

### *Cultural Ideology*

Since the text of *Introduction* is such as it is, namely “informative and affirmative”, I am not taking it as an object of relevant criticism. It mainly serves its purpose as a representation of a kind of an aesthetically qualified discourse, which displays a power to select, to categorize, to evaluate, to segregate, to judge, and so forth. As it appears, the authors tried to define art in a context, in which they find it difficult to distinguish between “fine” and “commercial” art. However, why is it necessary to distinguish between the two kinds of art? What purpose does the difference that must be the product of the delineation actually serve? Consequently, is not “fine art”, which is categorized as such, determined to be of a certain “value”, and does not this value express itself as a “market value”? Since commercial art usually happens to be accessible to the public at large and is relatively cheap for an individual consumer, what then is actually the meaning or purpose of the notion of “commercial”? Since the products of fine art that are determined as such by experts usually attain a high price in the art market, *they* should actually be considered as truly commercial. Maybe the distinction between “fine and commercial”, which, as we know, acquired a high degree of general recognition and acceptance, was not so correct after all. Or, finally, on the contrary, such a distinction has probably had a role, no matter how well understood or misunderstood, in the “classification struggle”, if we may borrow the term from Pierre Bourdieu (1994: p. 27).

It seems that Woods and his co-writers did not recognize any curiosity in the fact that they were recording themselves. They pointed out the role of museums and galleries and they somehow overlooked the determining impact of these institutions on the formation of artists and the production of art itself. How much did they take into account that a web of such institutions already makes up part of the industrial world so that “museums and galleries”, (and concert halls, cinemas and the media each with a defined role) form a decisive link in the production and distribution of art? The overwhelming influence of these institutions on the value of works of art is becoming common knowledge in the context of the post-industrial society nowadays, but it seems that somehow we are still confronted with a cultural ideology, which presupposes “true art vs. fake art or kitsch”. Among many others, John Berger found that

*/.../ since the French Revolution art has never enjoyed among the bourgeoisie the privileged position it does today. During the second half of the nineteenth century, there was also an art of revolt and its*