

As indispensable embellishment of currently produced objects, as general articulation of the system's rationales, and as advanced economic sector that directly creates an ever-increasing mass of image-objects, the spectacle is the leading production of present-day society.

What is economic power? It is the power to produce and to trade what one has produced. In a free economy, where no man or group of men can use physical coercion against anyone, economic power can be achieved only by voluntary means: by the voluntary choice and agreement of all those who participate in the process of production and trade. In a freemarket, all prices, wages, and profits are determined— not by the arbitrary whim of the rich or of the poor, not by anyone's "greed" or by anyone's need—but by the law of supply and demand. The mechanism of a free market reflects and sums up all the economic choices and decisions made by all the participants. Men trade their goods or services by mutual consent to mutual advantage, according to their own independent, uncoerced judgment. A man can grow rich only if he is able to offer better values—better products or services, at a lower price—than others are able to offer.

The spectacle is able to subject human beings to itself because the economy has already totally subjugated them. It is nothing other than the economy developing for itself. It is at once a faithful reflection of the production of things and a distorting objectification of the producers.

It was claimed then—as it is still claimed today—that business, if left free, would necessarily develop into an institution vested with arbitrary power. Is this assertion valid? Did the post-Civil War period give birth to a new form of arbitrary power? Or did the government remain the source of such power, with business merely providing a new avenue through which it could be exercised? This is the crucial historical question.

The fact that the practical power of modern society has detached itself from that society and established an independent realm in the spectacle can be explained only by the additional fact that that powerful practice continued to lack cohesion and had remained in contradiction with itself.

The western railroads were true monopolies in the textbook sense of the word. They could, and did, behave with an aura of arbitrary power. But that power was not derived from a free market. It stemmed from governmental subsidies and governmental restrictions.

The alienation of the spectator, which reinforces the contemplated objects that result from his own unconscious activity, works like this: The more he contemplates, the less he lives; the more he identifies with the dominant images of need, the less he understands his own life and his own desires. The spectacle's estrangement from the acting subject is expressed by the fact that the individual's gestures are no longer his own; they are the gestures of someone else who represents them to him. The spectator does not feel at home anywhere, because the spectacle is everywhere.

The problem of alienation and the problem of personal identity are inseparable. The man who lacks a firm sense of personal identity feels alienated; the man who feels alienated lacks a firm sense of personal identity.

Workers do not produce themselves, they produce a power independent of themselves. The success of this production, the abundance it generates, is experienced by the producers as an abundance of dispossession. As their alienated products accumulate, all time and space become foreign to them. The spectacle is the map of this new world, a map that is identical to the territory it represents. The forces that have escaped us display themselves to us in all their power.

Thus, he displaces his sense of self downward, so to speak, from his reason, which is the active, initiating element in man, to his emotions, which are the passive, reactive element. Moved by feelings whose source he does not understand, and by contradictions whose existence he does not acknowledge, he suffers a progressive sense of self-estrangement, of self-alienation. A man's emotions are the product of his premises and values, of the thinking he has done or has failed to do. But the man who is run by his emotions, attempting to make them a substitute for rational judgment, experiences them as alien forces. The paradox of his position is this: his emotions become his only source of personal identity, but his experience of identity becomes: a being ruled by demons.

Though separated from what they produce, people nevertheless produce every detail of their world with ever-increasing power. They thus also find themselves increasingly separated from that world. The closer their life comes to being their own creation, the more they are excluded from that life.

But why? What is the problem of alienation? What is personal identity? Why should so many men experience the task of achieving it as a dreaded burden? And what is the significance of the attacks on capitalism in connection with this issue?

It reveals itself for what it is: an autonomously developing separate power, based on the increasing productivity resulting from an increasingly refined division of labor into parcelized gestures dictated by the independent movement of machines, and working for an ever-expanding market.

