

- LACLAU, Ernesto/MOUFFE, Chantal (1985/2001): *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London, New York: Verso.
- O'BRIEN, Dave/OAKLEY, Kate (2017): *Cultural Policy*. London, New York: Routledge.
- TRÖNDLE, Martin/STEIGERWALD, Claudia (2019): *Anthologie Kulturpolitik: Einführende Beiträge zu Geschichte, Funktionen und Diskursen der Kulturpolitikforschung*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- WASHINGTON POST (2021): *The unfinished business of the Arab Spring*, <www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2021/arab-spring-10-year-anniversary-lost-decade/> [25.10.2021].

Weitere Rezensionen / further Reviews

ORIAN BROOK, DAVE O'BRIEN, AND MARK TAYLOR: *Culture is Bad for You*. Manchester: Manchester University Press 2020, 361pp.

Culture is Bad for You is a timely monograph, foregrounding ongoing inequalities in UK culture that are perpetuated through cultural production and consumption in its creative industries. Authors Orian Brook, Dave O'Brien, and Mark Taylor challenge dominant 'good news' narratives from successive UK governments that culture is *good* for us. Culture, we are told, is *bad* for us. As producers or consumers of culture we are complicit in perpetuating inequality, because inequalities in culture are inseparable from inequalities in society; which is not just *bad* for us, it's *bad* for everyone.

The authors combine rigorous qualitative and quantitative methodologies with research interests, including social mobility (Brook), intersectional approaches to class and culture (O'Brien), and cultural consumption related to race, gender, and class (Taylor). As the third phase of joint investigations into inequalities in cultural occupations, the book builds on previous studies, including *Panic! Social Class, Taste and Inequalities in the Creative Industries* (2018), which analysed survey data from 2,487 key cultural workers carried out in 2015 to better understand social mobility in the UK arts sector.

The results present how cultural occupations and culture itself are gatekeepers of class destinations, and how deep-rooted inequalities for working classes, people of colour, and women are maintained through them. Myths of meritocracy and a 'golden age' of social mobility are debunked, corroborating current debates situating its decline. Instead, this thinking is transposed as responsible for marginalisation, constricting

mobility, and heightening the UK cultural sector's resistance to change. The authors deliberately depose positively held views of UK culture, embedding their alternative message that UK culture has an inequality problem, its culture sector remains exclusive, and these issues have not been solved through policy. The issues raised are of public concern, opening up cultural policy considerations around diversity, inclusion, and the pervasiveness of talent as underlying success, and questioning the myths that underlie this thinking. Researchers of inequality/exclusion in the cultural sector, of creative labour, postracism, postfeminism, and the UK class system will be particularly interested in these findings.

However, there is a sense that we already know about these inequalities; that nothing has really changed since social inclusion and diversity became cultural policy priorities under New Labour in the 2000s. Yet, the meticulous detail given in this book, of the endemic inequalities experienced in the UK cultural industries offers a sharp reminder, and is its *modus operandi*. Finegrained analysis of bigdatasets, including UK Census (2011) and the Office for National Statistics Labour Force Survey (ONS 2019), reveal the extent to which people of colour, women, and working classes are (still) missing as producers and consumers of culture. Findings from 237 interviews with cultural workers reason that inequalities (still) stem from disproportionate heritable cultural capital. Crucially, those with these 'privileges' are shown to benefit from a *feeling of at homeness* in cultural work, which (still) elicits social closure, excluding those who don't know the rules.

Perhaps the most revealing knowledge gained from the book stems from interviews with senior male cultural workers, which highlight the greatest obstacle to accessing and staying in cultural work; the white middle-class male, termed the 'somatic norm' (developed from PUWAR 2001). While women, particularly those who become mothers, elaborate on the specific barriers this poses including feeling inhibited and compromised in its presence, it is the male cultural workers who illuminate how this barrier is maintained. Findings show they see their success as effortless, attributing it to luck and a gentlemanly attitude, consistently downplaying structures and meritocratic myths, and ensuring their dominance. These heedless attitudes frustrate the authors, reasoning the lethargic pace of change through rendering inequality 'unspeakable,' displacing anti-racism and anti-sexism campaigns, and entrenching the myth of inclusivity discussed in wider debate (GILL 2011). An all too familiar discourse ensues, underpinned by neoliberalism's quest for individualisation, that in order to escape

this, the onus falls onto insufficiently equipped individuals to navigate and carry the burden of these structural problems.

