. This method is still viable for cultural studies of an economy, but there is also more to consider here than these three steps.

These considerations include the material world, such as the economy with its manufactured products, the human body, and the physical environment. Each has its own character and autonomy, different from the mind with its symbols and levels of consciousness.<sup>23</sup>

We have said that these binaries are all ideational, like matter/spirit, the ideal/real. Principled binaries are for our purposes perennial constructs, i.e. non-historical, always present in tension and opposition. But we know that binaries also connect with our perception of the economy through middle-range concepts, which are closer to that material world in an empirical sense. Our approach to cultural studies then acknowledges that binaries (e.g. body/mind and matter/spirit) express this fact: they are ever-recurrent differences that are not resolved in their abstract principled form. And the economy has its own reality, so to speak, its own way that is linked with concepts, not fully shaped or determined by them.<sup>24</sup>

So, how is this link between such opposing concepts to be made?

The manner in which this link can be made by sociologists is through the undertaking of more fieldwork and participant observation in the market. Sociologists doing culture studies can observe concretely how stakeholders dialogue about a market problem. They can study the language and the patterns of speech present in a market, along with observations of connections with physical things like office furniture and

computers, which stand apart from people. Such observers do not assume that they can construct an entire reality through field data and their theories. This research is one “organization of human experience,” as post-structuralists would say.

Ferdinand Saussure says that there is no access to “reality” that is not mediated through semiotic systems. The most powerful of these systems is language. Economic sociologists must take seriously the “language of the market,” as it relates to the structure of market phenomena, as in dialogues and documents, texts, constitutions, charters, and body signs. Yet, while language is important, it is also not the final determinant of reality. Linguistic signs and symbols are representations that cannot be assumed as some final truth. The *ideal* (representation, symbol, idea, concept) is always in tension with the *real*. Those who do fieldwork seek thusly to uncover the special features of what people believe to be real and ideal in the market.

In sum, cultural studies of the market system is concerned with the ways in which people understand markets through language. Such studies represent a search into the uniqueness and characteristics of a market as both an institution as well and a set of practices in a material world represented inside the larger culture of society.<sup>25</sup>

### **Centering and Marginalizing**

In cultural studies we keep in mind the insights of literary critics. Poststructuralist theorists have established, as discussed about, the premise that language (discourse) produces social difference and problems of hierarchy. Such theorists would expose the “workings of power” through the practice of binary structuring, a practice started by de Saussure. So, I am suggesting that the binary structuring in research on markets can be a starting point for cultural studies of the economy.

The organization of meaning in the economy starts by looking at “centering” and “marginalizing” one or the other of two terms in a binary. One term may be observed as the first (foundational) term, and its seeming opposite, is 'not-being' that term, as literary critics say. A poststructuralist reading of gender in a corporate document, for example, might employ 'masculine' as the first term while the second, 'feminine,' is defined in terms of the first, in terms of 'not-being.' Such centering and marginalizing is very evident in business documents.

But the theoretical issues are broader. A sociological reading of the “economy” may be the first term while the second “society” is determined in terms of the first. Another reading of ideologies on the market would see that “freedom” is the first term while the second (or missing) is “justice. “ Now this is only the beginning. There is also a reversal inquiry that would probe both sides of these very abstract ideas. How is the economy in society and society in the economy? And so on.

My reason for looking at the mutual relationship among abstract ideas is not just to expose the centrality or dominance of one theme as opposed to another, as do many literary critics. It is to explore the relationship within and through and between the binaries. These binaries are mutually involved even as one of them may appear dominant. A hierarchy between opposites may be present, but the binaries are also connected with one another to make them embedded together, as found in market talk or in market theory.

There are special binaries that warn us about this dialectical nature of concepts. These special binaries are called conscious/unconscious and hidden/exposed. They tell us

to find a connection within and between binaries, to put it another way, the seen/unseen themes in the culture of markets.<sup>26</sup>

Deconstructionists and poststructuralists analyze a context by teasing out its components, relying on binaries to do it. They look for a binary opposition in a text and then show how each term, rather than being the polar opposite of its paired term, is actually a part of it. Then the structure or opposition, which kept them apart, collapses, as did with the terms “nature” and “culture” for Derrida. We should say that the same thing occurred in psychoanalysis. In a symbolic study of human consciousness, Carl Jung could see the figure of a man inside a woman and the figure of a woman inside a man. The mutual involvement of one with the other was complex as it showed itself in dreams. There is always a binary problem of identifying the relation between oppositions: the real inside the ideal and the ideal inside the real.

Indeed, in the case of the work of Jacques Derrida the reader may not be able tell which term is which when he is finished. The binary differences (e.g. as opposites) can lose all meaning. Deconstructionists sometimes will put analyses into a “play” mode, showing ambiguity rather than any explanation of it as reality. Their purpose is to open the mind to the complexity of opposites. There is more to this technique for our purposes, however, than producing ambiguity.<sup>27</sup>

Deconstructionist thinking is an attempt to dismantle the binary oppositions in a cultural context, or a system of thought. A deconstructive reading in the Derrida technique would identify the “logocentric” assumptions of a text with its binaries and hierarchies. A logocentric text always undercuts its own assumptions, its own logic, Derrida would say. Deconstructionists do this undercutting by examining binaries with “traces, supplements,

and invaginations in the text,” something we do not have space to follow here. (See Appendix R for bibliography).<sup>28</sup>

Critics argue that deconstructionism is so abstract and abstruse that it has no application in reality. How does it connect with everyday life in the political economy?