Capitalism, a term used to denote the economic system that has been dominant in the western world since the breakup of feudalism. Fundamental to any system called capitalist are the relations between private owners of nonpersonal means of production (land, mines, industrial plants, etc, collectively known as capital) and free but capitalless workers, who sell their labourservices to employers. . . The resulting wage bargains determine the proportion in which the total product of society will be shared between the class of labourers and the class of capitalist entrepreneurs.

As indispensable embellishment of currently produced objects, as general articulation of the system's rationales, and as advanced economic sector that directly creates an ever-increasing mass of image-objects, the spectacle is the leading production of present-day society.

What is economic power? It is the power to produce and to trade what one as produced. In a free economy, where no man or group of men can use physical coercion against anyone, economic power can be achieved only by voluntary means: by the voluntary choice and agreement of all those who participate in the process of production and trade. In a free market, all prices, wages, and profits are determined — not by the arbitrary whim of the rich or of the poor, not by anyone's "greed" or by anyone's need—but by the law of supply and demand. The mechanism of a free market reflects and sums up all the economic choices and decisions made by all the participants. Men trade their goods or services by mutual consent to mutual advantage, according to their own independent, uncoerced judgment. A man can grow rich only if he is able to offer better values—better products or services, at a lower price—than others are able to offer.

The spectacle is able to subject human beings to itself because the economy has already totally subjugated them. It is nothing other than the economy developing for itself. It is at once a faithful reflection of the production of things and a distorting objectification of the producers.

It was claimed then—as it is still claimed today—that business, if left free, would necessarily develop into an institution vested with arbitrary power. This assertion valid? Did the post-Civil War period give birth to a new form of arbitrary power? Or did the government remain the source of such power, with business merely providing a new avenue through which it could be exercised? This is the crucial historical question.

The fact that the practical power of modern society has detached itself from that society and established an independent realm in the spectacle can be explained only by the additional fact that that powerful practice continued to lack cohesion and had remained in contradiction with itself.

The western railroads were true monopolies in the textbook sense of the word. They could, and did, behave with an aura of arbitrary power. But that power was not derived from a free market. It stemmed from governmental subsidies and governmental restrictions.

The alienation of the spectator, which reinforces the contemplated objects that result from his own unconscious activity, works like this: The more he contemplates, the less he lives; the more he identifies with the dominant images of need, the less he understands his own life and his own desires. The spectacle's estrangement from the acting subject is expressed by the fact that the individual's gestures are no longer his own; they are the gestures of someone else who represents them to him. The spectator does not feel at home anywhere, because the spectacle is everywhere.

The problem of alienation and the problem of personal identity are inseparable. The man who lacks a firm sense of personal identity feels alienated; the man who feels alienated lacks a firm sense of personal identity.

Workers do not produce themselves, they produce a power independent of themselves. The success of this production, the abundance it generates, is experienced by the producers as an abundance of dispossession. As their alienated products accumulate, all time and space become foreign to them. The spectacle is the map of this new world, a map that is identical to the territory it represents. The forces that have escaped us display themselves to us in all their power.

Thus, he displaces his sense of self downward, so to speak, from his reason, which is the active, initiating element in man, to his emotions, which are the passive, reactive element. Moved by feelings whose source he does not understand, and by contradictions whose existence he does not acknowledge, he suffers a progressive sense of self-estrangement, of self-alienation. A man's emotions are the product of his premises and values, of the thinking he has done or has failed to do. But the man who is run by his emotions, attempting to make them a substitute for rational judgment, experiences them as alien forces. The paradox of his position is this: his emotions become his only source of personal identity, but his experience of identity becomes: a being ruled by demons.

Though separated from what they produce, people nevertheless produce every detail of their world with ever-increasing power. They thus also find themselves increasingly separated from that world. The closer their life comes to being their own creation, the more they are excluded from that life.

But why? What is the problem of alienation? What is personal identity? Why should so many men experience the task of achieving it as a dreaded burden? And what is the significance of the attacks on capitalism in connection with this issue?

