

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Senior Honors Projects

Honors Program at the University of Rhode
Island

5-2011

Marcuse on The Two Dimensions of Advanced Industrial Society and The Significance of His Thought Today

Michael C. Hartley Mr.
URI, michael_hartley@my.uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/srhonorsprog>



Part of the [Continental Philosophy Commons](#), [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), [Political Theory Commons](#), [Sociology of Culture Commons](#), and the [Theory, Knowledge and Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hartley, Michael C. Mr., "Marcuse on The Two Dimensions of Advanced Industrial Society and The Significance of His Thought Today" (2011). *Senior Honors Projects*. Paper 230.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/srhonorsprog/230>

This Article is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

Michael Hartley

HPR 401

Spring 2011

Marcuse on The Two Dimensions of Advanced Industrial Society and The Significance
of His Thought Today

Herbert Marcuse was born in Berlin in 1898. After receiving his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Freiburg, Marcuse worked by selling and publishing books in Berlin. In the late 1920's, after reading *Being and Time* by Martin Heidegger, Marcuse went back to Freiburg University, the same school where he had previously attended lectures by Edmund Husserl, to study under Heidegger. Marcuse's first book appeared in 1932 with the title *Hegel's Ontology and the Foundation of a Theory of Historicity*. Upon reading and reviewing Marcuse's book Theodore Adorno convinced Max Horkheimer of Marcuse's potential as a critical theorist and, in 1933, Marcuse was recruited to work for the *Institut für Sozialforschung* (Institute for Social Research). Unfortunately for Marcuse and other members of the Institute this was right around the time that Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. As Martin Jay puts it, "with the Nazi assumption of power on January 30, 1933, the future of an avowedly Marxist organization, staffed almost exclusively by men of Jewish descent...was obviously bleak".¹ In the months that ensued the official staff at the Institute fled from Germany. Most of the members fled to Geneva at first then to the United States of America.² After offering his services to United States government during World War II, Marcuse took to

teaching at various American universities including Columbia, Harvard, and Brandeis before settling down to teach at the University of California, San Diego.³ Marcuse would write many books and essays on the dynamics of political change and the quest for human emancipation during a time of radical pushes for political transformation in the United States, the 1960's to the early 70's. Marcuse would be credited by many leaders of the student movements in the United States, France, and West Germany as their intellectual inspiration.⁴ Three years after his retirement Marcuse died on July 29, 1979 in Starnberg, Germany at the age of eighty-one.

So, why should we care about Marcuse today? The 60's and 70's are long gone, some might add thankfully. What does reading Marcuse matter? Why bore us with the outdated ideas of another dead European male? To this I say the following: 'yes' the 60's and 70's are over, 'yes' Marcuse's thinking came from this historical and cultural context that is very different from the economic, social, and political situation we find ourselves in today, and 'yes' Marcuse had some highly questionable ideas.⁵ Nevertheless, to the question 'why should I care?', there seems to be a rather compelling answer.

Much of what can be seen to constitute a 'compelling' answer will depend substantially on the values of the reader. It is wise to get clear about this at the outset to avoid confusions that may arise in the readers mind as the paper progresses, a few examples are in order. It seems that with some problems what will constitute a compelling answer will depend very little on the values at stake. For example, if I seek the most compelling answer to the problem ' $2+2 = X$, what is X ?', values matter very little in my proclamation that the most compelling answer is ' $X=4$ ', although I must still value the weight of evidence to find the answer compelling. With the problems addressed

in this paper, however, values play a crucial role. Consider the following example: Mindy wants Terrence to read 'book X' because Mindy thinks this book offers the best advice for how to act in combating anthropogenic climate change. Now Terrence might say he does or doesn't believe in climate change and what he believes will most likely affect his choice whether or not to read book X. But suppose he does believe in anthropogenic climate change, believes in all the bad consequences it is predicted to cause, and trusts Mindy's judgment on such matters of recommending good books.⁶ Terrence could still say that he won't pick up the book because he isn't concerned with combating anthropogenic climate change. Terrence could have a general disdain for all life and wish all the bad consequences of climate change to come about. What we see in this example are two different value sets at stake. Mindy assumes that Terrence will want to read the book given its ability to help solve what she sees as a dire problem. Terrence and Mindy agree on the relevant factual issues (e.g. anthropogenic climate change is occurring, climate change will have devastating consequences for life on earth, the book will provide a good guide to solve the problem), but this doesn't require Terrence to agree with Mindy on what he 'ought' to do. Thus, if it is to be argued that reading Marcuse's main work *One-Dimensional Man* is something people in the United States ought to do, we want to be clear about what core values are at stake.

The only value one needs to hold in order to find this paper's argument for the proposition 'we, citizens of the United States, ought to read *One-Dimensional Man*' compelling, is valuing a flourishing democratic process. This use of the term democracy isn't to suggest that traditional political thought on democracy accurately describes the United States system of governance, it is most certain that the United States is not a direct

democracy. Our *current* system of governance is quite complex and cannot be fully summed up in such a 'trite' remark as 'it is a constitutional republic', although this is of course nominally true. What is suggested, however, is that we recognize that our system of governance has democratic aspects to it. It is these very democratic aspects with which we will here be concerned. If we value having a healthy democracy, then a compelling case for reading *One-Dimensional Man* can be offered.⁷ To argue for why we should prefer a healthy democratic process to a sick one or no democratic process at all would be quite a project in itself and ultimately would still reach no uncontestable conclusion.⁸ So, we shall take as our starting point the valuing of a healthy democratic process.

As Douglas Kellner notes, Marcuse "rarely discussed the theme of democracy or the democratization of society".⁹ So, why insist on reading Marcuse if we value a healthy democracy? What Marcuse provides is not a 'how to' manual for establishing some flourishing democratic process. Marcuse does provide, rather, "comprehensive philosophical perspectives on domination and liberation [and] a powerful method and framework for analyzing contemporary society".¹⁰ If we take the meaning of comprehensive to be 'absolutely complete', then this is undoubtedly too strong a word. More accurately and certainly what Kellner intends us to see is that Marcuse has a method and framework for casting new light and understanding on a wide-range of issues for contemporary society. Marcuse and much of what is considered 'the classics' in sociological theory are not worth reading if we are only looking in them for absolute truths and fundamental laws of how society operates. Marcuse is important because he offers a new way of looking at our contemporary world. The reader will see that what

Marcuse's analysis reveals to us is essential in order to work to uphold a democracy. This is, in part, why we should read *One-Dimensional Man*.