### **VI A Study Technique in Sociology: Fieldwork**

Sociologists should model “field studies” for stakeholders in a market. Stakeholders – all those people affected by a market – should begin to critique a market in which they are engaged, examine the conditions that oppress them. Paulo Freire introduced this method in cultural studies, which sociologists should study.

So, let’s take a look at Freire’s methodology before looking at the subjective principles governing the culture of capitalist markets.

### **Freire’s Cultural Studies in the Field: Concretizing**

Over twenty years ago Paulo Freire described cultural studies as a process of [collective] self-development. He believed that people had the potential to achieve personal and political liberation without a communist revolution. In his book, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, he explained “a process of liberation” based on this personal and political transformation.

Freire asserted that a structure, a system, or an institution of oppression must *not* be perceived as a closed world from which there is no exit. It is rather a situation that oppressed people can change. The oppressed, argued Freire, are not merely marginalized from societal processes, but rather intricately involved with the institutions in their political economy. He declared that a “critical consciousness of reality” must be developed from within these oppressed groups to change those conditions.<sup>29</sup>

Freire argued that there is a subtle relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed – similar to the Hegelian picture of the master/slave relationship. The status, power and domination of the oppressor are not possible without the involvement of the oppressed. Both the oppressor and the oppressed are *mutually involved* in a process of dehumanization.

The oppressor is dehumanized by the act of oppression while the oppressed are dehumanized by the “internalization of the image” of the oppressor. The oppressed sustain a dual identity of being themselves-and-the oppressor simultaneously. They have internalized the consciousness of the oppressor. Thus, in a violent revolution the oppressed, taking power, simply repeat the same pattern of becoming again the oppressor. The oppressor/oppressed relation is the only way of life that either the oppressor or the oppressed know from experience

But with cultural self-studies, the goal of the oppressed is to restore a lost humanity (i.e. liberate) themselves *and* the oppressor: The oppressed, fighting to be human, should take away the oppressors' power to dominate and restore to the oppressors the humanity they have lost in the exercise of oppression. The oppressed learn this process through studies of their own structures of domination.<sup>30</sup>

The process of actually transforming the oppressive system is complex, and beyond the scope of this appendix. Freire's theory and its application transform the intellectual movement in cultural studies into a practical grassroots movement. (Cultural studies should not remain simply the province of intellectuals outside everyday life.) At the same time participants should not follow the Freire methodology in isolation without support from political movements. Freire's valuable experiments at local levels are easily

crushed in oppressive states. Freire's method is a local start at solving the problem of state domination but it must be complemented by real politics.<sup>31</sup>

Freire's process requires political actors, including quiet sympathizers inside an oppressive government, and outside observers like sociologists that enable the process to work effectively in practice. The larger story of the effectiveness of this process can be seen in reports on civil disobedience and nonviolent actions that have succeeded more consistently than violent revolutions to overthrow oppressive regimes.<sup>32</sup>

Now with Freire's method of cultural studies in mind, let us move back into cultural studies for researchers, scholars and intellectuals.

### **Binaries in Capitalist Economies**

Researchers who advance cultural studies should first look to see how markets are embedded in binary principles. The capitalist system is bound up in a culture that has opposing ideas, interests, and beliefs. We see these opposing and even contradictory ideas, interests and beliefs, for example, in the irony produced by Marxists or the satire produced by novelists such as John Steinbeck. However, these modes of interpretation (i.e. irony and satire) are not the only kind of cultural work that needs to be done.

Great principles, values, and ideas can be studied as binaries without assuming satire as a rhetoric or dualism as a metaphysic. A theory of binaries is one story important to consider because it allows researchers to see how a culture-bound economy can operate. The basis of such a theory as the starting point for research methodology is evident in popular studies such as Freire's, but it is also evident in field studies, in participant observation, and in comparative anthropological studies. These field studies clarify the contradictions and suggest methods for developing alternative markets.<sup>33</sup>

For example, in *A CIVIL REPUBLIC* I said that researchers should study binaries, with both sides examined simultaneously. And planners of civil development should maximize both opposing principles at once. This means *maximizing together* both sides of a binary like Individual/Community. These binaries are not simple pure opposites, rather, equally mutually involved. In the quest for civil alternatives to capitalist markets, they should be enhanced together.

We are talking broadly now about propositions for “civil development” and in cultural theory. Theorists need to take both sides of these binaries seriously when studying the cultured market in the context of the larger culture of society.

Philosophical binaries are embedded in these markets. They include *Individual vs. Community, Unity vs. Plurality, Order vs. Freedom, Public vs. Private, Subject vs. Object, Ideal vs. Real, Body vs. Mind, and Quality vs. Quantity*, and more.