Capitalism, a term used to denote the economic system that has been dominant in the western world since the break up of feudalism. Fundamental to any system called capitalist are the relations between private owners of nonpersonal means of production (land, mines, industrial plants, etc, collectively known as capital) and free but capitalless workers who sell their labour services to employers. . . . The resulting wage parings determine the proportion in which the total product of society will be shared between the class of labourers and the class of capitalist entrepreneurs.

It reveals itself for what it is: an autonomously developing separate power, based on the increasing productivity resulting from an increasingly refined division of labor into parcelized segments dictated by the independent movement of machines, and working for an ever-expanding market.



The fact that the practical power of modern society has detached itself from that society and established an independent realm in the spectacle can be explained only by the additional fact that that powerful practice continued to lack cohesion and had remained in contradiction with itself.

What is economic power? It is the power to produce and to trade what one as produced. In a free economy, where no man or group of men can use physical coercion against anyone, economic power can be achieved only by voluntary means: by the voluntary choice and agreement of all those who participate in the process of production and trade. In a freemarket, all prices, wages, and profits are determined— not by the arbitrary whim of the rich or of the poor, not by anyone’s “greed” or by anyone’s need—but by the law of supply and demand. The mechanism of a free market reflects and sums up all the economic choices and decisions made by all the participants. Men trade their goods or services by mutual consent to mutual advantage, according to their own independent, uncoerced judgment. A man can grow rich only if he is able to offer better values—better products or services, at a lower price—than others are able to offer.

As indispensable embellishment of currently produced objects, as general articulation of the system’s rationales, and as advanced economic sector that directly creates an ever-increasing mass of image-objects, the spectacle is the leading production of present-day society.

It was claimed then—as it is still claimed today—that business, if left free, would necessarily develop into an institution vested with arbitrary power. Is this assertion valid? Did the post-Civil War period give birth to a new form of arbitrary power? Or did the government remain the source of such power, with business merely providing a new avenue through which it could be exercised? This is the crucial historical question.

The spectacle is able to subject human beings to itself because the economy has already totally subjugated them. It is nothing other than the economy developing for itself. It is at once a faithful reflection of the production of things and a distorting objectification of the producers.

The western railroads were true monopolies in the textbook sense of the word. They could, and did, behave with an aura of arbitrary power. But that power was not derived from a free market. It stemmed from governmental subsidies and governmental restrictions.

It reveals itself for what it is: an autonomously developing separate power, based on the increasing productivity resulting from an increasingly refined division of labor into parcelized gestures dictated by the independent movement of machines, and working for an ever-expanding market.

The problem of alienation and the problem of personal identity are inseparable. The man who lacks a firm sense of personal identity feels alienated; the man who feels alienated lacks a firm sense of personal identity.

Though separated from what they produce, people nevertheless produce every detail of their world with ever-increasing power. They thus also find themselves increasingly separated from that world. The closer their life comes to being their own creation, the more they are excluded from that life.

Thus, he displaces his sense of self downward, so to speak, from his reason, which is the active, initiating element in man, to his emotions, which are the passive, reactive element. Moved by feelings whose source he does not understand, and by contradictions whose existence he does not acknowledge, he suffers a progressive sense of self-estrangement, of self-alienation. A man's emotions are the product of his premises and values, of the thinking he has done or has failed to do. But the man who is run by his emotions, attempting to make them a substitute for rational judgment, experiences them as alien forces. The paradox of his position is this: his emotions become his only source of personal identity, but his experience of identity becomes: a being ruled by demons.

The alienation of the spectator, which reinforces the contemplated objects that result from his own unconscious activity, works like this: The more he contemplates, the less he lives; the more he identifies with the dominant images of need, the less he understands his own life and his own desires. The spectacle's estrangement from the acting subject is expressed by the fact that the individual's gestures are no longer his own; they are the gestures of someone else who represents them to him. The spectator does not feel at home anywhere, because the spectacle is everywhere.

But why? What is the problem of alienation? What is personal identity? Why should so many men experience the task of achieving it as a dreaded burden? And what is the significance of the attacks on capitalism in connection with this issue?