What shall be argued is that the analysis of advanced industrial societies, the United States falling into this category, in *One-Dimensional Man* reveals something important to us. Marcuse's analysis is revelatory in that it gives us a new vantage point for thinking about various issues in our society. By looking at Marcuse's mapping-out of the two general *ways* of thinking, one-dimensional and dialectical, that inhabitants of the advanced industrial society are prone to and the forces in the society that lead people to acquire one *way* of thinking over the other, we will see how his ideas are revelatory in such a way that they generate crucial insights into problems we face today. Thus, the title of this project is *Marcuse on The Two Dimensions of Advanced Industrial Society and The Significance of His Thought Today*. The former part of the title being related to the two general *ways* of thought and the later to how Marcuse's insights on this matter are of great import to us today if we value a healthy democratic process in the United States. I will show this in concrete analysis of these areas: regulation of the Internet, arts and humanities education, and federal funding for public broadcasting.

Part I: The Two Dimensions of Advanced Industrial Society

“Stepan Arkadyich subscribed to and read a liberal newspaper, not an extreme one, but one with the tendency to which the majority held. And though neither science, nor art nor politics itself interested him, he firmly held the same views on all these subjects as the majority...and changed them only when the majority did, or rather, he did not change them, but they themselves changed imperceptibly in him. Stepan Arkadyich chose neither his tendency nor his views, but these tendencies and views came to him themselves, just as he did not choose the shape of a hat...but bought those that were in fashion...He liked his newspaper, as he liked a cigar after dinner, for the slight haze it produced in his head”¹

Marcuse’s *One-Dimensional Man* provides us with a powerful framework for analyzing our current society. In Marcuse’s analysis we are introduced to two ideal types that occupy the advanced industrial society, *the one-dimensional type* and *the dialectical type*. Each of these two types corresponds to two *dimensions* of the advanced industrial society, *civilization* and *culture*. In this section I will examine Marcuse’s analysis of the two dimensions of advanced industrial society, seek to clarify the one-dimensional and dialectical types, and show how his ideas have important implications for democracy. In the end we will have a powerful framework for analyzing our society and, in part II, I will begin to put this framework to use.

The Two Dimensions

For Marcuse, human societies are made up of two dimensions in constant tension with each other. These two dimensions are *civilization* and *culture*. In our everyday language we generally think of civilization and culture as synonymous. Marcuse asks us to consider these words as two distinct concepts. Civilization is the current material structure of life in the society, the *real* existing society, the current political, economic,

and social arrangements. It is the material state of affairs, the status quo. Culture, for Marcuse, is “the complex of distinctive beliefs, attainments, traditions, etc., constituting the ‘background’ of a society...[which] appears as the complex of moral, intellectual, [and] aesthetic goals (values)...a society considers the purpose of [its] organization”.²

To get clear about this distinction an example would be helpful. Let us consider the notion of justice. In American society, as well as many others, justice is generally regarded as some sort of moral fairness to be upheld by a certain legal system. It is a value the society holds and its *realization* is an ideal to which the society aspires. This would be just one example of what Marcuse means by culture. Civilization, however, would be how justice is actually carried out in American society. In looking at the currently existing justice system we can see a dissonance between our professed values and the actuality of the situation. One indication of this is the large disparity between African American and European American incarceration rates for males aged eighteen and up, though there are many other examples to be found in the justice system.³ The essential tension Marcuse sees that can push society to a more humane state of existence is this very tension between civilization and culture. Human communities can draw on their *historically* rooted values, such as justice, and compare them with the current status quo. Unless the civilization is in a condition that embodies the cultural values, then there will exist a tension the society can work to erase, namely civilizations lack of measuring up to the expectations of cultural values.

In the advanced industrial society this tension between civilization and culture is systematically reduced. The tension is reduced by a type of colonization of the actual content of the culture. We shall turn again to justice for an example to guide our thinking.

Justice as a meaningful historical concept can be used by forces and turned into its opposite. If we were to see political ads in which the state colonized the concept of justice and used it to support agendas that were in fact working against the culture's true meaning of the word, then we'd be experiencing the systematic reduction of the tension between civilization and culture. As Marcuse states, "the result is the familiar Orwellian language ('peace is war' and 'war is peace', etc.), which is by no means that of terroristic totalitarianism only".⁴ Not only could such a reduction of the conceptual content of cultural values effectively restrain their humanizing potential, but these same concepts now having their inner content rewired can help to further support the civilization (i.e. the status quo) or work regressively. Not reflecting on the deeper meaning of the concept justice whilst having a love of it, we are taught to value such things after all, lends itself to a certain danger. We could be led by a shallow conception of justice to implement a fundamentally unjust reality.

So why is this different from any other civilization? Haven't sectors of power always acted in a similar fashion? The reason this absorption of the two dimensions into the one dimension (i.e. civilization) is different in the advanced industrial civilization is because of their technological capabilities. Marcuse states:

This liquidation of two-dimensional [reality] takes place not through the denial and rejection of the 'cultural values', but through their wholesale incorporation into the established order, through their reproduction and display on a *massive scale*⁵ [emphasis added]

With the more technologically advanced societies the reduction of culture to civilization risks becoming *totalized*. With technology aiding an unprecedented ability for mass

communication “the advancing one-dimensional society”⁶ threatens to sweep away all remnants of the historically meaningful content of cultural values like justice.

Keep in mind that justice is just one example of what Marcuse means by culture, we could no doubt use other values such as a work of art, the concept of freedom, citizen, patriot, American, and so on and so forth. Moreover, the type of colonization can vary. In our earlier example of justice we saw that the hijacking of the concept’s historically meaningful content by a certain sector of the state, a political faction. If we were to use some examples in music (e.g. rock & roll, hip-hop, etc.), we could see that art forms once oppositional to their respective established orders (i.e. civilization) have been subjected to colonization by market forces. In the next section we shall turn to an analysis of the one-dimensional type and the dialectical type. Once this is understood we will try to grasp what is at the root of this process and how to counteract its negative effects.