In *A CIVIL REPUBLIC* I referred to these binaries in special ways. The binary propositions I emphasized were *Order/Freedom, Individual/Community, and Public/Private*. I see these terms analytically bound together and argue that they should be emphasized together in both theory and civil development. Here I elaborate on what I could not say in the space of that book.

Table 1 illustrates this mutuality in all binaries. Each principle below that refers to one binary (in parenthesis) applies to all great binaries. These are abstract terms but this theory, and also this method for civil development, infers that social scientists should be knowledgeable about them and watchful of the intricate relationship of such opposites, which are otherwise left for philosophers to study.

We are proposing that each side of a binary should be introduced into cultural studies of the economy. We are using the terms “binary” and “polarity” as equivalent for our purposes.

**Table 1. A General Theory: Great Ideas in Development**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Each philosophical principle in a polarity (e.g. Individual vs. Community) has its own ultimate value in a theory of culture and in the practice of civil development.</li> <li>2. Each philosophical principle (e.g. Unity vs. Plurality) has allied concepts (e.g. "same" vs. "different") that are co-present in a theory of culture and in civil development.</li> <li>3. Neither side of a pair of high principles (e.g. Order vs. Freedom) should be assumed superior to the other in a theory of culture and the practice of civil development.</li> <li>4. Great perennial valued ideas (e.g. Public vs. Private) are concretely expressed in market organization to be understood in a theory of culture and civil development.</li> <li>5. The optimization of values on <u>each side</u> of a pair of opposing principles (e.g. Freedom vs. Order) is important in understanding a culture and civil development.</li> <li>6. A common good is created through the joint optimization of these great opposing principles (e.g. Order vs. Freedom, Individual vs. Community) at all levels of organization in the economy (i.e. local, regional, state, national, and global).</li> <li>7. A linking (or balancing and synthesis) of principles and their allied concepts is part of the process of both cultural theory and civil development.</li> </ol>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Let's explain what we mean by allied concepts of these binaries.

Each major (universal) principle carries *allied concepts* that have kinship with its abstract (philosophical) meaning. Table 2 demonstrates these allied concepts that I used with their philosophical referent.

**Table 2. Achieving a Common Good by Optimizing Opposites**  
Four Examples

Example 1: **Order vs. Freedom**

<i>Universal Principles</i>	
Order➔	←Freedom
<i>Allied Concepts</i>	
Justice, fairness, equity, accountability, impartiality, fair play, even-handedness, legitimacy, and neutrality.	Autonomy, autarchy, sovereignty, voluntary, choice, license, emancipation, release, self-rule, and independence.

Example 2: **Private vs. Public**

<i>Universal Principles</i>	
Private➔	←Public
<i>Allied Attributes</i>	
Secret, personal, individual, single, different, confidential, restricted, classified, and intimate.	Common, shared, communal, joint, gathered, transparent, widespread, prevalent, collective, and general.

Example 3: **Individual vs. Community**

<i>Universal Principles</i>	
Individual➔	←Community
<i>Allied Attributes</i>	
Separate, singular, unique, distinct, unconstrained, particular, personal, and distinctive.	Fellowship, friendship, cooperative, common, concord, shared, and communal.

Again, these allied concepts are mutually involved as well as (paradoxically) separate and autonomous. They are theoretically part of every culture and become part of the optimizing, matching and balancing process of civil development. Their connection (dominance, opposition, equity) should be revealed in cultural studies, and in our case in cultural studies of the market.

We said in *A CIVIL REPUBLIC* that philosophers, social scientists, and economists define the market with the principle of Freedom, typically, and they leave out Justice (based on Order.) Justice is associated with the state, not markets. One fieldwork question for cultural studies is then: How do systems of justice (*accountability, fairness, even-handedness*) develop among people in capitalist markets? The question for civil-development planners is: How could a justice-oriented market grow within a free market system?<sup>34</sup>

The binary of *justice vs. freedom* can be presented as a contradiction. It can also be presented in fieldwork as an informational fact. It can be depicted in a journal report, i.e. the way an anthropologist records data for an ethnographic tract. For example, I recall writing field reports to myself, which I sent to the United Fruit Company (UFCO) during my visits to Guatemala and Honduras. These reports illustrate concretely what I am talking about here.

I was a participant observer on UFCO plantations with the permission of the vice president in charge of Latin American operations. I kept a journal on the company's field operations and gave my reports to the public relations office. For example I noted in my journal, "How odd it is that this Company claims to have nothing to do with national politics in this country when I am sitting in this local office listening to conversations

between a corporate manager and the President of Guatemala. I hear the President asking the United Fruit Company to hire the people who supported him during the recent election. How can the President demand this of the Company? ” This statement can be seen as an implied irony, a rhetorical statement, but placed in the journal as a fact of observation. UFCO had given money to help elect the new President, who had been called by peasants “The Right Hand of Terror.” Now the Company was expected to comply with the new President’s expectations. This is political collusion that was not reported to people by the public relations office.