Workers do not produce themselves, they produce a power independent of themselves. The success of this production, the abundance it generates, is experienced by the producers as an abundance of dispossession. As their alienated products accumulate, all time and space become foreign to them. The spectacle is the map of this new world, a map that is identical to the territory it represents. The forces that have escaped us display themselves to us in all their power.

Capitalism, a term used to denote the economic system that has been dominant in the western world since the breakup of feudalism. Fundamental to any system called capitalist are the relations between private owners of nonpersonal means of production (land, mines, industrial plants, etc, collectively known as capital) and free but capitalless workers, who sell their labourservices to employers. . . . The resulting wage bargains determine the proportion in which the total product of society will be shared between the class of labourers and the class of capitalist entrepreneurs.

What is economic power? As indispensable embellishment of currently produced objects, as general articulation of the system's rationales, and as advanced economic sector that directly creates an ever-increasing mass of image-objects, the spectacle is the leading production of present-day society. It is the power to produce and to trade what one has produced. The spectacle is able to subject human beings to itself because the economy has already totally subjugated them. In a free economy, where no man or group of men can use physical coercion against anyone, economic power can be achieved only by voluntary means: by the voluntary choice and agreement of all those who participate in the process of production and trade. It is nothing other than the economy developing for itself. In a free-market, all prices, wages, and profits are determined — not by the arbitrary whim of the rich or of the poor, not by anyone's "greed" or by anyone's need — but by the law of supply and demand. It is at once a faithful reflection of the production of things and a distorting objectification of the producers. The mechanism of a free market reflects and sums up all the economic choices and decisions made by all the participants. The western railroads were true monopolies in the textbook sense of the word. Men trade their goods or services by mutual consent to mutual advantage, according to their own independent, uncoerced judgment. They could, and did, behave with an aura of arbitrary power. A man can grow rich only if he is able to offer better values — better products or services, at a lower price — than others are able to offer. But that power was not derived from a free market. It was claimed then — as it is still claimed today — that business, if left free, would necessarily develop into an institution vested with arbitrary power. It stemmed from governmental subsidies and governmental restrictions. **Is this assertion valid?** The alienation of the spectator, which reinforces the contemplated objects that result from his own unconscious activity, works like this: The more he contemplates, the less he lives; the more he identifies with the dominant images of need, the less he understands his own life and his own desires.

Did the post-Civil War period give birth to a new form of arbitrary power? The spectacle's estrangement from the acting subject is expressed by the fact that the individual's gestures are no longer his own; they are the gestures of someone else who represents them to him. **Or did the government remain the source of such power, with business merely providing a new avenue through which it could be exercised?** The spectator does not feel at home anywhere, because the spectacle is everywhere. **This is the crucial historical question.**

The problem of alienation and the problem of personal identity are inseparable. Workers do not produce themselves, they produce a power independent of themselves. The man who lacks a firm sense of personal identity feels alienated; the man who feels alienated lacks a firm sense of personal identity. The success of this production, the abundance it generates, is experienced by the producers as an abundance of dispossession.

As their alienated products accumulate, all time and space become foreign to them. Thus, he displaces his sense of self downward, so to speak, from his reason, which is the active, initiating element in man, to his emotions, which are the passive, reactive element. The spectacle is the map of this new world, a map that is identical to the territory it represents. Moved by feelings whose source he does not understand, and by contradictions whose existence he does not acknowledge, he suffers a progressive sense of self-estrangement, of self-alienation. The forces that have escaped us display themselves to us in all their power. A man's emotions are the product of his premises and values, of the thinking he has done or has failed to do.

But the man who is run by his emotions, attempting to make them a substitute for rational judgment, experiences them as alien forces. Though separated from what they produce, people nevertheless produce every detail of their world with ever-increasing power. The paradox of his position is this: his emotions become his only source of personal identity, but his experience of identity becomes: a being ruled by demons. They thus also find themselves increasingly separated from that world.

The closer their life comes to being their own creation, the more they are excluded from that life. But why? It reveals itself for what it is: an autonomously developing separate power, based on the increasing productivity resulting from an increasingly refined division of labor into parcelized gestures dictated by the independent movement of machines, and working for an ever-expanding market. What is the problem of alienation?