The One-Dimensional and Dialectical Types

Before attempting to undertake a full-fledged analysis of the one-dimensional and dialectical types, it would be of some use to get clear about the use of the term ‘type’. Ideal type is a term used by Max Weber to describe a tool used in historical and social analysis, in Weber’s own words, an ideal type is:

A construction of ideas to which the *factual* average content of the historical only *approaches* to varying degrees. In truth, every historian, consciously or (usually) unconsciously, constantly employs concepts *of this kind*, if he uses clear-cut ‘concepts’ at all⁷

We can see from this that an ideal type is a conceptual construct that is used to clarify seemingly disparate data that can appear in the analysis of society. Although “to employ

the concept of the 'ideal type' ...to some extent...does violence to the historical reality. Without it, the amount of qualification necessary would make any clear formulation impossible".⁸ Thus, it becomes clear that ideal types are used as conceptual tools to usefully sort-out information that would otherwise be impossible to make intelligible in any meaningful sense.

The use of setting up the two poles of one-dimensional and dialectical thought may seem like a rather rash binary that seems to have gone out of favor in our present intellectual climate. It is not clear, however, if Marcuse himself thought of one-dimensional thought and dialectical thought as a totalized all-or-nothing way of embodied being. What is clear, however, is that one can use Marcuse's insights without committing themselves to this way of thinking. The types can be quite useful if we think of them as ends of a spectrum that we all drift along depending on the moment and social location we occupy. We do not wholly embody either one-dimensional or dialectical thought, but instead one or the other way of thinking is foregrounded depending on the social context.

What are the characteristics of these two types? First, we must stress that these are *ways* of thinking. It is not the actual content of the thought (i.e. what you think) it is, rather, the manner in which you think (i.e. how you think, the *way* you think). Thus, even though Marcuse's political stance is Marxism, you need not believe these tenets to be a dialectical thinker. Marcuse cites conservatives and liberals, including Edmund Burke, Alexis de Tocqueville, and John Stuart Mill, as possessing dialectical ways of thinking.⁹ These two ways of thinking each have sets of distinct and opposing characteristics that make up the person's consciousness in these modes. The characteristics are: *historical*

consciousness, happy consciousness, loss of transcendence, and purely instrumental rationality. Both the loss of transcendence and possessing purely instrumental reason are most central to understanding the one-dimensional type. We shall now see what these characteristics involve.

The first set of characteristics for the two types concerns historical consciousness. One-dimensional thought lacks the historical consciousness whereas dialectical thought possesses it. Marcuse states that historical consciousness “discovers the factors which made the facts, which determined the way of life”.¹⁰ What we are to take from this is that the possessor of historical consciousness doesn’t just see civilization as it currently stands, but instead sees the historical circumstances that brought about the current state of civilization. The one-dimensional type, however, cannot get beyond the ‘given’. The current status quo of the civilization, that is to say the prevailing economic, political, social orderings. Thus, we see that the one-dimensional type lives in the dimension of civilization and not of both civilization and culture. One-dimensional thought can’t get beyond the given facts of the established status quo (i.e. civilization).

Happy consciousness is the next set of characteristics. The one-dimensional possessing happy consciousness, whilst the dialectical type does not. The happy consciousness is not so much a direct cause of the loss of general comprehension and intellectual independence as it is a “token” of these losses.¹¹ This token appears not to be one of necessity to the one-dimensional type as much as one to be found given the social circumstances. It is possible to be a one-dimensional type without possessing happy consciousness depending on the society you belong to. It is, however, common for the one-dimensional type to slip into happy consciousness in the societies that repress the

individual while offering them an ideal to live up to that will never offer satisfaction. In other words, the society offers a master narrative for how one *ought* to live their life (e.g. working hard in high school, going to college, getting a job, getting married, having kids, etc.), which will still leave those who meet the ideal utterly discontented. For an example of this in art, let us turn to a passage from Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. In this passage we see the climactic scene where Nora Helmer stands up to her husband Torvald Helmer and says she is leaving him:

[Torvald:] How unreasonable and how ungrateful you are, Nora! Have you not been happy here? [Nora:] No, I have never been happy I thought I was but it has never really been so. [Torvald:] Not-not happy! [Nora:] No, only *merry*¹²

[emphasis added]

Here Ibsen reveals to us what Marcuse seems to be getting at. Nora was living the 'ideal' life according to her society, yet she was never really happy, only *merry*. Marcuse states that in the advanced industrial society there tends to be ubiquitous unhappiness over which the happy consciousness is cast. Thus, we see happy consciousness as the *merry* veil that overlays an inner churning of discontent.¹³

We get an even clearer picture of happy consciousness by using Betty Friedan's insights into the "problem that has no name".¹⁴ Here we see a social group, 1950's American women, meeting the ideal that the society's narrative has assured them is what it takes to live a flourishing life. If you are meeting the ideal you *should* be happy, but all the group could ask of its existence is, "is this all?".¹⁵ There is an ineffable felt lack. A dissonance between how you *ought* to feel and how you really do feel. Thus, the happy consciousness is the *merry* mask that hides an unhappy reality that is experienced as a felt lack. In certain societies the happy consciousness is endemic to the one-dimensional type.

Whether or not happy consciousness is in the contemporary United States society is open to debate; maybe we are these *merry* alienated types, maybe we really are living flourishing lives, or perhaps we are still alienated types that just aren't so *merry* anymore.

Loss of transcendence is widespread amongst the one-dimensional type. Marcuse defines transcendence as “tendencies in theory and practice which, in a given society, ‘overshoot’ the established universe of discourse and action”.¹⁶ To put it rather simply, transcendence is imagination.¹⁷ It is the ability to go beyond the ‘given’ civilization to form new ideas to change the civilization in a qualitative, not just quantitative, way. The one-dimensional type lacks this imaginative capacity whereas the dialectical type possesses it. This loss of imagination leads directly into the next set of characteristics.

The one-dimensional thinker is fundamentally a purely instrumental thinker. Instrumental rationality is a type of rationality that seeks to find the most efficient means to certain ends in a given project. All humans use this type of rationality. When instrumental thought becomes *totalized*, however, it blocks the ability to evaluate the ends the thinker is striving towards. An example will help to clarify: James and Sarah are trying to figure out how to most efficiently build a hotel next to the ocean. They might discuss what building materials to use, how many workers to hire, and other things of this nature, to calculate the best means to bring about the end of having a hotel built next to the ocean. In this example we see instrumental rationality in action. James and Sarah are using this means-end thinking to most efficiently solve their problem. Again, we all use this type of reasoning in our day-to-day lives. The problem, however, is when this instrumental rationality becomes the only rationality employed in the everyday. In the example given, the purely instrumental thinker wouldn't ask the question, ‘should I be

building the hotel next to the ocean in the first place?'. The purely instrumental thinker doesn't stop to question the ends to which they are striving. The purely instrumental thinker can, with great efficiency, calculate how to bring about certain ends, but never stops to *evaluate* the ends themselves.

With these characteristics in mind we will turn to how the puzzle pieces all fit together. How the structure of the advanced industrial society leads to the one-dimensional type's flourishing and the dialectical type's withering. I hope to come to the root of the problem and spell out how this insight has profound implications for the democratic process.

The Origin of the Cheerful Robot

C. Wright Mills once said that "rationally organized social arrangements are not necessarily a means of increased freedom...in fact, often they are a means of tyranny and manipulation, a means of expropriating the very chance to reason".¹⁸ It is this notion that is at the heart of the questioning Marcuse subjects the advanced industrial societies to, revealing their dark side in the process. Marcuse wants us to see that the advanced industrial societies have, as an extension of the enlightenment, succumbed to a process of rationalization. What this amounts to is the civil society forming bureaucratic systems, originally rooted in the cultural values of a community, to best serve the interests of that society in a rational way.¹⁹ The problem lies in these large rationalized systems becoming detached from the community values in an attempt to most efficiently maximize its own goals. So as not to remain too abstract let us turn to an example.

Hospitals were made to serve the interests of a community in an efficient and rational way that small medical practices couldn't do. Just one instance where a large hospital is better is the fact that they can have a slew of medical treatment options due to the massive quantities of medical equipment they have, which a small practice could not afford. The hospital is supposed to serve the interests of the community and meet their values in ways small practices can't. The massive centralization of resources to be found in these large industries allow for the potentially of a more efficient allocation of resources than in the small industries. Now, the medical industry, both in small and large forms, in the United States is by and large a for-profit system. In other words the medical industry is an industry, they try to maximize their profits. The problem comes when this bureaucratic system becomes detached from the original intent to serve the community and becomes a monstrous system bent primarily on making as much profit as possible. In doing so the hospital can turn into a place where patients are reduced to medical charts; not to have their interests filled, but to be most efficiently 'fixed', as if the patient were a broken bicycle, in a manner which profits the key players in the healthcare industry.²⁰

It is these very systems that once stood to serve the community that now colonize its values, the very same the system used to be rooted in. Often, depending on the system, this is done through advertising of some sort. We have seen earlier how certain hypothetical actors in the state can use political ad campaigns to twist the content of culture. This form of colonization can, in draining the content of concepts like justice, leave us with the Orwellian situation where 'war is peace' and 'peace is war'. Orwell seems to have picked up on the ability of systems to manipulate these now empty concepts to influence public opinion, but we are not concerned with this topic here. What

we are concerned with, however, is how this draining of culture leaves the majority of the community in a one-dimensional universe of thought. The two-dimensional sphere of society is systematically reduced to a one-dimensional universe by the draining of the second dimension (i.e. culture). The destruction of culture is carried out by rationalized systems, originally designed to serve society, which have become separated from their roots. In the advanced industrial society, these bureaucratic institutions have the technological and scientific capabilities to colonize the sphere of culture at an ever-greater rate. For example, mass communications aids in the dissemination of advertisements, which could seek to undermine cultural concepts. Moreover, advances in fields like cognitive science, sociology, and psychology have aided the task of marketing goods and services to the public.

The by-product of this reduction from the two-dimensional sphere to the one-dimensional are the conditions that allow the one-dimensional type of thought to triumph over dialectical thought. Without the sphere of culture, according to Marcuse, the civil society won't have the collective intellectual means for thinking beyond the status quo (i.e. civilization) in a qualitative, not merely quantitative, way. Without this ability to imaginatively transcend the brute immediacy of our everyday experiences of the world we are left with a purely operational form of thought. This is the essential facet of the one-dimensional type. We are left stuck like robots navigating our lives in a quantitative means-ends way without ever evaluating the ends themselves. If we tack on the feature of happy consciousness, the one-dimensional type can be said to match up perfectly with C. Wright Mills notion of "The Cheerful Robot".²¹ Mills asks, in our society "will there

come to prevail, or even to flourish, what may be called The Cheerful Robot?”.²² The answer to this question, of course, lies in the social conditions persons are brought up in.

Marcuse’s analysis seems to offer us keen insight into the type of social conditions that make The Cheerful Robot flourish. We see that the one-dimensional type becomes more prevalent as the two-dimensional sphere is whittled down to a one-dimensional sphere of thought and behavior. What exactly is this sphere? Marcuse calls it a “universe of discourse”. How are we to take this? The type of discourse Marcuse is talking about has been roughly defined in the human sciences as, “a formation or cluster of ideas, images, and practices that construct knowledge of, ways of talking about, and forms of conduct associated with a particular topic, social activity, or institutional site in society”.²³ We can see that discourse is a collective sphere of knowledge we draw from to understand our world, our society, and ourselves. So, Marcuse is saying that a main condition that lets The Cheerful Robot triumph in a society is the constraining of the universe of discourse to a fundamentally one-dimensional universe of discourse.

The universe of discourse, for Marcuse, *ought* to be two-dimensional. As we’ve seen this is tantamount to the persons in a society being capable of thinking about the material structuring of society (i.e. civilization) and grasping the content of their shared value systems (i.e. culture). We have also seen that this second dimension doesn’t come from any particular political set of beliefs. So, perhaps it is better to think of the two-dimensional universe as a multi-dimensional universe; a public sphere where various qualitatively different ideas can clash for the betterment of the community’s collective knowledge. With this two-dimensional universe of discourse the society can imagine new ways of being. It will not just be home to the purely instrumental way of thinking, but

also to a reason that imagines and can evaluate the ends the society is striving after, not just the best means to get to pre-established and unchallenged ends.

This is the origin of the increased prevalence of The Cheerful Robot, the one-dimensional type. The universe of discourse is being turned from a two-dimensional sphere into a one-dimensional sphere due to colonization by rational systems (e.g. the state and the market) originally designed to help the civil society. In the wake of this reduction the persons in the society can no longer draw upon collective spheres of knowledge that transcend beyond the status quo and question the goals of the established society (i.e. the direction it is heading in, the ends to which it strives). Technological and scientific mastery of the advanced industrial society aids the systems in this absorption of the two-dimensional universe into the one-dimensional. This is Marcuse's framework. This is the Marcuse-spectacles with which one can cast new eyes onto contemporary society. This fundamental framework seems to hold as true today as it did in 1964, when *One-Dimensional Man* was written.

