

similarly, the ideological elements articulated by a hegemonic class do not have a necessary class belonging” (p. 67). It would take much more than this brief paper to confirm this assertion, especially if we are talking about signifiers from the cultural domain. Throughout the post-war period, when the Western world was a social space for great achievements, frivolities and symbolic turns in the arts, but also the space for a fascinating growth of the popular culture, we had to deal with the hegemonic pressures due to the imposing influence of the ideological as well as political difference between the “two worlds”. The rule of “ideology” was of course superficial as far as culture and at least a part of social sciences were concerned. The characteristics of the above-mentioned Gramscian meaning of the term of hegemony were perceptible in the views on culture and art exactly in that period. From this perspective, I can fully agree with the following account:

*As the higher culture of the West was largely a product of a pretechnological age, it is scarcely any wonder that those who wish to sustain the one should find themselves in the position of advocating the other. Hence, from Matthew Arnold to F. R. Leavis, from Raymond Williams to Richard Hoggart, from Theodor Roszak to Charles Reich we are confronted with men whose commitment to cultural values seems ineluctably welded to a nostalgic regard for an organic community, whose work and culture are two aspects of a unified life. And since both left and right wing critics have been so deceived in their belief that a shorter working week would be the key to a new and fuller existence, the right has turned to the past, ignoring all too often the social cost of pretechnological culture, and the left to some distant future in which temporary restrictions would give way to a fully realized classless culture, unguided by rationalistic strictures (Bigsby. 1976: p. 16).*

Such insights accumulated in the 1970s, especially after the demise of tumultuous political activities that left no artistic field in the Western world untouched. It became visible that cultural and political hegemony in their interdependency disrupt any clear meanings of such ideological notions as progressive and conservative, beautiful and ugly, political left and right, etc. Although we may find certain differentiating signifiers within the cultural and artistic fields that undoubtedly set apart different politics, which again reflect some hegemonic “values,” we usually cannot be certain to which political tendency some social effects of any breakthrough artistic praxis will appeal to. The post-modern plurality, no matter how we grasp it in theoret-