Marxist Media Theory

Daniel Chandler

In Britain and Europe, neo-Marxist approaches were common amongst media theorists from the late '60s until around the early '80s, and Marxist influences, though less dominant, remain widespread. So it is important to be aware of key Marxist concepts in analysing the mass media. However, there is no single Marxist school of thought, and the jargon often seems impenetrable to the uninitiated. These notes are intended to provide a guide to some key concepts.

Marxist theorists tend to emphasize the role of the mass media in the reproduction of the status quo, in contrast to liberal pluralists who emphasize the role of the media in promoting freedom of speech.

Opposition to functionalism

The rise of neo-Marxism in social science represented in part a reaction against 'functionalist' models of society. Functionalists seek to explain social institutions in terms of their cohesive functions within an inter-connected, socio-cultural system. Functionalism did not account for social conflict, whereas Marxism offered useful insights into class conflict.

Opposition to liberal pluralism

As the time of the European ascendancy of neo-Marxism in media theory (primarily in the 1970s and early 1980s), the main *non-Marxist* tradition was that of

liberal pluralism (which had been the dominant perspective in the United States since the 1940s) (see Hall 1982: 56-65). As Gurevitch *et al.* put it:

> Pluralists see society as a complex of competing groups and interests, none of them predominant all of the time. Media organizations are seen as bounded organizational systems, enjoying an important degree of autonomy from the state, political parties and institutionalized pressure groups. Control of the media is said to be in the hands of an autonomous managerial elite who allow a considerable degree of flexibility to media professionals. A basic symmetry is seen to exist between media institutions and their audiences, since in McQuail's words the 'relationship is generally entered into voluntarily and on apparently equal terms'... and audiences are seen as capable of manipulating the media in an infinite variety of ways according to their prior needs and dispositions, and as having access to what Halloran calls 'the plural values of society' enabling them to 'conform, accommodate, challenge or reject'. (Gurevitch *et al.* 1982: 1)

In contrast, they continue:

> Marxists view capitalist society as being one of class domination; the media are seen as part of an ideological arena in which various class views are fought out, although within the context of the dominance of certain classes; ultimate control is increasingly concentrated in monopoly capital; media professionals, while enjoying the illusion of autonomy, are socialized into and internalize the norms of the dominant culture; the media taken as a whole, relay interpretive frameworks consonant with the interests of the dominant classes, and media audiences, while sometimes negotiating and contesting these frameworks, lack ready access to alternative meaning systems that would enable them to reject the definitions offered by the media in favour of consistently oppositional definitions. (*ibid.*)

Base and superstructure

Economism (also called '*vulgar Marxism*') is a key feature of 'classical Marxism' (orthodox or fundamentalist Marxism). In economism, the economic *base* of society is seen as *determining* everything else in the superstructure, including social, political and intellectual consciousness. Theories positing economic relations as the basic cause of social phenomena are also called *materialist* theories, and Marx's version is also known as '*historical materialism*'.

Mass media research in this fundamentalist tradition interprets the 'culture industries' in terms of their economic determination. According to this view, 'the contents of the media and the meanings carried by their messages are... primarily

determined by the economic base of the organizations in which they are produced' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 18). Consequently, 'commercial media organizations must cater to the needs of advertisers and produce audience-maximizing products (hence the heavy doses of sex-and-violence content) while those media institutions whose revenues are controlled by the dominant political institutions or by the state gravitate towards a middle ground, or towards the heartland of the prevailing consensus' (*ibid.*). Marxists of the 'political economy' variety (such as Graham Murdock) still see ideology as subordinate to the economic base. The base/superstructure model as applied to the mass media is associated with a concern with the *ownership* and *control* of the media.

Critics regard economism as reductionist, failing to account for diversity. Althusserian Marxists propose 'the relative autonomy of the superstructure with respect to the base... [and] the reciprocal action of the superstructure on the base' (Althusser, cited in Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 5; *my emphasis*). According to this view ideological practices such as the mass media are relatively autonomous from economic determination (see Stevenson 1995: 15-16). The notion of 'relative autonomy' has been subject to criticism (e.g. by Paul Hirst in 1977: see Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 13-14; Curran *et al.* 1982: 25).

Under the influence of Althusser, Stuart Hall and other 'culturalist' Marxists reject the base/superstructure formulation, arguing that there is a dialectic between what Marx termed 'social being' and 'social consciousness' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 27).