The Issue of a Healthy Democracy

At the outset of this paper it was stated that we should read Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* if we valued a healthy democratic process. For those who know Marcuse this might have seemed like an unusual thing to say, as earlier noted Marcuse doesn't talk much at all about democracy. With the framework we have distilled from Marcuse, however, we can start to see how this all makes sense. C. Wright Mills states:

The society in which...this cheerful robot, flourishes is the antithesis of the free society – or in the literal and plain meaning of the word, of a democratic society...Put as a trouble of the individual...it is the trouble called 'alienation'.

As an issue for publics...it is no less than the issue of democratic society, as fact and as aspiration²⁴

Here we see the warning that in a society where the one-dimensional type of thinking flourishes democracy is in jeopardy. A healthy democracy requires a two-dimensional universe of discourse, which systems like the state and market are turning into a one-dimensional universe.

A democracy, if it is to be successful, needs not only to be able to have citizens capable of instrumental reason, but also capable of imaginative thinking to deal with fundamentally new historical realities, new problems that present themselves. The invading one-dimensional sphere is, as we've seen, denying this latter ability. My concern here is with the two-dimensional universe of discourse as a *necessary*, though *not sufficient*, pillar of having a healthy democratic process. Marcuse's framework reveals to us a way of seeing our society that helps us to realize that this sphere that is a necessary condition for a healthy democratic process is constantly threatened with reduction. The democratic process is threatened and Marcuse helps us to see why this is the case. Additionally, the Marcuse-spectacles, in helping us get a grasp of our situation, aid us in thinking about measures to counteract this absorption of the two-dimensional universe of discourse into the one-dimensional.

In part II we will see the implications of this realization and start to put the framework to use.

Part II: The Significance of Marcuse's Thought Today

“Democracies have great rational and imaginative powers. They also are prone to some serious flaws in reasoning, to parochialism, haste, sloppiness, selfishness, narrowness of the spirit. Education based mainly on profitability in the global market magnifies these deficiencies, producing a greedy obtuseness and a technically trained docility that threaten the very life of democracy itself”¹

We have seen that a necessary pillar of a healthy democratic process is the existence of a two dimensional society. If the democratic society is to properly function, then it *needs* a space for critical thought, reflection, and discourse. Marcuse has also showed us that structural forces in advanced industrial societies lead to the erosion of this crucial space. This is what Marcuse's analysis can show us today. If the democratic society doesn't have this second dimension, then it will be doomed to dysfunction and, ultimately, failure. Marcuse's popularity has plummeted in recent times, nearly no one reads any of his works anymore, but his powerful framework for understanding advanced industrial societies still has much to teach us. If we decide to ignore these insights it will be at our own peril.

Marcuse's analysis can generate new ways of thinking about the world that can aid in the quest to strengthen a democratic society. When we put on the Marcuse-spectacles we can begin to see practical ways we can fight back against the whittling down of the two dimensional society. It becomes clear that certain policy choices can directly help or hurt the development of a space for imagination and critical thinking in a given society.

There are, no doubt, a multitude of policy choices that affect the second dimension of the advanced industrial society. What I will explore are just three major issues that are becoming quite relevant to contemporary political debate. First, I will look

at proposals to regulate the Internet and argue that we should have limited, although sensible, regulation. Second, it will be emphasized that public funding for the arts and humanities is of utmost importance if we wish to have a two dimensional society. Finally, the importance for a democracy to publicly fund news programs like PBS and NPR will be explored through a Marcusean lens.

Regulation of the Internet

In recent years there has been talk of regulating the content of the Internet. No doubt sensible regulation is preferable to none whatsoever; very few people seem to oppose regulation of content such as child pornography. I intend to show that even though we should not be overly optimistic about the Internet's potential to strengthen the democratic process, we still have good justification for supporting a platform of limited regulation to Internet content if we are interested in bolstering democracy.

Scholars who are skeptical of the Internet's role in strengthening democracy have, quite rightly, seen a rather common public perception about its role in society.² Many people subscribe to what Evgeny Morozov has called cyber utopianism. Cyber utopianism is the belief that if we introduce the Internet to various parts of the world, then strong democracy will take root across the globe. The Internet, as a tool, has the *potential* for this grand democratization, but potentiality is not actuality. Cyber utopianism often amounts to a confusion between possible use and how people are actually using the Internet.

In terms of *potential*, the Internet could become a positive force for spreading critical thought and challenging the status quo, not unlike the invention of the printing

press. The Internet has the *potential* to be a truly democratized medium of public discourse. As per most technology, however, the benefits and disadvantages will be user dependent. If you are already interested in searching for various academic and NGO studies, then the Internet will present itself as an invaluable tool for connecting you to vast amounts of important information that will help you understand the world we live in. If you are not already disposed to searching for this information, then the effects of the Internet may not be so advantageous in strengthening your critical faculties.

The *actual* uses of the Internet, Morozov maintains, tend to be a form of cyber hedonism. In actuality the Internet is generally used to download various forms of entertainment, be it movies, games, or pornography. Although it is unclear how exactly the Internet has affected the way humans behave and think, the case can be made that the overall effect has been to encourage acceptance of the status quo and discourage critical thought. With a written text we are often required to engage in a more reflective way, but can the same be said with the Internet? It seems that we more often end up chasing from link to link at hyper speed, lured by ever-present novelty at our fingertips. Does the Internet encourage or discourage critical thought? It often seems as though the Internet has impeded our ability to maintain sustained attention, but it seems difficult to render a conclusive answer to the question posed. Additionally, although the Internet becomes a place where nearly all can voice their opinion for very little money, there is a certain sense of authority that becomes lost in Internet discourse. With the centralization of media the public tends to become subject to monotony, very few corporations distribute similar messages throughout the public sphere. In the Internet age, however, something very similar happens. As there becomes an overflow of voices they tend to get lost in a

sea of chatter, there are too many voices to take in. We end up in a position where some who have dedicated their careers to concentrated study on an area may have no more influence on public perception of this area of study than someone who has just read an article on this very same subject matter and decided to blog about it.