I made many journal notes like this on the opposition between the real and the ideal, i.e. what the UFCO claimed to be its ideal, and what I saw on the ground in Guatemala. Subsequently, my journal descriptions were given to the President of the United Fruit Company and, after reading my report, he asked to come to my campus office and talk about it. We talked about the contradictions between the “real” activities of the Company reported in my journal as opposed to the “ideal” statements made by his public relations department. And we went from there to talk about civil alternatives.

My reporting was not satire. It was a journal report that listed the contradictions between the UFCO’s public speech and its private conduct. The President and I talked about the financial cost of doing business this way (the cost of feeding government troops on the edge of the plantation to protect the workers, etc.) and the human cost to people in these countries. We talked about civil (democratic) alternatives, such as offering local employee ownership for this subsidiary to be paid over time by the workers. We talked about writing social contracts with management trained employee/owners.

This dialogue that I had with the President of the Company carried an allied concept of justice (fairness) and democracy (employee ownership.). Justice (i.e. fairness) was discussed in concert with the President's need to make money. I told the President that he could make more money by introducing employee self-management and local ownership, by providing better housing, etc. There was also some persuasion on my part to make the changes I recommended to the President. For example, I mentioned to the public relations officer that my report on the disjunction between what was public and private could be given to local newspapers if the practice continued.<sup>35</sup>

### **What is Missing in Cultural Studies?**

Lawrence Grossberg, Gary Nelson, and Paula Treichler write that cultural studies should remain open to the unexpected, the unimagined, even the uninvited possibilities. They see cultural studies as a trans-disciplinary and sometimes counter-disciplinary field. This ambitious and ambiguous field of cultural studies is committed to the study of the entire range of a society's arts, beliefs, institutions, and communicative practices.

What could be missing in the literature on cultural studies are the art productions themselves (paintings, novels, sculpture, poetry, theater, drama) whose expressive values cannot be understood in writing or thought alone. A work of art produces a direct experience of feelings and emotions. What is missing from all the writing about cultural studies is the direct experience of emotions, like hate, rage, hostility, jealousy, love, tenderness, and affection. None of these feelings can be understood through a rational text, but they can be experienced in the human context of art itself, and in field studies based on participant observation. The participant observer must then find artful ways to interpret those feelings by metaphor, image, and dramatic descriptions of scenes.

So, the acts of writing and thinking miss the types of knowledge that comes from experience itself. This is why participant observation is so vital to this method of cultural studies. Fieldworkers need to search for ways that convey feelings in the context of life, and in our case, market life.<sup>36</sup>

### **Conclusion**

Centuries ago, social contract philosophers like John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau pointed to the idea of a democratic government and a political economy. Today, public scholars need to conduct cultural studies of the economy and point to a civil (justice-oriented) economy and a new republic. This modern idea of a civil government took centuries to move from its status as an idea (ideal) to its reality as an institution. Cultural studies can lay a conceptual foundation for the institutions of a post-modern economy.

Students of culture should keep the insights of modern thinkers, and those who contributed to postmodernist and post-structuralist thought. These writers provide the background for new directions in cultural studies. They provide insight into cultural studies of the economy that do not systematize principles into a theory of reality.

The capitalist economy is theorized on the principle of civil *freedom* and is missing its oppositional principle of civil *order*. The consequences of this theory and its ideology are a very uncivil order requiring government to introduce the attributes of justice. A study of the “production of oppositional subjectivities” in the economy means looking at the problem of (civil) order and freedom together. It is a study of the “potentialities and the possibilities” for developing a civil (free) economy. The research

problem is to find conceptual links among the attributes of key principles like Freedom/Order and Individual/Community that rest in the culture of markets.

This problem of binaries should not be left to literary critics and philosophers. Great binary principles in American culture are studied and resolved everyday in this political economy. The U.S. Supreme Court and the American Congress must daily resolve the issues of binary principles, like Freedom/Order, Equality/Hierarchy, and Public/Private. The Supreme Court faces binary principles they see in the American Constitution. Abstract ideas like freedom and order are debated daily in law schools. They are thus subjects for cultural studies that are backed up with field data. They are in the constitution of society and its economy as well as the constitution of government.<sup>37</sup>

Great polar ideas operate in the cultures of all nations. They are mutually involved in theory as well as in opposition; and their allied concepts should be examined to understand how market economies operate. Concepts reside in the mind, but they are interpreted in a material world, in the economy, the body, the earth, and the environment in space and time. The important thing for participant observers and field researchers is that binary principles are linked not only conceptually, but also concretely through middle-range (allied) concepts. Allied concepts are grounded in sense perceptions that articulate with theory.<sup>38</sup>

In sum, when we theorize about cultures in the economy and society, we must take into account of the ever-present tension of abstract principles, like Order and Freedom, Individual and Community, Private and Public. High principles are written into the documents of corporate markets, business law and the language of stakeholders. They are intrinsic to modern culture, but one side of these binaries cannot serve as the

explanation of a social order. Freedom cannot exist in a market without order. This fact is critical to understand for cultural studies of the economy.

Finally, scholars in cultural studies have been interested in “the production of oppositional subjectivities,” which suggests that they should become actively involved in a critique of the “prearranged” disciplines of the university. Cultural studies should not stay in the departments of English and Philosophy but branch out to other departments like sociology, economics and political science. Sociologists need to examine the “orders of knowledge” that often lose something when isolated into departments of the university.

Binary principles should be introduced into cultural theories. The principle of (civil) *freedom* alone is not acceptable as the basis for theorizing about markets. It is always in tension with the idea of (civil) *order* in the economy. And the idea of the *individual* will not suffice alone without linking with the idea of *community*. When one side of a binary is theorized in isolation, apart from its opposition, it becomes an ideology, as in this case: *individualism* and *communism*.

Binary principles have allied concepts that “concretize” them with lower (middle) range meanings. A great idea (e.g. Justice) carries allied (lower-range) meanings (e.g. fairness) in the study of markets. Great principles and their allies can be studied ethnographically, as in field studies and participant observation. Participant observation is based in its own dialectical principles (participant vs. observer) and is most capable of dealing with binaries and the countervailing meanings found in their allied concepts.

So the economy has a culture that exists inside the larger culture of society. It has principles in concord and in conflict with principles of that larger culture. Sociologists

and social scientists must take up, through the use of fieldwork, the study of this disjuncture between the culture of a market and the culture of society. Cultural studies need researchers to explain what is happening in these “oppositional subjectivities,” like the *real* and the *ideal* in this market economy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stuart Hall, The Hard Road to Renewal (London: Verso, 1988). See also Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms," Media, Culture, Society, no. 2 (1980) pp. 57-72. Hall distinguishes between a "culturalist" paradigm, which he associates with the work of Raymond Williams and E.P. Thompson, and a "structuralist" paradigm, which he associates with the work of structuralists like Claude Levi-Strauss and the Marxism of Louis Althusser.

<sup>2</sup> Some associations are developing with this question in mind. The Association for Cultural Economics International (ACEI) is a scientific society that includes academic scholars, government officials, and foundation officials, managers of arts and cultural organizations and artists. They are brought together by their interest in understanding of the economic aspects of the arts and culture in their own countries and throughout the world. The members hold international research conferences every two years, sponsor small conferences, workshops, sessions concerned with public policy and cultural economics.

<sup>3</sup> William K. Tabb, The Postwar Japanese System: Cultural Economy and Economic Transformation (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

<sup>4</sup> Allen J. Scott, The Cultural Economy of Cities: Theory, Culture and Society, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000). Culture, Scott says, is big business. It is at the root of urban regeneration schemes throughout the world. It is part of the post-Fordist economic revolution, yet the economy of culture is under-theorized and under-developed.

<sup>5</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). The Frankfurt School viewed painters (such as Kandinsky) adopting a language that was out of reach of the commercialized culture. It was because of the epiphanies offered within their works. Bourdieu asks whether the avant-garde might not have developed an entirely different context once the structures of the modern art market had been established. When the leading exponents of modern art became valued in the art market and their works came to be used to prove that their owners had “a spiritual soul,” “the artist as saint” emerged. Any attempt to introduce a scientific study of art and its social relations was denounced as reductionist. But I would argue that cultural studies require looking at artistic autonomy within capitalism. There is cultural production designed for the market versus a production of works for symbolic interpretation.

---

Everything can be seen as a work of art given the right conditions in which it is observed. See my discussion of Art and Aesthetics at <http://www2.bc.edu/~bruyn>.

<sup>6</sup> Cultural capital for Bourdieu includes three states: first, embodied in the individual (as a type of habitus); second, objectified in cultural goods; third, institutionalized as academic credentials or diplomas. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, Ed. John Richardson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986) pp. 241-258.

<sup>7</sup> For more details on these references see Richard Swedberg, Principles of Economic Sociology (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003) pp. 42-43.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 218-222.

<sup>9</sup> Alexander goes on. Pierre Bourdieu, he says, reduces culture to a dependent of social structure. Michel Foucault leaves no room for understanding an autonomous cultural realm. And, contemporary work on "the production of culture" reduces it all to the workings of corporate sponsors and the elite. This allows little room for the examination of "internal cultural inputs and restraints." Alexander cites Wendy Griswold's study of the transformed trickster figure in Restoration drama as lacking an acknowledgment of dramatic narrative itself — its inner workings of plot and character and the effect they inevitably have on the coding of meaning. Alexander's wants a strong program of cultural sociology that fuses ideological criticism of Clifford Geertz with pragmatism and literary studies. Jeffrey Alexander, The Meanings of Social Life: Cultural Sociology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) pp. 12-20.

<sup>10</sup> Dialectics may have begun with ancient Taoism, which posits a naturalistic unity of complementary polarities known as Yin and Yang. This "co-substantial" union of opposites, known as the Taiji or 'Supreme Ultimate,' is a forerunner of dialectical thinking. Lao Tzu set down the philosophy of the "Tao" or the "Way" in about 600 B.C. in 81 poems, entitled "The Tao Teh Ching". These poems show a dialectical nature to things by a poetic insight on life. They show the opposition of forces as a condition of humanity. They also suggest that comprehending them could lead a to a higher level of understanding. Its poetic and paradoxical expressions, as "effortless action," lead us to understand "synthesis" in the co-existence of opposites.