Media as means of production

The mass media are, in classical Marxist terms, a 'means of production' which in capitalist society are in the ownership of the ruling class. According to the classical Marxist position, the mass media simply disseminate the ideas and world views of the ruling class, and deny or defuse alternative ideas. This is very much in accord with Marx's argument that:

> The class which has the means of material production at its disposal has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. (Marx & Engels: *The German Ideology*, cited in Curran *et al.* 1982: 22).

According to this stance, the mass media functioned to produce 'false consciousness' in the working-classes. This leads to an extreme stance whereby media products are seen as monolithic expressions of ruling class values, which ignores any diversity of values within the ruling class and within the media, and the possibility of oppositional readings by media audiences.

Ideology

A central feature of Marxist theory is the '*materialist*' stance that *social being determines consciousness*. According to this stance, ideological positions are a function of class positions, and the dominant ideology in society is the ideology of its dominant class. This is in contrast to the '*idealist*' stance that grants priority to consciousness (as in Hegelian philosophy). Marxists differ with regard to this issue: some interpret the relationship between social being and consciousness as one of direct determination; others stress a *dialectical* relationship.

In fundamentalist Marxism, ideology is '*false consciousness*', which results from the emulation of the dominant ideology by those whose interests it does not reflect. From this perspective the mass media disseminate the *dominant ideology*: the values of the class which owns and controls the media. According to adherents of Marxist political economy the mass media conceal the economic basis of class struggle; 'ideology becomes the route through which struggle is obliterated rather than the site of struggle' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 26).

Althusser rejected the notion of false consciousness, stressing that ideology is the medium through which we experience the world (Curran *et al.* 1982: 24). Althusserian Marxism stresses the irreducibility and *materiality* of ideology: i.e., ideology is seen as a determining force in its own right. The ideological operation of the mass media in the West contributes to the reproduction of the capitalist system.

Another Marxist theorist of ideology, Valentin Volosinov, has been influential in British cultural studies. Volosinov argued that a theory of ideology which grants the purely abstract concept of consciousness an existence prior to the material forms in which it is organized could only be metaphysical. Ideological forms are not the product of consciousness but rather *produce* it. As Tony Bennett notes: 'Rather than being regarded as the product of forms of consciousness whose contours are determined elsewhere, in the economic sphere, the signifying systems which constitute the sphere of ideology are themselves viewed as the vehicles through which the consciousness of social agents is produced' (Bennett 1982: 51).

Clearly, Marxist theorists agree that the mass media has ideological power, but disagree as to its nature.

Media as amplifiers

In Marxist media analysis, media institutions are regarded as being 'locked into the power structure, and consequently as acting largely in tandem with the dominant institutions in society. The media thus reproduced the viewpoints of dominant institutions not as one among a number of alternative perspectives, but as the central and "obvious" or "natural" perspective' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 21).

According to adherents of Marxist political economy, in the mass media there is a tendency to avoid the unpopular and unconventional and to draw on 'values and assumptions which are most valuable and most widely legitimated' (Murdock & Golding 1977: 37, cited in Curran *et al.* 1982: 26).

As Curran *et al.* note, most researchers in the Marxist tradition in Britain (such as Stuart Hall) have approached the issue of media portrayals of violence in terms of whether such portrayals have served 'to legitimize the forces of law and order, build consent for the extension of coercive state regulation and de-legitimate outsiders and dissidents'. 'They have thus examined the impact of the mass media in situations where mediated communications are powerfully supported by other institutions such as the police, judiciary and schools... The power of the media is thus portrayed as that of renewing, amplifying and extending the existing predispositions that constitute the dominant culture, not in creating them' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 14; see also *ibid.*: 27).

Similarly, 'some Marxist commentators have contended that media portrayals of elections constitute dramatized rituals that legitimate the power structure in liberal democracies; voting is seen as an ideological practice that helps to sustain the myth of representative democracy, political equality and collective self-determination. The impact of election coverage is thus conceived in terms of reinforcing political values that are widely shared in Western democracies and are actively endorsed by the education system, the principal political organizations and the apparatus of the state' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 15).

