

tions and projections of technological changes seem to be a clear effect of a demise or severe weakening of once strong actors in the field of emancipation struggles such as trade unions, left wing political parties and public intellectuals.

Considering various discourses on a different level, we can see that such a phenomena as political populism and an explosion of *false news* as the main and most banal agency of the *post-fact* world causes the mass culture to look almost like a natural disaster. It is interesting that after the shocking American presidential elections results in November 2016, both expressions denominating massive practice of the uncontrolled as well as manipulated communication and perception became “viral” themselves. It looked as if the Epimenides’ paradox of the liar had become “operational” in the mode of communicative behaviour; since the world is such that everybody lies, each and every one should join in the game of social networks of unlimited lying. The performative gesture behind acts of “publishing” on Facebook or Twitter is based on the tacit claim by authors: “I am a liar” and then the reading of messages turns into the checking of who is the more “true liar”. If I take as a hypothesis that we have to deal with some structural or qualitative change or a quantitative leap within mass culture, then I would claim that we are at the beginning of something new in Deleuzian terms or we are at the brink of the *event* as the eruption of the unpredictable in Badiou’s sense of the word. The transformation of mass culture, which contains a multiplicity of changes in the orders of the world, comprising of institutions from factory to education, politics and aesthetic productions, bring about a change in mass participation within a society. Therefore, as much as one can feel pessimistic due to the above mentioned recent phenomena, one should think about Walter Benjamin, who at the time of the dawn of Nazism had not given up his idea of the emancipatory potential of mass culture: “The fact that the new mode of participation first appeared in a disreputable form must not confuse the spectator” (Benjamin, 1969: p. 239). However, his idea was not (as some critics do sometimes surmise it) that the mass culture functioned as an automatic emancipatory mechanism. He well indicated the scary counter-emancipatory potentials within it, which was, in his time, demonstrated by rising Nazism. His appeal to communism to “politicize art” (cf. Ibid: p. 242) clearly points to a dialectics of involvement of so-called masses or multitudes into antagonisms of the social processes.