<sup>11</sup> Hegel spoke of a rational process developing in three stages: a thesis, an antithesis, which contradicts or negates the thesis, and a synthesis embodying what is essential to each. We are interested in the idea of synthesis but not in his abstract employment of this idea. In Logic, for example, he describes a dialectic of existence posited first as pure Being (thesis), then pure Being, upon examination, found to be indistinguishable from Nothing (antithesis), then both Being and Nothing are united as Becoming (synthesis). This three-stage process is realized when it is understood what is coming into being is also returning to nothing. We might say that high principles (ideas) are like life. Old organisms die as new organisms are born. Hegel's dialectic makes implicit contradictions

---

explicit, the latent, manifest. Each stage of the process is the product of contradictions implicit in the preceding stage. For Hegel, history is dialectic; the largest moments chart a progression from self-alienation (slavery) to self-realization in a state of free and equal citizens.

As soon as the contradiction between thesis and antithesis is resolved by synthesis, the fact that a new thesis has emerged gives rise in turn to a new antithesis and therefore another contradiction. But what is notable? This successive negation is not self-defeating, rather, it is progressive, and each new synthesis is seen as an improvement (or a refinement) of the premises from which it was derived. Now, we add a point. Each word here, when magnified, carries its own contradiction. The concept of Progression then has its tension with concepts like Regression, not a subject for Hegel. See Thelma Z. Lavine, "Philosophy and the Dialectic of Modernity," paper presentation at the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy, Boston, MA, August 10-15, 1998. Also, see Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialectic>.

<sup>12</sup> The dialectical method became the foundation for Marxist politics through the work of Karl Korsch, Georg Lukacs and certain members of the Frankfurt School.

<sup>13</sup> Anthony Mansueto, The Journey of the Dialectic, Foundation for Social Progress/Institute for Religion and the Common Good. This paper was indexed at the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy, Boston, MA, August 10-15, 1998.

<sup>14</sup> Mansueto says that current crisis in the dialectical tradition arises from a failure to demonstrate that the universe is a teleological system, as if it were ordered to some perfect form or based on the development of higher levels of organization. Yet, he says that it is possible to show this to be the case through science. Mansueto does not sufficiently confront the challenges of deconstructionist thought. History and the universe can be seen as dialectical and they can also be seen as not dialectical. All principles are in contradiction as well as not in contradiction. All principles are in tension, in opposition, and also in a constant stage of resolution in middle range levels of thought. This will be my point.

<sup>15</sup> Claude Levi-Strauss was known for his development of structural anthropology. From 1935-9 he was Professor at the University of Sao Paulo making expeditions to central Brazil. Between 1942-1945 he was Professor at the New School for Social Research. His books include The Raw and the Cooked, The Savage Mind, Structural Anthropology and Totemism.

<sup>16</sup> In literary theory and criticism, structuralism refers to a line of thought stemming from linguistics and Ferdinand de Saussure. The generalization of linguistic models by Levi-Strauss inspired others to apply their versions of structuralist ideas. A main point in these ideas is that language is not just a set of abstract words that refer to concrete things. The word "rock" does not have "sense" simply because we identify it with real rocks we can see. Rather, language consists of a system of meaning in which the meaning of any one word is determined by its relationship with other words. Simply put, a dictionary doesn't

---

juxtapose words with pictures of things; rather, it defines words in terms of other words. When looking solely at language or systems of meaning, this approach is called semiotics. When looking at other phenomena, it is structuralism. Any approach that sees the meaning of something as subordinate to its place within a system is structuralism.

<sup>17</sup> Post-structuralists challenged the Enlightenment view that 'individuals' are intact, that the mind is the only true source of meaning. They rejected the idea that "value" is rooted in some universal or trans-historical essence, or some metaphysical system. Some enlightenment thinkers worked with essences, but that is not acceptable in this mode of thought. A concept of essence suggests that there is a reality that exists independent of historical and cultural conditions like language, that there is really such a thing as 'truth' or 'beauty' apart from an historical context.

<sup>18</sup> British Cultural Studies (or the Birmingham School in the UK) has made major contributions to literary and historical theory, including the ethnography of urban sub-cultures, popular culture and media studies, women's studies, and ethnic studies. It is represented partly by Stuart Hall, who combines insights drawn from Marxism, post-structuralism, race theory and feminism with tools drawn from sociology, history, ethnography, and media studies. Through the work of people like Dick Hebdige, Angela McRobbie, and others, British Cultural Studies has influenced scholars around the world. See Richard Hoggart, "Contemporary Cultural Studies," Occasional Paper, 1969. See also Stuart Hall, "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities," *October*, 1990, 53, pp. 11-90. A conference on the subject at the University of Illinois in April, 1990 revealed how panelists drew from a vast literature ranging from Marxism and feminism, to psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, and postmodernism.