The constitution of the subject

Marxist theorists make a particular kind of distinction between *subject* and *object*. Tony Bennett notes that the historical dialectic involves a mutually interactive relationship between the subject (human agents) and the object (the conditions of their existence) (Bennett 1982: 42). Fiske distinguishes 'the subject' thus:
> The *individual* is produced by *nature*; the *subject* by *culture*. Theories of the individual concentrate on *differences* between people and explain these differences as *natural*. Theories of the subject, on the other hand, concentrate on people's *common experiences* in a society as being the most

productive way of explaining who (we think) we are... The subject... is a *social construction*, not a natural one. (Fiske 1992: 288; *my emphases*)

In Marxist thought, individuals are 'constituted' as the bearers of positions through the effects of social relations (Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 7). This is referred to as 'the constitution of the subject'.

Althusser rejected the humanist notion of the individual as a self-conscious, autonomous being whose actions could be explained in terms of personal beliefs, intentions, preferences and so on (Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 14-15). He introduced the concept of a mechanism of interpellation, whereby subjects are constituted as the effects of pre-given structures. Ideology functions to constitute individuals as subjects. Individuals are interpellated (have social identities conferred on them) primarily through 'ideological state apparatuses' (ISAs), including the family, schooling and the mass media. It is through ISAs that people gain both a sense of identity and an understanding of reality (Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 8).

The notion that the human subject is constituted by pre-given structures is a general feature of structuralism, according to which subjectivity is determined by structures such as language, family relations, cultural conventions and other social forces (Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 10-11).

Althusser's notion of interpellation allows Marxist media theorists to explain the political function of mass media texts. 'As a pre-existing structure, the text interpellates the spectator, so constituting him or her as a subject' (Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 12). According to this view, the subject (viewer, listener, reader) is constituted by the text, and the power of the mass media resided in their ability to 'position' the subject in such a way that their representations were taken to be reflections of everyday reality.

Althusserian Marxism did not allow for the possibility of individuals resisting the process of interpellation, whereas ISAs are not invariably and completely successful; the subject can be agent as well as effect. Althusserian media theorists tended to see the text as the sole determinant of the subject's response (Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 15). They also treated the subject as 'unified', whereas subsequent Marxist theories have posited 'a contradictory, de-centred subject displaced across the range of discourses in which he or she participates' (Curran *et al*. 1982: 25).

Whilst Herbert Marcuse's (1972) portrayal of the power of the mass media tended to cast audiences as passive victims, neo-Marxist stances have typically come to grant more active roles to audiences. As Curran *et al*. put it, whilst dominant meaning systems are seen as 'moulded and relayed' by the mass media, they are also seen as 'adapted by audiences and integrated into class-based or "situated" meaning systems' (Curran *et al*. 1982: 15).

Differences within Marxism

The different schools of thought within Marxist media theory are variously framed by commentators. Michael Gurevitch and his colleagues listed three 'contending paradigms': 'structuralist', 'political economy' and 'culturalist' (Gurevitch *et al.* 1982: 8). Althusserian Marxism is structuralist. Purely structuralist analysis focuses on 'the internal articulation of the signifying systems of the media' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 28).

In the Marxist fundamentalist tradition, 'political economists' see ideology as subordinate to the economic base (Curran *et al.* 1982: 26). Work by Graham Murdock (Murdock & Golding 1977; Murdock 1982) represents the 'critical' political economy approach, locating the power of media in the economic processes and structures of media production. Onwership and economic control of the media is seen as the key factor in determining control of media messages.

Work by Stuart Hall (e.g. Hall *et al.* 1978) represents the Marxist culturalist approach, which sees the mass media as a powerful (if secondary) influence in shaping public consciousness (Curran *et al.* 1982: 28). Culturalism follows Althusserian structuralism in rejecting economism, but unlike structuralism, it emphasizes the actual experience of sub-groups in society and contextualizes the media within a society which is seen as 'a complex expressive totality' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 27). The culturalist approach is reflected in the work of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham, of which Stuart Hall was once the director.

As Curran *et al.* put it, 'Marxist theorists vary in their accounts of the determination of the mass media and in their accounts of the nature and power of mass media ideologies' (Curran *et al.* 1982: 23).

The Frankfurt School

The Frankfurt School of 'critical theory' was regarded by orthodox Marxists as 'revisionist' partly because it criticised economism and crude materialism, and partly because of its eclecticism. In media theory it is important for offering the first Marxist attempt to theorize about the media (Gurevitch *et al.* 1982: 8). However, it provided no real way forward for the study of the mass media (Curran *et al.*1982: 23). The most notable theorists connected with the Frankfurt School were Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse and Max Horkheimer - all committed

Marxists - who were associated with the Institute for Social Research, which was founded in Frankfurt in 1923 but shifted in 1933 to New York.