What is economic power? As indispensable embellishment of currently produced objects, as general articulation of the system's rationales, and as advanced economic sector that directly creates an ever-increasing mass of image-objects, the spectacle is the leading production of present-day society. It is the power to produce and to trade what one has produced. The spectacle is able to subject human beings to itself because the economy has already totally subjugated them. In a free economy, where no man or group of men can use physical coercion against anyone, economic power can be achieved only by voluntary means: by the voluntary choice and agreement of all those who participate in the process of production and trade. It is nothing other than the economy developing for itself. In a freemarket, all prices, wages, and profits are determined — not by the arbitrary whim of the rich or of the poor, not by anyone's "greed" or by anyone's need — but by the law of supply and demand. It is at once a faithful reflection of the production of things and a distorting objectification of the producers. The mechanism of a free market reflects and sums up all the economic choices and decisions made by all the participants. The western railroads were true monopolies in the textbook sense of the word. Men trade their goods or services by mutual consent to mutual advantage, according to their own independent, uncoerced judgment. They could, and did, behave with an aura of arbitrary power. A man can grow rich only if he is able to offer better values — better products or services, at a lower price — than others are able to offer. But that power was not derived from a free market. It was claimed then — as it is still claimed today — that business, if left free, would necessarily develop into an institution vested with arbitrary power. It stemmed from governmental subsidies and governmental restrictions. Is this assertion valid? The alienation of the spectator, which reinforces the contemplated objects that result from his own unconscious activity, works like this: The more he contemplates, the less he lives; the more he identifies with the dominant images of need, the less he understands his own life and his own desires. Did the post-Civil War period give birth to a new form of arbitrary power? The spectacle's estrangement from the acting subject is expressed by the fact that the individual's gestures are no longer his own; they are the gestures of someone else who represents them to him. Or did the government remain the source of such power, with business merely providing a new avenue through which it could be exercised? The spectator does not feel at home anywhere, because the

spectacle is everywhere. This is the crucial historical question.

The problem of alienation and the problem of personal identity are inseparable. Workers do not produce themselves, they produce a power independent of themselves. The man who lacks a firm sense of personal identity feels alienated; the man who feels alienated lacks a firm sense of personal identity. The success of this production, the abundance it generates, is experienced by the producers as an abundance of dispossession.

As their alienated products accumulate, all time and space become foreign to them. Thus, he displaces his sense of self downward, so to speak, from his reason, which is the active, initiating element in man, to his emotions, which are the passive, reactive element. The spectacle is the map of this new world, a map that is identical to the territory it represents. Moved by feelings whose source he does not understand, and by contradictions whose existence he does not acknowledge, he suffers a progressive sense of self-estrangement, of self-alienation. The forces that have escaped us display themselves to us in all their power. A man's emotions are the product of his premises and values, of the thinking he has done or has failed to do.

But the man who is run by his emotions, attempting to make them a substitute for rational judgment, experiences them as alien forces. Though separated from what they produce, people nevertheless produce every detail of their world with ever-increasing power. The paradox of his position is this: his emotions become his only source of personal identity, but his experience of identity becomes: a being ruled by demons. They thus also find themselves increasingly separated from that world.

The closer their life comes to being their own creation, the more they are excluded from that life. But why? It reveals itself for what it is: an autonomously developing separate power, based on the increasing productivity resulting from an increasingly refined division of labor into parcelized gestures dictated by the independent movement of machines, and working for an ever-expanding market. What is the problem of alienation?