<sup>19</sup> All these points should have more elaboration here. The brevity of these statements invites misinterpretation, but our purpose is to provide a sense of direction for methodology in cultural studies. The point is that we can learn from such movements in order to develop a method for cultural studies.

<sup>20</sup> Michael Groden and Martin Kreiswirth, "Adorno, Theodor W." *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, (MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997). Adorno believed that such thought tends toward the aesthetic. His published fragment *Aesthetic Theory* (1970) addresses the themes of aesthetics - the autonomy of the work of art as well as its status as an historical phenomenon.

<sup>21</sup> The term 'discursive', deriving from 'discourse', is a central theme for post-structuralists. Briefly, a discourse in Foucault's sense is a way of organizing meaning. Different social institutions produce symbolic discourses about things. Hence, we might say in our study, discourses are forms of regulation of meanings that are interpreted in markets. Given that the world is governed by a multitude of competing discourses, people are positioned in multiple ways, and they are not all reducible to what is known as scientific (empirical) research.

---

<sup>22</sup> Severyn Bruyn, A Civil Republic (Bloomsfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2005)

<sup>23</sup> Immanuel Kant might say that the mind and matter are concepts not precepts. He said that concepts without precepts (perceptions, sensations, experiences) are empty; precepts without concepts are blind. In Critique of Pure Reason (1787) Kant proposed that no concepts be allowed to enter which contain in themselves anything empirical. In other words, reason consists in knowledge wholly a priori, or prior to, empirical knowledge. Transcendental philosophy is of pure and speculative reason. All that is practical, so far as it contains motives, relates to feelings, belong to the empirical sources of knowledge.

<sup>24</sup> Sociologists cannot finally explain the economy as a reality by joining theories with empirical studies. The economy has its material reality, i.e. a force in its own right to be respected apart from concepts. High principles that are in a binary (e.g. same/different, ideal/real, universal/concrete) are non-historical, repeating themselves freshly in the context of civilization but also remaining as concepts. So, cultural studies should investigate the relations between opposites, such as body and mind, the individual and the community, the economy and society but keep in mind the ever-present tension between the binary ideal/real.

<sup>25</sup> Some scholars argue that Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) is not only the founder of modern linguistics but also the initiator of post-structuralism. The method of Structuralism in linguistics and literary studies find their starting point in his work at the turn of the twentieth century but others contend that the complex of strategies generating "post-structuralism" are found in the work of Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva, and Roland Barthes.

<sup>26</sup> A methodology for cultural studies suggests that we need a new critique of the philosophical subject. We would propose that the exploration of relationships between major cultural polarities (e.g. the Subject/Object, the Individual/Community, Divine/Human) is where the work begins. But the problem in some philosophies today is that the *subject* is a term used commonly to represent people as individuals, a person not a group or a society or some higher order. Subjects are thought to be people who develop their identities by living through roles and cultural practices. They occupy roles in groups, for example, as family members who are occupationally and economically and regionally defined, gendered, members of clubs or presidents of an organization and so on. But the subject also includes the whole group, the configuration of meaning in those collections of beings, as Emile Durkheim might say. Each site in a market evokes a different configuration of the collective self in different languages and social practices.

People (subjects) are considered as human beings residing in a material world. They are entrenched in the material practices and the economic order of society, working, playing, procreating, and living through the material conditions of society. People form pools of common symbols and practices that they share with their sub-cultures and groups.

---

<sup>27</sup> "Deconstruction" is a background for cultural studies, not the basis for them. The name deconstruction has its own contradiction evoking irony. You cannot have deconstruction without construction. This method in cultural studies the binary of construction/destruction. Cultural scholars simply learn from deconstructionists who do not simply destroy a concept of hierarchy or construct new system of binaries. Indeed, they do not want to end up with the previously subordinated term on top of the hierarchy. They would not destroy one side in order to elevate the other; rather, they deconstruct new thought by showing how the basic units of "structuration," i.e. binary pairs and the rules for their combination, can contradict their own logic. It is, in this regard, similar to the Socratic method with the exception that the ancient Greeks sought Truth, while deconstruction would not, although they would accept some ambiguity.

<sup>28</sup> Deconstructionists can play on words and on human perception. Derrida plays with binary words, deconstructs them, and reveals both the inside and outside, so to speak, of some subject at hand. This disrupts conventional thought or any "pre-supposed fixity." Dualism may be implied in this binary method is not intended to be a master theme. It is only a method to reach greater understanding of the subject. But if this method were to be used repeatedly, it becomes a master theme.

Those involved in cultural studies of the market should learn from this deconstructionist method but also keep in mind its limits. Sociologists assume that the economy is in a culture that can be understood by its binaries as well as by its contexts, respecting the universal/particular binary. They study the context of markets, i.e. the language of entrepreneurs, customers, buyers and sellers, the documents, the social contracts, bylaws, constitutions, stakeholder agreements, commercial laws, etc. while they search the contradictions in them, the logic (principles) of the market.

