

maybe it can be even proved that the “*The work of art...*” occupies a special place within the context of the completely fragmented work by Benjamin. As much as this paper obviously is not in accordance with Adorno's views, it is not in accordance with, at least, Benjamin's style and approach in most of the rest of his discourse on aesthetic phenomena of his time.

However, taking into account the Adorno's criticism slightly helps our evaluation of those meanings of Benjamin's text, which transcend the boundaries of the age in which it was written. Some political motives, the intellectual revolt against Nazism most visible among them, clearly belong to historical determinations, which caused Benjamin's strong criticism of the idea of the autonomous work of art. Such a stand could be well understood within the logic of the text itself seeking to define artistic production as a kind of a “material force”, as an agency of the emancipation – not as a product of a solitary intellectual effort (which an autonomous work of art is usually supposed to be), but as a consciousness creating force. This consciousness is, of course, most decisively related to the mass perception of reality. Benjamin's supposed over-reaction against *l'art pour l'art* is not based on a perception of fascism as only a “brutal totalitarianism”. On the contrary, the problem is, that the /.../ “aesthetic concept of culture (*Kulturbegriff*) isn't /.../ exterior to fascism, to his cult of the form as the power claim by the privileged Subject, who in his tendency already encircles the totality of the form-able material into the political sphere” (Hillach, 1985: p. 257). Therefore, the problem is that fascism makes use of the mass culture, made possible by the mechanical reproduction, and Benjamin's intention is to show that *in spite* of it, the dawn of the age of a new mode of production – the aesthetic products included – brings the means of the emancipation through the “transformation of the superstructure”.

Benjamin's “clash with fascism” clearly helped the author to express some views, which could be considered along the lines of Adorno's criticism as a distortion or even as slightly crude reductionism. Nevertheless, a question could be put forward, how important really is this side of the text for its main points? The communication, personal as it may be, between Benjamin and Adorno, reflected two different points of view of the same traumatic problem. Adorno's approach led to problems of “enslaved subjectivity” of the Subject, who “lost his spontaneity” and autonomy in subjection to market forces. Consequentially, Adorno's aesthetic theory became a brilliant illustration of the philosophy, marked by pessimism and even nostalgia. Benjamin's discourse has not been developed in such a wide scope. It