Even though knowledge of how the Internet is affecting the ability of persons to critically think, it seems hard to deny the Internet's great ability as a tool for those who know how to use it. For those who *are* actively searching credible information the Internet provides an unrivaled resource, given the funds required to access it. It seems that we have good reason to oppose state regulation of the Internet except in extreme cases, such as child pornography. By keeping the Internet away from state regulation it will allow the dissemination of information that actors within the state would otherwise like to suppress. As Morozov points out powerful heads of state are using the Internet to help further gain control over their populations, but surely this can't be used as an argument to give the state more control over the content accessible to its citizens.³ Though the Internet shouldn't be seen as an absolute savior for strengthening critical thought, it remains a great tool for cheaply accessing crucial information. Regardless of the hope that should be placed on the Internet for opening up a space for critical discourse, the Internet is not going away anytime soon and the second dimension of society can only benefit from limited state regulation of the Internet. Thus, if we value the two dimensional society we should support policies of a sensibly unregulated Internet. We should equally avoid falling into cyber utopianism and thinking that the Internet will magically cure the ills that threaten our democracy.

The Importance of the Arts and Humanities

United States society has frequently stressed the importance of education. Often, however, education is only stressed as a means to the end of a stronger economic system. A stronger economy is obviously important to the well being of the citizenry, but it is just one end a society should strive toward. As an outcome of education with a for-profit motive the United States society stresses the importance of a math, engineering, and science education; math, engineering, and science can help to aid in technological development, which is a key factor in growing the United States economy. In the latest State of the Union address President Obama talked at length about investing in education, but nowhere to be found was talk of investing in the arts and humanities. In mainstream conversations about education reform the arts and humanities are increasingly marginalized as a consequence of the pervasive view that the study of the arts and humanities are nonessentials to the health of society. As philosopher Martha Nussbaum puts it, the arts and humanities are “seen by policy-makers as useless frills”.⁴ I will argue that if we are to save a space for critical thought, reflection, and discourse, then the arts and humanities should be given substantial public funding and be treated with utmost respect.

The growth of a country’s economy does not ensure better lives for that country’s citizens. Even if we were to grant that the general citizenry would experience its country’s economic gains, not a great assumption given that economic growth increasingly goes to only the top few percent of wealthy elites, there is no guarantee that the citizens would live more fulfilled existences. Living a flourishing life requires more than just material goods, although a certain level of material comfort is necessary, e.g.

being able to put food in one's belly and having access to adequate shelter. If we continue to sideline the arts and humanities we will be left with nothing but "generations of useful machines".⁵ Even science and math education are increasingly not about the wonders of mathematics or the development of knowledge about the world by pure science. These subjects are being used in a purely instrumental way with the sole unquestioned end to energize the economy. The United States policy choices on education are essentially interested in one thing, training obedient workers to help grow the GDP.

The arts and humanities are crucial to the development of the second dimension of society. In order to have a healthy democracy the society needs the skills to imagine beyond the given, to think critically about political issues, to be able to engage in meaningful discourse with those of a different perspective. With the encroaching one-dimensional society differing perspectives are increasingly eradicated to a monotonous conformist one, although surface differences will, of course, be present. If the United States education system continues to emphasize narrow training as a cog in a machine and doesn't also educate the citizenry with the resources to think outside that role, then instrumental reason will continue its domination. The creative ability that is nurtured in the arts and humanities is essential to critical thought. Additionally, the arts and humanities can teach us to take on the perspectives of others; Nussbaum uses Ralph Ellison's work *Invisible Man* to show how reading works of literature can allow us to see the world from a different lens. This ability has a profound role to play in combating the dangers that can accompany the takeover of purely instrumental reason.

To educate citizens to think only in instrumental terms is to "feed the forces that lead to violence and dehumanization and fail to feed the forces that lead to cultures of

equality and respect”.⁶ To be incapable of seeing the world through another person’s eyes is a moral failing that can have disastrous consequences, this doesn’t help in an ethos where we have steadily turned “people into money”.⁷ In our age to see educating persons in the arts and humanities as a frivolous luxury is to risk humanitarian crisis, it is also to ensure difficulty for any democratic system. If we value a flourishing democratic process we must ensure that the arts and humanities receive public funding. Currently the federal spending for the National Endowment for the Arts is less than it was in 1988.⁸ Since 2008, when the United States economy took a downturn, various receivers of federal funds have been in danger of getting their funds cut. If the society cares about keeping a major pillar of the second dimension and thus a pillar of democracy, policy-makers and voters should think twice before reducing funds that support the arts and humanities.

Public Broadcasting

Early on in the year 2011 House Republicans introduced a plan to drastically reduce federal spending levels. On the list of programs to be eliminated, funding for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting.⁹ I will argue that if we take Marcuse seriously and believe that democracy needs a space for critical discourse, then getting rid of funding for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting will have disastrous consequences for the health of our democracy.

Public discourse is a major factor in shaping our social reality. If we are to apply this to our political reality, the public discourse in a society influences what and how people think about political issues. Discourse constructs what issues we see as important, what solutions will seem ‘realistic’, how we see the nature of the political order, and so

on. If the public discourse about politics is shallow, then gradually so too will become the citizens' understanding of political issues. The political news media that can be seen on television stations such as MSNBC, CNN, and Fox News, is becoming increasingly superficial. Public understanding of complex political issues is becoming nothing more than conditioned Pavlovian responses to short sound bites. As Todd Gitlin notes, in the year 2000 "the average sound bite was seven seconds long".¹⁰ Although one might wonder why this process is happening to news media, the sound bite length appears to be getting shorter and shorter every year, if we stop to reflect, then it seems to be the rational outcome of the privatization of political news media.

The privatized political news media is ultimately a business. The end to which these businesses strive is the pursuit of profit. This push for profit is the driving force behind media empires forming and trying to buy up more and more stations. We are left in a situation where, as Karlyn Kohrs Campbell puts it, "the big five – TimeWarner, Disney, Murdoch's News Corporation based in Australia, Viacom, and Bertelsmann based in Germany – own most of the newspapers, magazines, book publisher, motion picture studios, and radio and television stations in the United States".¹¹ This rational centralization of resources creates an atmosphere where what counts as 'reasonable' political discourse is bounded within the parameters set by five corporations. News station X owned by corporation Y will promote view Z on its politicized shows while news station A owned by corporation B will promote view C. C and Z might be in disagreement, but we have a narrowing of public narratives for understanding complex political issues. What constitutes a 'rational' political debate will fall somewhere between the parameters set by views C and Z, opinions that lay outside this space will be *prima*

facie irrational. Now this is, of course, an oversimplification designed to orient the reader to the phenomena that is happening. There are more than just two reasonable opinions on every political issue, more than just a choice between C and Z. What this example is suppose to illustrate, however, is the steady narrowing of available stories we can draw on for forming an understanding of what is really happening in current political affairs.