The Frankfurt School was influenced by predominantly conservative notions of 'mass society', though it gave this perspective a leftist slant (Bennett 1982: 42). The so-called 'father of the New Left', Herbert Marcuse, in *One-Dimensional Man* (1972), presented the media very pessimistically as an irresistible force:

> The means of... communication..., the irresistible output of the entertainment and information industry carry with them prescribed attitudes and habits, certain intellectual and emotional reactions which bind the consumers... to the producers and, through the latter to the whole [social system]. The products indoctrinate and manipulate; they promote a false consciousness which is immune against its falsehood... Thus emerges a pattern of *one-dimensional thought and behaviour*. (Marcuse, cited in Bennett 1982: 43).

For Marcuse, the mass media defined the terms in which we may think about the world (Bennett 1982: 44). The Frankfurt School in general was profoundly pessimistic about the mass media. As Janet Woollacott puts it, their work 'gives to the mass media and the culture industry a role of ideological dominance which destroys both bourgeois individualism and the revolutionary potential of the working class' (Woollacott 1982: 105).

Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer (1972, cited in Bennett 1982: 31) coined the phrase 'the culture industry', referring to the collective operations of the media. The Frankfurt School's focus on ideology helped to undermine economism, but it was criticized by other Marxists for elitism and for Hegelian idealism (Bennett 1982: 47).

Althusser

Louis Althusser (b. 1918) was a French Marxist philosopher who saw Marxism as a science. His work is in the *structuralist* tradition. One feature of Althusserian Marxism is a rejection of Marx's Hegelian *essentialism*. Essentialism is a reduction of things to a single principle or essence. Althusser rejected two kinds of Marxist essentialism: *economism* (economic determinism) and *humanism* (in which social developments were seen as expressive of a pre-given human nature). So Althusserian Marxism is anti-economist and anti-humanist. In rejecting economism he saw *ideology* as itself a determining force shaping consciousness, embodied in the material signifying practices of 'ideological state apparatuses', and enjoying 'relative autonomy'. Althusser's work represents a move away from a preoccupation with economic determination.

Ideology, for Althusser 'represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence' (cited in Stevenson 1995: 37). Ideology transforms human beings into subjects, leading them to see themselves as self-determining agents when they are in fact shaped by ideological processes.

Tony Bennett notes that since he represents all ideological forms as contributing to the reproduction of the existing system, Althusser comes 'dangerously close to functionalism', representing capitalist society as monolithic, and failing to allow for internal conflict (Bennett 1982: 53). Stuart Hall adds that in Althusser's theory it is difficult 'to discern how anything but the "dominant ideology" could ever be reproduced in discourse' (Hall 1982: 78). In Althusserian theory mass media texts 'interpellate the subject' whereas many current media theorists argue that the the subject projects meaning onto the media texts. For the notion of a 'struggle over meaning' one must turn to Volosinov and Gramsci. Althusser's influence has been held responsible by some critics for leading some of his followers into purely formalist readings of the signifying systems of mass media forms, neglecting their modes of production and reception. However, Althusser is 'the central conduit through which developments in structuralism and semiotics have both entered into and lastingly altered Marxist approaches to the media' (Bennett 1982: 53).

For useful general accounts of Althusserian Marxism see: Lapsley & Westlake 1988: 3-16; Gurevitch *et al.* 1982: 23-5; Bennett 1982: 51-3; White 1992: 168-9; Fiske 1992: 286-88.

Gramsci and hegemony

Antonio Gramsci, an Italian (1891-1937), was a leading Marxist thinker. Like Althusser, he rejected economism, insisting on the independence of ideology from economic determinism. Gramsci also rejected crude materialism, offering a humanist version of Marxism which focused on human subjectivity.

Gramsci used the term *hegemony* to denote the predominance of one social class over others (e.g. *bourgeois hegemony*). This represents not only political and economic control, but also the ability of the dominant class to project its own way of seeing the world so that those who are subordinated by it accept it as 'common sense' and 'natural'. Commentators stress that this involves willing and active consent. Common sense, suggests Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, is 'the way a subordinate class lives its subordination' (cited in Alvarado & Boyd-Barrett 1992: 51).

