Visiting architectural monuments and heritage sites is a leisure time activity for most people. But what entices someone to go visit say a house museum instead of spending his or her time in a movie theater? Heritage site managers, like it or not, must compete against companies that are also vying to capture audiences, or cultural consumers if you will. After WWII, perhaps because of the increased share of leisure time that television took, preservationists began to realize that it was not enough to physically conserve monuments; it was also necessary to bring monuments to the public’s awareness, to package and market them as something (e.g. unique experiences, unforgettable destinations) that could be consumed as entertainment. Early examples of this trend included *son-et-lumière* spectacles, begun in 1952 by curator Paul Robert-Houdin at the Château de Chambord in France, then quickly adopted at sites all over the world including the Pyramids of Giza (1961), Independence Hall in Philadelphia (1962), and the Red Fort in Delhi (1965). Attracting visitors became essential to making preservation possible, not so much because of ticket sales, which were never enough to cover the real costs of preservation, but because the governmental and non-profit institutions that funded the majority of costs, used visitation numbers as an open or tacit criterion for awarding grants. These public and private funding bodies shielded preservation to some extent from the verdict of supply and demand, while at the same time constantly pushing preservation to become more financially independent by inventing new ways to turn monuments into cultural commodities. Max Horkheimer (1875-1973) and Theodor W. Adorno (1903-1969) offered one of the earliest and most influential theoretical analyses of this paradoxical condition of cultural products in late capitalism, as being both exempted from and subjected to the laws of commerce. The transformation of culture into a commodity, they argued, changed its social function from a means to help people become free thinking individuals into a way of controlling their minds. As neo-Marxist sociologists, Horkheimer and Adorno argued that the culture industry (music, literature, radio, film, design, architecture, etc.) had turned culture, one of the main elements in the Kantian project of individual enlightenment, into mass deception. “Kant’s formalism,” they wrote, “still expected a contribution from the individual, who was thought to relate the varied experiences of the senses to fundamental concepts; but industry robs the individual of this function. Its prime service to the customer is to do his schematizing for him.” Max Horkheimer became professor of Social Philosophy at the Goethe University in Frankfurt in 1930, and also director of the Institute for Social Research, a separate Marxist research organization. His younger colleague at Goethe University, Theodor W. Adorno also joined the Institute. After the rise of the Nazis, Horkheimer was dismissed from his posts as a Jew. He and Adorno went into exile in the United States, and relocated the institute to New York City, where it became a center of Marxist social and cultural thought that came to be known as the Frankfurt School. Horkheimer and Adorno wrote the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947) while in exile, and returned to their respective professorships in Frankfurt professorship in 1949. Subsequently, the institute returned there as well. Horkheimer retired in 1958, and Adorno went on to become a public figure with writings and appearances in the mass media on cultural, musical and social subjects; in the 1960s, leftist student radicals attacked him for keeping a distance from their political goals. Adorno published his major work on epistemology, *Negative Dialectics*, in 1966, and his *Aesthetic Theory* was published posthumously in 1970.
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