

to intentional planning, rather than that something ,exotic' still exists" (Adorno 1974: 83). The most important aspect, according to Herbert Marcuse, is culture becoming an agent of administration through its commodification. With the economic realm of society becoming less individualistic and laissez-faire but more governable, the same is to happen with culture. Culture becomes an object of marketing, just as other consumer goods (Greisman & Ritzer 1981: 39-40). While for Max Weber the escape of a total domination of the rational was to be found in capitalism, for Critical theory, just as in Graeber's writing, capitalism is portrayed as the catalyst. The loss of culture to rationalization is specifically tragic for Marcuse and his colleagues, as the feature of constituting a possible realm of escape had been designated to culture (ibid. 40-41). After the fall of culture, Marcuse describes a

„state of unfreedom because its total administration is systematic restriction of (a) ,technically' available free time; (b) the quantity and quality of goods and services ,technically' available for vital individual needs; (c) the intelligence (conscious and unconscious) capable of comprehending and realizing the possibilities of self-determination" (Marcuse 1964:49).

Culture playing such a prominent role in the critique of bureaucracy from a Critical Theory perspective, ' Greisman and Ritzer (1981: 45-46) take this as an opportunity to examine possible counter-cultures. They identify a renaissance of spiritual quest in the rise of the 1960s counterculture incorporating movements such as Buddhism, Yoga, Satanism and psychedelic drugs. Confirming the worries of critical theorists' though, they also portray the commercialization and bureaucratization of that counterculture: