

Festival

David M. Boje
January 4, 1999

PART I. SPECTACLE ORGANIZATION WORLDVIEWS

Chapter 1 Why Study Festival and Spectacles

Why Study Festivals and Spectacles? In November 1997 I toured India with my wife Grace Ann Rosile and our spiritual teacher, Gurudev Shree Chitrabhanu. As I saw India, I was even more resolved than before, that world capitalism is a tragic coevolutionary-play led by the spectacle of inhumanity to all sentient beings. I saw the world's future if we are not able to coevolve in more sensitive ways; it was written all over the streets of Mumbai, in people and animals sleeping in doorways, in the faces of starving children. Gurudev is a former Jain monk, now a spiritual teacher of non-violence. Gurudev says, "the decision is up to us to be violent or non-violent."

The concentration of people is overwhelming. Kids living on the streets with mothers under tarps tied to fences or walls; babies in hammocks slung between branches; a mother fighting with her son over a quarter begged from our bus as she caressed her infant. This is a spectacle teeming with entrepreneurial business life, with every kind of business in doorways and on carts; cars honking, mostly taxis, with animals of all types in every street. There were scooters, bicycles, women with bundles balanced on their heads, carts heavy with bricks, cows and goats, begging children, donkeys pulling carts to markets, and flies everywhere. I have never seen so many flies (actually I did see them in my tour of duty in Vietnam in 1969-1970. The filth, stench, unsanitary conditions on the streets, the gas fumes and all those flies; it is overwhelming to the Western mind. We did not stay in shanties or sleep in doorways; we stayed in the best hotels, traveled in the air-conditioned tour bus, and ate at the four and five star vegetarian restaurants. Yet, through the bus window, I was seeing the image of what life will be like everywhere as our planet's population doubles in the year

2025. I was born in 1947, and during my life, the population of the world has doubled, and by 2025 it will double again. I did get off the bus and walked along the back streets of India, visited the local shops and I found it gets easier to tune out the misery. There is also tremendous beauty everywhere in India, mostly in the temples and in the equanimity of the people. Many people of India, with so much tragedy, have learned to find inner peace, serenity, and calmness through a very different philosophy of life.

Gandhi was deeply influenced by the Ahimsa philosophy. Gandhi sought alternatives to silk production, a process that kills the silk worms during the manufacturing process. I attended the Gandhi Institute and observed one of his inventions, a cotton spinning machine that any person with a bit of training and patience, can operate. He distributed the spinning machines to create an alternative to the then British controlled manufacture of cotton and the nation's dependency on silk garments. My friend Susan Segall brought back this factory in a box machine so that I might also meditate while I spin threads. It takes a lot of patience and higher levels of skill than I now possess. It does allow me to mediate on non-violent options in my own production and consumptive practice.

I would like to look at Ahimsa as a non-violent way of doing business, an alternative philosophy to Victorian Capitalism and our current manic consumption habits. Business is only beginning to learn how to coevolve in more sensible ways with the natural environment such as by recycling waste products, reducing consumption of natural resource, and reusing instead of planned obsolescence. Instead of maximizing production and consumption, a more sensible spectacle would be to reduce, reuse, and recycle wherever possible. People are learning to restrain their affluence, to live more simply, and to let others live, as well.

Learning to restrain spectacle is not easy. I grew up in the most violent and privileged industrial nation on the planet. As my contribution to the field of organization theory, I will intermingle the Situationist movement, particularly the work of Guy Debord, the postmodern theory of spectacles in work by Steven Best and Douglas Kellner, and the Ahimsa (non-violence) approach to business

practice. Ahimsa is what I learned from my wife Grace Ann, and our Ahimsa teacher, Gurudev Shree Chitrabhanu.

I am eager to find non-violent patterns of living in a world saturated with violence. I write this book to elaborate and explore non-violent situations, or Ahimsa spectacles of production and consumption. Violence is everywhere in the global economy of late capitalism, and growing more perverse and pervasive. Yet the violence that is everywhere, is made invisible to us through the spectacle which has separated producer and consumer. We do not see what we grow up in, we do not see who makes our products, and we do not even glimpse how violent the production process has become. All we see are the glitzy lights at the mall, the sexy displays of TV ads, and the corporate claims to excellence on all web-sites.

Spectacle is visible everywhere in the advertising extravaganza, from the four-story coke bottle that houses digital Storytelling Theater to a Disney that has migrated itself to the Malls and Airports, and is mimicked from Las Vegas to the local shopping mall. We can see spectacle as the Digital Storytelling Theater, most clearly presented in Disneyland, but also on the Las Vegas strip with the Luxor, Caesar's Palace, Mirage; in spectacles in our living room, like the Super Bowl (with digitized advertising superimposed on the field of play and Reebok icon-jerseys battling with Nike icons). Beneath this illusion lies brutality, cruelty and inhumanity to animals, humans, and mother earth.