<sup>29</sup> Freire maintained that a critical understanding of oppression would not achieve political liberation in and of itself. Critical perception among laborers or the peasantry is, paradoxically, both indispensable and insufficient in itself. So, Freire's message of critical awareness, based on a conception of the dialectical relationship between the world and human consciousness, places Pedagogy of the Oppressed in the canon of radical educational pedagogy.

<sup>30</sup> The goal of liberation is mediated by another dialectical relationship, namely that "of the world and human consciousness." The concept of *conscientization*, or critical awareness, is basic to Freire's radical pedagogy of the political economy. Critical awareness is made possible through praxis which Freire defines as "...reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it." Freire connects reflection and action together as part of the process in the recognition and transformation of social, economic and political contradictions. Freire's four and a half year exile to Chile (1964-1969) must have provided a profound learning process in his pedagogy.

<sup>31</sup> Freire upholds values like love as the essence of dialogue: "If I do not love the world -- if I do not love life -- if I do not love people," Freire declares, "I cannot enter into dialogue. According to Freire, the requirements for effective dialogue include love,

---

humility, faith, trust, hope, and critical thinking. But his method faced much criticism. Freire's pedagogy was accused of being an idealized, inconsistent, localized, exclusive and paternalistic analysis. For example, Freire's language has been criticized for being pompous, inaccessible, elitist, and pretentious. While Freire says that changing language is part of the process of changing the world he does not include popular discourse within the text of his own pedagogy, limiting his work to a largely academic audience.

<sup>32</sup> Cultural studies need to be linked with the strategies for social change that have proven historically successful, as discussed in Gene Sharp, The Methods of Nonviolent Action (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973).

<sup>33</sup> One example is the work of Karl Polanyi. His central thesis in The Great Transformation (1944) was that capitalism is a historical anomaly. Historically, while previous economic arrangements were "embedded" in social relations, in capitalism, the situations were reversed - economic relations defined social relations. In Polanyi's view, in the sweep of human history, rules of *reciprocity, redistribution and communal obligations* were far more frequent than market relations. The ascendancy of capitalist markets destroyed these conditions. The "great transformation" of the industrial revolution was to completely replace all these social modes of interaction with economic relations. We are not in full agreement with Polanyi on this matter (e.g. we look for reciprocity and communal obligations in capitalist markets) and we think there are alternatives emerging through them but his work is relevant in terms of comparative studies. (See his Trade and Markets in Early Empires, with K. Conrad, K. Arensburg and H.W. Pearson, 1957.)

<sup>34</sup> The capitalist subculture is interwoven with the larger culture. It emphasizes productivity, efficiency, profitability, competition, and the ideology of individualism. But this capitalist subculture is part of the larger culture, which embodies much more meaning and a larger scope of values. Thus, it is constantly challenged, and changing.

The special values in the capitalist economy (e.g. productivity) are important to preserve because they have their own place and purpose, but standing alone, they cannot sustain an autonomous economy.

<sup>35</sup> For more see, "The Multinational Corporation and Social Research: The Case of the United Fruit Company," in Social Theory and Practice, Vol. 1, No. 4, Fall 1971.

<sup>36</sup> What is missing is also in the order of religious life. A new frontier for cultural studies means accepting the uninvited experience that goes beyond secularism and the humanities, transcending the human domain. The search for the paradoxes of truth can be found in the deep residues of spiritual life, in those principles that transcend the secular bound humanities. The uninvited data could be found in the recorded experience of what is interpreted to be Divine, as opposed to Human, as great ideas. The mystery in this search for the dimensions of truth and knowledge can also rest in the experience of great religious founders that transcend the common words of "cultural production and reproduction." We are not interested in the finality of what is often believed to be Divine.

---

We are interested in what culture generates as binary ideas, all capable of being investigated as in the opposing subjectivities of culture. Here again we emphasize the mode of research we have called participant observation.

<sup>37</sup> Judges and scholars interpret high principles (e.g. Freedom) as they see them in them in the American constitution but they are not alone in their interpretation of them. Business leaders, union leaders, and customers apply these same ideas everyday in the economy. People must resolve (synthesize) the contrariness of such principles, like order/freedom or individual/community, at the shopping mall, the shoe store, the Internet, the wedding, and the funeral. The resolution is part of the talk of financial investors who decide on rules of order in the stock market. Most conflicts between the ideas, like order and freedom are not settled in state and federal courts. This is why cultural studies of the marketplace are so important.

If great principles are part of daily life of the economy, we should see them in tension with their differences to be resolved concretely everyday. The process by which people decide to settle their differences everyday is linked to these high principles of philosophers and judges and thus important to study as they emerge in the life of economies around the world.

<sup>38</sup> Immanuel Kant said convincingly that ideas could not suffice alone in the quest for truth. Kant attacked rationalism in The Inquiry into the Distinctness of the Principles of Natural Theology and Ethics where the question was whether metaphysics could use the same method as mathematics, which Kant denied. Mathematics, he argued, could prove its theorems by constructing its objects from their very definitions, but metaphysics can only use analysis to develop definitions of objects from given concepts, and could not construct the objects themselves.