In an effort to sell their product the news stations often package their delivery of information with entertainment. To old adage ‘if it bleeds it leads’ is the guiding principle. This leads to the simplification of political complexity. Increasingly the political news outlets report less on substantial issues and more on the polling races; operating on the, perhaps correct, assumption that policy issues don’t drag in as many viewers as the ‘horse race’. As Campbell notes:

One study, which compared network news coverage of...presidential elections...found that 71 percent of stories in 2000 were concerned primarily with the “horse race,” compared to 48 percent in 1996...The Annenberg Public Policy Center’s content analysis of television news in 2000 showed that fewer than one-third of the statements in election stories mentioned any issue at all, no matter how briefly¹²

With attention dedicated to profit instead of informing the public, the news media is increasingly failing at its task in purportedly being a pillar of a functioning democracy. The rational pursuit of profit that guides a news corporation’s actions leads to the decreased quality and quantity of the actual amount of important political information the public has access to.

Public broadcasting relies on government funding and private contributions, although some stations like PBS have “authorized the airing of 30-second advertisement

spots”.¹³ Since these stations are generally not concerned with making a large profit, they don’t succumb to covering the ‘horse race’ over covering real issues. The outcome of this is that non-commercialized outlets like “NPR, PRI, and PBS...have demonstrably better records in promoting accurate perceptions about public issues”.¹⁴ If the general public values having a news media system that really informs them, then they should support federal funding for public broadcasting. Although these stations are funded by the state, they don’t have any content dictated to them by the state and should not be considered ‘state media’ in the derogatory sense. Without substantial funds outside of private donations some of the last informative news outlets will not be able to bring the coverage that a democratic system needs. Operating a real news station requires a massive amount of capital, as Michael Schudson puts it, “analysis, like investigation, requires something that providing information does not require so fully: money. It takes a great deal of time and effort to do analysis”.¹⁵ To get a news outlet that will get beyond feeding the public entertainment and will have the resources to truly scrutinize political issues, we need to publicly fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

News media shapes what and how we think about political reality. It is a creator of a space out of which critical social narratives about political issues can take place. It creates a space for critical thought, reflection, and discourse. As market forces eat away at the second dimension of the advanced industrial society, public broadcasting can create a space that will be a garrison for critical analysis. Stations like NPR and PBS can only do so, however, if they receive enough capital to enable real analysis and investigation of political issues. With the economy weakened and politicians calling for spending cuts these very same stations risk having their federal grants eliminated. If we think the

insight into the necessity of a space for critical thought, reflection, and discourse for a healthy democracy is correct, then we should be vigilant in not letting federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting be cut.

I began this paper with a question, why should we care about Marcuse today? The answer should now be apparent. Marcuse's analysis of the advanced industrial society in *One-Dimensional Man* gives the reader a powerful framework for understanding forces in societies like the United States that lead to pervasive uncritical thought and behavior, to the rise of the one-dimensional type. With this framework we can gain a better understanding of the social situation we face today. By putting on the Marcuse-spectacles we see the world in a different way. In using Marcuse's analysis we can see that a healthy democratic system will require a two-dimensional universe and that this universe is under threat of reduction by the colonizing forces of the state and market. What this amounts to is the erosion of a space for critical thought, reflection, and discourse, the destruction of public narratives we can use as resources to provoke us into critical questioning and debate. In understanding these forces in the advanced industrial society we can apply the ideas and begin to think about a multitude of policy choices we should support if we value a flourishing democratic process, just three of which I explored in this paper.

The philosophical satirist Matthew Stewart has aptly described the situation facing Marcuse as follows:

Flavor of the Day. You must, at all cost, discover the trendy name(s) of the moment and throw them in the mix. The truth is never more than a few years old. Be careful to avoid those who have lost the historical moment. If you mistakenly

use Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979), a...Marxist who made a splash in the late sixties, for example, you will probably be put in a museum¹⁶

Although interest in Marcuse's thought has waned, his analysis of advanced industrial society still has much to teach us today. One need not be concerned with how his insights relate to democracy to see the revelatory nature of his work; his insights can shed light on a number of different issues. What should be clear, however, is that if we don't incorporate this type of understanding of the advanced industrial society into our public discourse, then we might not be able to comprehend that silent crises are occurring all around us that could determine the future failure or success of American democracy.

Special thanks to Professor Eske Møllgaard for advising this project and guiding the development of my ideas as well as Professor C.B. Peters for introducing me to Marcuse's thought and offering helpful commentary on the project.

Notes

Introduction

1. Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination: a History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. (Berkeley: University of California, 1996), p. 29
2. For an extensive history on the Institute member's flight from Germany see Wiggershaus, Rolf. *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance*. Trans. Michael Robertson. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994), pages 127-148. By late September 1934, all but one of the Institute's official members were in New York. The last one of the members, Henryk Grossman, arrived in New York in 1938.
3. During World War II Marcuse worked as a senior analyst for the Office of War Information and transferred to the Office of Secret Services in March 1943, where he would remain until the end of the war. Marcuse taught briefly at Columbia (1952-1953) and Harvard (1954-1955), but taught for about seven years at Brandeis (1958-1965) when they offered him a tenure position in their political science department. He would go on to teach at the University of California, San Diego from 1965 until he retired in 1976 at the age of seventy-eight.
4. Some such leaders were the ever-controversial figures of the time including, but not limited to, Abbie Hoffman, Angela Davis, Mark Rudd, and Rudi Dutschke. Both Abbie Hoffman and Angela Davis were students of Marcuse at Brandeis University. Angela Davis later moved to the University of California at San Diego to further engage in study with Marcuse.
5. Some of Marcuse's ideas are *prima facie* highly dubious and others just sound strange to our contemporary ears. An example of the former would be his insistence that if science developed in the context of a pacified world, then "science would arrive at essentially different concepts of nature and establish essentially different facts" – Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon, 1991), p. 167. Although we might be inclined to agree to the former claim that we'd possess quite different concepts for nature, the latter claim that science will come upon 'essentially different facts' seems highly suspect. To many contemporary, see postmodern, readers Marcuse's belief that we can determine the best choices for how society should operate in the future by means of *objectively valid* criteria may seem laughable at best, and downright dangerous at worst – see *One-Dimensional Man*, p. 217-218.
6. There are a slew of other values and judgments Terrence must make in this case. For example he must weight how he should spend his time, his money, etc. These other values are, for the purposes of the case at hand, irrelevant.
7. One might add to this list the commonwealths and territories of the United States government. Of course, this is not to suggest these areas do or don't see themselves, in terms of national identity, as part of the United States or to suggest they have equal voting rights as those who live in the fifty states.

8. If we were to use our earlier example of Mindy and Terrence, then we could see that Mindy could tell Terrence all sorts of reasons not to despise living things or various other reasons to act on combating anthropogenic climate change. Terrence, however, could always say that he still doesn't value acting against climate change. Mindy could tell Terrence that his inaction will cause immense pain and suffering to all living creatures on earth, but Terrence could find this agreeable if he is, lets assume, both a sadist and a masochist, valuing the prescription of suffering to others and himself. Likewise, one could argue for all the reasons to prefer a healthy democratic process to a sickly one, but this argument will never reach an uncontested conclusion for it presupposes whole sets of values others might not share. This is not to say developing arguments for preferring a healthy democracy have no purpose, it is just to say that they are by their very nature limited.
9. Kellner, Douglas. "A Marcuse Renaissance?" *Marcuse: From the New Left to the Next Left*. Ed. John Bokina and Timothy J. Lukes. (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, 1994. Pgs. 245-68). Web. 26 Feb. 2011. <gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/marcuserenaissance.pdf>. p. 13.
10. Ibid, p. 1.

Part I: The Two Dimensions of Advanced Industrial Society

1. Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina: A Novel In Eight Parts*. Trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. (New York, NY: Penguin USA, 2002), p. 6-7. For other uses of this quote in a sociological context see also: Riesman, David, with Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney. *The Lonely Crowd: a Study of the Changing American Character*. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1953), p. 39.

The Two Dimensions

2. Marcuse, Herbert. "Remarks on a Redefinition of Culture." *The Essential Marcuse: Selected Writings of Philosopher and Social Critic Herbert Marcuse*. Ed. Andrew Feenberg and William Leiss. (Boston: Beacon, 2007. Pgs. 13-31), p. 14. The same ideas are expressed in *One-Dimensional Man*, but certain passages from this essay are much clearer in explaining the two dimensions of society.
3. Payne, Charles M. "Demanding and Supporting Success." *American Educator* Vol. 34.No. 1 (Spring 2011 pgs. 14-23), p. 17.
4. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, p. 88.
5. Ibid, p. 57.
6. Ibid, p. 247.

The One-Dimensional and Dialectical Types

7. Weber, Max. "A Final Rebuttal of Rachfahl's Critique of the 'Spirit of Capitalism'" Trans. Peter Baehr and Gordon C. Wells. *The Protestant Ethic and*

- the "Spirit" of Capitalism and Other Writings*. (New York: Penguin, 2002. Pgs. 282-339), p. 300.
8. Weber, Max. "The Protestant Ethic and the 'Spirit' of Capitalism" Trans. Peter Baehr and Gordon C. Wells. *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism and Other Writings*. (New York: Penguin, 2002. Pgs. 1-202), p. 145.
 9. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, p. 101.
 10. Ibid, p. 100.
 11. Ibid, p. 76.
 12. Ibsen, Henrik. "A Doll's House." *A Doll's House and Two Other Plays*. Ed. Ernest Rhys. (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1912. 5-86), p. 80.
 13. It should also be noted that Marcuse thinks this underlying discontent "lends itself easily to political mobilization [which] may become the...reservoir for a...fascist way of life". See *One-Dimensional Man*, p. 76.
 14. Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. (New York: Norton, 2001), p. 63.
 15. Ibid, p. 57.
 16. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, p. xliii.
 17. Marcuse himself starts to call transcendence 'imagination'. See *One-Dimensional Man*, p. 248.

The Origin of the Cheerful Robot

18. Mills, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination*. (New York: Oxford UP, 1959), p. 169.
19. For much of this discussion I will be using the terminology of Jürgen Habermas (e.g. process of rationalization, systems, colonization).
20. The primary of the 'key players' seems to be the health insurance industry. This is a great example of a business designed to serve the public becoming detached from its community rooted values and terrorizing the civil society.
21. Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, p. 171.
22. Ibid, p. 171.
23. Chavez, Leo. "The Latino Threat Narrative." *The Latino Threat*. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008), p. 22.

The Issue of a Healthy Democracy

24. Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, p. 172.

Part II: The Significance of Marcuse's Thought Today

1. Nussbaum, Martha Craven. *Not For Profit: Why Democracy Needs The Humanities*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2010), p. 142.

Regulation of the Internet

2. Much of my ideas on this subject have been influenced by a lecture given by Evgeny Morozov. Morozov, Evgeny. "YouTube - Evgeny Morozov - The Internet in Society: Empowering or Censoring Citizens?" *YouTube - Broadcast Yourself*. RSA.org, 8 May 2010. Web. 12 Apr. 2011. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ah_T9cg-J6s>.
3. For a good example of a head of state using the Internet to increase their power see the BBC article entitled *Thai website to protect the king*. "BBC NEWS | Asia-Pacific | Thai Website to Protect the King." *BBC News - Home*. 5 Feb. 2009. Web. 14 Apr. 2011. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/7871748.stm>>.

The Importance of the Arts and Humanities

4. Nussbaum, *Not For Profit*, p. 2.
5. *Ibid*, p. 2.
6. *Ibid*, p. 143.
7. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism*, p. 11.
8. "National Endowment for the Arts Appropriations History." *National Endowment for the Arts*. Web. 20 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.nea.gov/about/budget/AppropriationsHistory.html>>.

Public Broadcasting

9. Hulse, Carl, and David M. Herszenhorn. "E.P.A. and Public Broadcasting Are on House Republicans' List for Deep Cuts." *The New York Times*. 11 Feb. 2011. Web. 15 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/12/us/politics/12congress.html>>.
10. Gitlin, Todd. "Deliberation in Democracy." *The Hedgehog Review: Critical Reflections on Contemporary Culture* 6.3 (Fall 2004): 7-13, p. 8.
11. Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Marketing Public Discourse." *The Hedgehog Review: Critical Reflections on Contemporary Culture* 6.3 (Fall 2004): 39-54, p. 40.
12. *Ibid*, p. 46.
13. *Ibid*, p. 43.
14. *Ibid*, p. 52.
15. Schudson, Michael. "News and Democratic Society." *The Hedgehog Review: Critical Reflections on Contemporary Culture* 10.2 (Summer 2008): 7-22, p. 12.
16. Stewart, Matthew. *The Truth About Everything: An Irreverent History of Philosophy*. (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2005), p. 363.