It is possible to consider the inequalities discussed in *Culture is Bad for You* as mere reflections of societal issues that are independent of them. However, the authors refute this thinking, reframing visions of culture as having absolved itself of inequalities, and placing culture firmly at the centre of the problem. It is repeatedly stated, that while culture is a reflection of an unequal society, *inequality is produced, reproduced, and maintained through it*. The culture we have is a far cry from a post-racial, postfeminist society, and a long way from its 'civilising' intentions noted at the beginning of the book. Overarchingly, it raises awareness and challenges inequality in cultural occupations. It is a difficult, emotional, and (openly) pessimistic read. However, I believe it is an essential read too, furthering urgent debate in this area by continuing to make inequality visible.

There are also some missing elements to the book, especially intersections of disability and sexuality. While this lack is noted, a study which includes these groups would highlight further interconnections of unequal grounds. Deeper discussions on identity and taste as influential factors, the intermediate and precariat classes, and a discursive lens could have expanded the debates this book draws out. As well, a puzzling omission, is acknowledgement of the authors' whiteness, that two are male and one female, and we don't hear about their class origins. More reflection on this would help underpin a contextual framework to the study, perhaps reasoning aspects of inquiry/oversight too.

Nonetheless, recommendations to tackle issues raised give glimmers of hope to an otherwise bleak outlook. The authors advocate a combined approach, of individual awareness, where audiences and artists demand radical change, alongside forceful policy/action, where governments implement tough labour regulations. Though some of these solutions exacerbate individual burden, through these, inequalities in culture, and therefore society, might finally be addressed. *Culture is Bad for You* goes to the heart of the exclusions and inequities experienced in the cultural industries for workingclasses, women, and people of colour. Speaking from two of these angles, the book is deeply relatable, leaving me with a sense of personal understanding and vulnerability. Yet, there is optimism in the book's exposure of UK culture's problem with inequality, which could ultimately promote positive change in levelling the playing field.

References

- BROOK, Orian, O'BRIEN, Dave/TAYLOR, Mark (2018): *Panic! Social Class, Taste and Inequalities in the Creative Industries* <<https://createlondon.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Panic-Social-Class-Taste-and-Inequalities-in-the-Creative-Industries1.pdf>> [25.10.2021].
- GILL, Rosalind (2011): Sexism Reloaded, or, It's Time to Get Angry Again! – In: *Feminist Media Studies*, 11(1), 61–71 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2011.537029>> [25.10.2021].
- OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS (ONS) (2011): *UK Census 2011* <<https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census/2011censusdata/2011censususerguide>> [25.10.2021].
- OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS (ONS) (2019): *Labour Force Survey: User Guidance* <www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/methodologies/labourforcesurveyuserguidance> [25.10.2021].
- PUWAR, Nirmal (2001): The Racialised Somatic Norm and the Senior Civil Service. – In: *British Sociological Association* 35(3) 651–670 <<https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038501000335>> [25.10.2021].

*Sarah Scarsbrook**

PETER TSCHMUCK: Einführung in die Kulturbetriebslehre. Springer VS. Wiesbaden 2020, 160 Seiten.

Peter Tschmuck unternimmt in seiner *Einführung in die Kulturbetriebslehre* eine umfassende Aufarbeitung einschlägiger theoretischer Positionen, auch international, zum Wechselverhältnis von Kultur, Organisation und Ökonomie. Daraus formuliert er eine eigene Aufgabenbeschreibung und Definition der Wissenschaftsdisziplin der Kulturbetriebslehre (basierend u.a. auf einer ersten Monografie zum Thema von Tasos Zembylas von 2004).

Der Autor ist Professor am Institut für Kulturmanagement und Gender Studies der Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Wien mit dem Forschungsschwerpunkt Musikwirtschaftsforschung und der dezidierten Venia in seiner Habilitation für das Fach der „Kulturbetriebslehre“. Dieses weiter zu konturieren, theoretische und methodologische Grundlagen zu vertiefen ist Ziel seiner Arbeit als Lehrender und Ziel seiner im Springer-VS-Verlag erschienenen Publikation.

Kulturmanagement ist für Tschmuck ein Teilbereich der Kulturbetriebslehre. In der Gründungsphase des Fachverbands für Kulturmanagement gab es kontroverse Diskurse zur Frage, inwiefern Kulturmanagement und die damit verbundene Forschung und Lehre sich der allgemeinen Betriebswirtschaftslehre subsumieren lässt oder inwiefern das Feld Kunst und Kultur auf ganz eigenen Regeln basiert und ent-

* Email: sarahscarsbrook@hotmail.com