Thanking My Teachers I call this new business paradigm "**Ahimsa-spectacle**" in honor of my dad, Daniel, an inventive teacher, and my teacher Gurudev Shree Chitrabhanu, for twenty years a Jain monk, now someone who teaches the Western mind the philosophy of non-violence, and Grace Ann. Grace Ann (I am her spouse) had tried to explain non-violence (Ahimsa) to me, but I did not get it until I saw India. I also acknowledge Guy Debord, along with Steven Best, Douglas Kellner, and my marketing teachers, Firat Fuat and Nicholas Dholakia. I take an ecocentric (what I call Ahimsa) position that all life has a right to exist and that business can be life enhancing or life-destructive, or

both, in the kind of consumption and production spectacles enacted. Ahimsa respects the right of all life to evolve.

I also gratefully acknowledge my postmodern teacher Steven Best. Modern capitalism, he reminds me, coexists with “older premodern forms” (Best & Kellner, 1997: 108). And, there are many postmoderns including that New Age stuff, where people want to think of spiritual alternatives to dead machine production and deadly over consumption. I am also indebted to two marketing teachers, Firat and Dholakia (1998), whose pioneering work on “theaters of consumption” based in Baudrillard helped me see the false divide between management and marketing. Their influence prompted me to look at the potential import of postmodern theater for spectacle analysis. In sum, I want this book to be about the transition from modern spectacle to a postmodern festival combining theatrics, dramatics, narrativity, and new storytelling of organizations (Boje, 1991, 1995).

Festival is what I mean by non-violent patterns of production and consumption. *Festival is defined as the pragmatics of long term sustainability in a non-violent culture, in balance with the whole planet.* It is, I believe, an third kind of political economy, an alternative to both state communism and predatory capitalism.

The alternative Debord, Chitrabhanu, Best, Kellner, Firat and Dholakia, and I am proposing, from differing perspectives, is to re-enter the festive world, to walk and breath real life “situations” as an active participant, not a passive spectator in everyday life space. Festival means cutting back on an over-consumptive and conspicuous production life style. It means overcoming societal addictions to violent entertainment. Festival means being critical of materiality. It means taking a critical look at commodity and production needs that are inherently artificial prescriptions for the happy person in the happy society. Materiality does not bring happiness. I think the new ISO14000 standards are helping global and local capitalism move slowly and cautiously in the direction of sustainability, but not festival.

Part of the Jain or Ahimsa philosophy is to treat all living beings as equal to ones own self. This means not interrupting or degrading the evolution of plants, animals, and humans. This would necessitate a critical look at animal rights, the living planet, and ways in which we are tampering with all species in the Biotech Century. It means looking at the coevolution of humans, their technology, animals, and planets.

This is a book about how spectacles could be transformed, and even overcome through acts of postmodern theatrics, restorying and otherwise deconstructing the production and consumption practices of late capitalism into the festival. It is a book about how spectacle materially participates in the coevolution of nature, human and machine systems in dysfunctional ways, ways that could be made more festive with hard choice making. This books looks at spectacle as a way to explore the postmodern turn, the narrative turn, the turn to postmodern theatrics, and three the millennia focus of my Jain teachers on Ahimsa.

The Situationist movement, however, is not about Ahimsa. It resituated Marx's call for emancipation of the workers from slave production into a call for the emancipation of consumers from a life of passive accumulation. The Situationists, like Marx, do not like fetish of any type, including Ahimsa. Yet, it is obvious in reading Marx that he abhorred violence, particularly making people cogs in machines, keeping people away from leisure in long hours of sweaty production, and oppressively using child labor.

Why Study Spectacles? Spectacle is everywhere, some more violent than others, in the OJ Simpson Trial, the Rodney King beating, the Gulf war, and now the Clinton Impeachment. We consume cyber spectacles of violence in our television viewing and our web surfing. Our parents or their parents lived through the Holocaust. They were horrified by it and decided it would not happen again. Yet we are witnesses to many more Holocausts throughout the world. We grew up consuming educational spectacles condemning the Holocaust. Yet, we did not learn about the genocide that took place before the Holocaust, that systematic extermination of native people around the world. We dropped Atom bombs on

Japan, napalmed Vietnam, and thought that was all a way to end violence. Yet spectacles of production and consumption legitimate violence of a more pervasive and more invisible sort, an ongoing Holocaust in which indigenous people, prison labor, sweatshop labor, and wage slaves live dehumanized conditions so that a minority can over produce and over consume. We do not see who makes our clothes, our appliances, and our computers. And many do not want to know.