++++P1&2++++ As **What indispensable is embellishment economic of power?** currently **It produced is objects, the as power general to articulation produce of and the to system's trade rationales, what and one as as advanced produced. economic In sector a that free directly economy, creates where an no ever-increasing man mass or of group image-objects, of the men spectacle can is use the physical leading coercion production against of anyone, present-day economic society. power can be achieved only by voluntary means: by the voluntary choice and agreement of all those who participate in the process of production and trade. In a freemarket, all prices, wages, and profits are determined— not by the arbitrary whim of the rich or of the poor, not by anyone's "greed" or by anyone's need—but by the law of supply and demand. The mechanism of a free market reflects and sums up all the economic choices and decisions made by all the participants. Men trade their goods or services by mutual consent to mutual advantage, according to their own independent, uncoerced judgment. A man can grow rich only if he is able to offer better values—better products or services, at a lower price—than others are able to offer.**

++++P3&4++++ **The It spectacle was is claimed able then—as to it subject is human still beings claimed to today—that itself business, because if the left economy free, has would already necessarily totally develop subjugated into them. an It institution is vested nothing with other arbitrary than power. the Is economy this developing assertion for valid? itself. Did It the is post-Civil at War once period a give faithful birth reflection to of a the new production form of of things arbitrary and power? a Or distorting did objectification the of government the remain producers. the source of such power, with business merely providing a new avenue through which it could be exercised? This is the crucial historical question.**

++++P5&6++++ **The The fact western that railroads the were practical true power monopolies of in modern the society textbook has sense detached of itself the from word. that They society could, and and established did, an behave independent with realm an in aura the of spectacle arbitrary can power. be But explained that only power by was the not additional derived fact from that a that free powerful market. practice It continued stemmed to from lack governmental cohesion subsidies and and had governmental remained restrictions. in contradiction with itself.**

++++P7&8++++ The **The fact problem that of the alienation practical and power the of problem modern of society personal has identity detached are itself inseparable. from The that man society who and lacks established a an firm independent sense realm of in personal the identity spectacle feels can alienated; be the explained man only who by feels the alienated additional lacks fact a that firm that sense powerful of practice personal continued identity. to lack cohesion and had remained in contradiction with itself.**

++++P9&10++++ Workers Thus, do he not **displaces produce his themselves, sense they of produce self a downward, power so independent to of speak, themselves. from The his success reason, of which this is production, the the active, abundance initiating it element generates, in is man, experienced to by his the emotions, producers which as are an the abundance passive, of reactive dispossession. element. As Moved their by alienated feelings products whose accumulate, source all he time does and not space understand, become and foreign by to contradictions them. whose The existence spectacle he is does the not map acknowledge, of he this suffers new a world, progressive a sense map of that self-estrangement, is of identical self-alienation. to A the man's territory emotions it are represents. the The product forces of that his have premises escaped and us values, display of themselves the to thinking us he in has all done their or power. has failed to do. But the man who is run by his emotions, attempting to make them a substitute for rational judgment, experiences them as alien forces. The paradox of his position is this: his emotions become his only source of personal identity, but his experience of identity becomes: a being ruled by demons.**

++++P11&12++++ Workers **But do why? not What produce is themselves, the they problem produce of a alienation? power What independent is of personal themselves. identity? The Why success should of so this many production, men the experience abundance the it task generates, of is achieving experienced it as by a the dreaded producers burden? as And an what abundance is of the dispossession. significance As of their the alienated attacks products on accumulate, capitalism all in time connection and with space this become issue? foreign to them. The spectacle is the map of this new world, a map that is identical to the territory it represents. The forces that have escaped us display themselves to us in all their power.**

+++++p13&14+++++ Capitalism, Workers a do term not used produce to themselves, denote they the produce economic a system power that independent has of been themselves. dominant The in success the of western this world production, since the the abundance breakup it of generates, feudalism. is Fundamental experienced to by any the system producers called as capitalist an are abundance the of relations dispossession. between As private their owners alienated of products nonpersonal accumulate, means all of time production and (land, space mines, become industrial foreign plants, to etc, them. collectively The known spectacle as is capital) the and map free of but this capitalless new workers, world, who a sell map their that labourservices is to identical employers. to . the . territory The it resulting represents. wage The bargains forces determine that the have proportion escaped in us which display the themselves total to product us of in society all will their be power. shared between the class of labourers and the class of capitalist entrepreneurs.