However, unlike Althusser, Gramsci emphasizes *struggle*. He noted that 'common sense is not something rigid and immobile, but is continually transforming

itself' (Gramsci, cited in Hall 1982: 73). As Fiske puts it, 'Consent must be constantly won and rewon, for people's material social experience constantly reminds them of the disadvantages of subordination and thus poses a threat to the dominant class... Hegemony... posits a constant contradiction between ideology and the social experience of the subordinate that makes this interface into an inevitable site of ideological struggle' (Fiske 1992: 291). References to the mass media in terms of an ideological '*site of struggle*' are recurrent in the commentaries of those influenced by this perspective. Gramsci's stance involved a rejection of economism since it saw a struggle for ideological hegemony as a primary factor in radical change.

Criticisms of Althusser's theory of ideology drew some neo-Marxists to Gramsci's ideas.

Stuart Hall

Stuart Hall, now Professor of Sociology at the Open University, was a major figure in the revival of the British political Left in the 1960s and '70s. Following Althusser, he argues that the media appear to reflect reality whilst in fact they construct it.

Janet Woollacott (1982: 108-110) offers a useful critique of *Policing the Crisis*, a key work by Stuart Hall *et al.*(1978). The work reflects an analysis of the signifying practices of the mass media from the perspective of Marxist culturalist theory inflected through Gramsci's theory of hegemony, and 'an Althusserian conception of the media as an ideological state apparatus largely concerned with the reproduction of dominant ideologies', claiming relative autonomy for the mass media (Woollacott 1982: 110). For Hall *et al.* the mass media do tend to reproduce interpretations which serve the interests of the ruling class, but they are also 'a field of ideological struggle'. The media signification system is seen as relatively autonomous. 'The news' performs a crucial role in defining events, although this is seen as *secondary* to the *primary definers*: accredited sources in government and other institutions. The media also serve 'to reinforce a consensual viewpoint by using public idioms and by claiming to voice public opinion' (Woollacott 1982: 109).

Stuart Hall has also addressed theoretically the issue of how people make sense of media texts. He parts from Althusser in emphasizing more scope for diversity of response to media texts. In a key paper, 'Encoding/Decoding', Stuart Hall (1980), argued that the dominant ideology is typically inscribed as the '*preferred reading*' in a media text, but that this is not automatically adopted by readers. The *social situations* of readers/viewers/listeners may lead them to adopt different stances.

'*Dominant*' readings are produced by those whose social situation favours the preferred reading; '*negotiated*' readings are produced by those who inflect the preferred reading to take account of their social position; and '*oppositional*' readings are produced by those whose social position puts them into direct conflict with the preferred reading (see Fiske 1992 for a summary and Fiske's own examples, and Stevenson 1995: pp 41-2). Hall insists that there remain limits to interpretation: meaning cannot be simply 'private' and 'individual' (Hall 1980: 135).

Hall's emphasis on ideology has been criticized for being at the expense of the importance of ownership and control (Stevenson 1995: 35).

Limitations of Marxist analysis

Critics argue that Marxism is just another ideology (despite claims by some that *historical materialism* is an objective science). Some Marxists are accused of being 'too doctrinaire' (see Berger 1982). Fundamentalist Marxism is crudely deterministic, and also reductionist in its 'materialism', allowing little scope for human agency and subjectivity. Marxism is often seen as 'grand theory', eschewing empirical research. However, research in the Marxist 'political economy' tradition in particular does employ empirical methods. And the analysis of media representations does include close studies of particular texts.

The orthodox Marxist notion of 'false consciousness' misleadingly suggests the existence of a reality 'undistorted' by mediation. The associated notion that such consciousness is irresistibly induced in mass audiences does not allow for oppositional readings. Marxist perpectives should not lead us to ignore the various ways in which audiences use the mass media.

Neo-Marxist stances have in fact sought to avoid these pitfalls. The primary Marxist emphasis on class needs to be (and had increasingly been) related to other divisions, such as gender and ethnicity.

Strengths of Marxist analysis

Unlike many approaches to the mass media Marxism acknowledges the importance of explicit theory. Marxist 'critical theory' exposes the myth of 'value-free' social science. Marxist perspectives draw our attention to the issue of political and economic interests in the mass media and highlight social inequalities in media representations. Marxism helps to situate media texts within the larger social

formation. Its focus on the nature of ideology helps us to deconstruct taken-for-granted values. Ideological analysis helps us to expose *whose* reality we are being offered in a media text. Whilst Althusserian Marxism helps to undermine the myth of the autonomous individual, other neo-Marxist stances see the mass media as a 'site of struggle' for ideological meaning, opening up the possibility of oppositional readings.

Marxist theory emphasizes the importance of social class in relation to both media ownership and audience interpretation of media texts: this remains an important factor in media analysis. Whilst content analysis and semiotics may shed light on media content, marxist theory highlights the material conditions of media production and reception. 'Critical political economists' study the ownership and control of the media and the influence of media ownership on media content cannot be ignored. It also remains important to consider such issues as differential access and modes of interpretation which are shaped by socio-economic groupings. Marxist media research includes the analysis of representation in the mass media (e.g. political coverage or social groups) in order to reveal underlying ideologies. We still need such analyses: however oppositional it may sometimes be, audience interpretation continues to operate *in relation to* such content. Because of the distribution of power in society, some versions of reality have more influence than others.

References

- Allen, Robert C. (Ed.) (1992): *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled.* London: Routledge
- Althusser, Louis (1971): 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses'. In *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays.* London: New Left Books
- Alvarado, Manuel & Oliver Boyd-Barrett (Eds.): *Media Education: An Introduction.* London: BFI/Open University
- Bennett, Tony (1982): 'Theories of the media, theories of society'. In Gurevitch et al. (Eds.), op. cit.
- Berger, Arthur Asa (1982): *Media Analysis Techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage (Chapter 2, 'Marxist Analysis') [easy, but largely too easy]
- Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (1992): 'The Social Science Tradition'. In Alvarado & Boyd-
- Barrett (Eds.), op. cit. [section from pp. 174ff]
- Curran, James, Michael Gurevitch & Janet Woollacott (1982): 'The study of the media: theoretical approaches'. In Gurevitch *et al.* (Eds.), op. cit. [very useful]

- Fiske, John (1992): 'British Cultural Studies and Television'. In Allen (Ed.), op. cit. [includes summary of Hall's account of 'preferred readings' and alternative reading strategies: pp 292-3]
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* London: Lawrence & Wishart
- Gurevitch, Michael, Tony Bennett, James Curran & Janet Woollacott (Ed.) (1982): *Culture, Society and the Media.* London: Methuen (Part 1, 'Class, Ideology and the Media')
- Hall, Stuart (1980): 'Encoding/decoding'. In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (Ed.): *Culture, Media, Language.* London: Hutchinson [important paper, though not initially an easy read]
- Hall, Stuart (1982): 'The rediscovery of "ideology": return of the repressed in media studies'. In Gurevitch *et al.* (Eds.), op. cit. [a key article by Hall]
- Hall, Stuart, C. Critcher, T. Jefferson, J. Clarke & B. Roberts (1978): *Policing the Crisis.* London: Macmillan
- Lapsley, Robert & Michael Westlake (1988): *Film Theory: An Introduction.* Manchester: Manchester University Press (Chapter 1, 'Politics': pages 1-17 offer a very useful account of Althusserian Marxism)
- Marcuse, Herbert (1972): *One-Dimensional Man.* London: Abacus [not for the faint-hearted]
- McQuail, Denis (1987): *Mass Communication Theory.* London: Sage (Chapter 3, 'Theory of Media and Theory of Society'; Chapter 4, 'Media Theory Applied: Power, Integration and Change')
- Murdock, Graham (1982): 'Large Corporations and the Control of the Communications Industries'. In Gurevitch *et al.* (Eds.), op. cit.
- Murdock, Graham and Peter Golding (1977): 'Capitalism, communication and class relations'. In James Curran, Michael Gurevitch & Janet Woollacott (Eds.): *Mass Communication and Society.* London: Arnold
- Stevenson, Nick (1995): *Understanding Media Cultures: Social Theory and Mass Communication*. London: Sage (Chapter 1: 'Marxism and Mass Communication Research')
- Strinati, Dominic (1995): *An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*. London: Routledge (Chapter 4: 'Marxism, Political Economy and Ideology', pp. 127-76)
- White, Mimi (1992): 'Ideological Analysis and Television'. In Allen (Ed.), op. cit. [useful overview pp. 163-170,with good bibliography]
- Woollacott, Janet (1982): 'Messages and Meanings'. In Gurevitch *et al.* (Eds.), op. cit. [Useful review of Hall *et al.* 1978]

[See also general reference works on mass media, politics and sociology]

Daniel Chandler