Most, if not all, products and services, are somehow linked to violence, as even the family value icon, Disney does violence to Haitian workers. The icon of sports and health, Nike does violence to Asian workers. Ronald McDonald's the modern icon chuckles as we consume the beef that rainforests have been slashed and burned to feed. Our children scream if we deny them a Nintendo kill-game of "realistic" violence. I want to also look at each product and each service as a spectacle of violence, and employees as being producers of, and managers as managing, but not seeing violent-spectacle, and investors, suppliers, and customers playing their bit parts in webs of violence. It is a web where strands of separation allow each spider to say, "I am not the violent one." I want to see spectacles of violence on a global scale as unhealthy production and consumption colonizes the planet, and beyond, spreading our spectacle to other planets. And I want to see non-violent options.

To me, spectacles are quite material, though to see their materiality is not so easy. The spectacle, to me, is materialism made to appear as happiness, progress, and enlightenment. Beneath the spectacle and its substituted images are the tangible realities of production, the misery of labor and the exploitation of our natural environment.

People do resist spectacle; there is hope for spectacle transformation. There are eco-teams forming in Europe and North America to look at ways to cut back on our over-consumption patterns. Consumer groups are forming that resist shopping addictions, credit card addiction, workaholism, and television/Nintendo/Web cyber dependency. There are also moves to curb corporate power. Korten (1996) contends that corporations in the U.S. have

abused their 1776 corporate charters by creating loopholes to escape local accountability for the social and environmental actions. The reengineering and other social engineering gurus, as well as the managers of spectacle in general, have misread Adam Smith's (1776) *Wealth of Nations*. Smith advocated local accountability, moral reasoning, and a limit to bigness of business. Guy Debord (1967) proposes that we change spectacles to be more self-managed by workers and by consumers. Best and Kellner (1999b), for example, assert that spectacle is going through a transformation, from passive spectators in highly structured and massive spectacles to a stage of interactive spectacle in which spectators are actively producing and consuming their own spectacle in self-designed experiences. However, the problem of course is that the very corporations we seek to reform, are adopting the strategy of consumers becoming active in the design of their own experience as a way to continue to expand spectacles of production and consumption. Put on the virtual reality goggles and design the placement of doors and windows, the color of wallpapers, and the placement of furniture in your dream home. Then, the factories will turn it out just as you imagined.

Business is only beginning to learn how to coevolve in more sensible ways with the natural environment such as by recycling waste products, reducing consumption of natural resource, and reusing instead of planned obsolescence. Instead of maximizing production and consumption, a more sensible spectacle would be to reduce, reuse, and recycle wherever possible.

Spectacle respects material accumulation in the violent struggle of the so-called "fittest" to survive. We as humans can choose violent or non-violent coevolution with our machines, human labor, and ecology. But, I think that spectacle makes our choices difficult to see. I abhor violence. For this reason I became a vegetarian. Actually, I became a vegetarian to woo the beautiful Grace Ann, and later I learned that vegetarianism based on Ahimsa is not just a dietary choice, it is a non-violent lifestyle. Ahimsa is a profound respect for all living things. I am not writing to convince you to be vegetarian or to be a Jain businessperson (such choices are up to you). I am writing to assert that there

may be more enlightened ways of conducting commerce. I am also envisioning a life beyond spectacles, even ones reformed by Ahimsa, a life without a partition between work and play, a festive life. Here are differences I see between Ahimsa-Festival and regular spectacle.

Table One: Assumptions of Spectacle and Ahimsa Business Practices.

Spectacle Assumptions	Ahimsa-Festival Assumptions
✓ Progress defined as material accumulation	✓ Progress defined as spiritual accumulation
✓ Material accumulation = happiness	✓ Self awareness = happiness
✓ Spectacles of production and consumption grow by resource use	✓ Planet has finite and dwindling resources to be preserved.
✓ Economic productivity	✓ Eco-sustainable productivity
✓ Material values	✓ Spiritual values and awareness
✓ Work that is drudgery	✓ Work that is ennobling/actualizing
✓ Business that pollutes	✓ Business is non-polluting
✓ Technology advances to sustain competitive progress	✓ Technology used sparingly to sustain natural splendor
✓ Survival of the fittest = richest	✓ Survival of the cooperative
✓ Consume for immediate gratification; live for today	✓ Consume in ways healthy for our offspring; live for their future
✓ Conspicuous consumption = good	✓ Frugal consumption = good

To the Jain businessperson, we are in the initial stages of transforming the old Spectacle assumptions into the new Ahimsa assumptions of what makes for an enlightened business organization. The women’s movement, ecology movement, peace movement, (affirmative and new age) postmodern turn, and a host of spiritual disciplines such as yoga, shamanism, Buddhism, and Jainism are helping along this transition toward a more non-violent business practice. But, I must stress again, that to Guy Debord and the student rebels of the 1960s, spectacle can not be reformed. I shall return to this point. For now, let us explore spectacle reform.

Table Two: Old and New Business Spectacle Paradigms.

Old Spectacle Paradigm of Business	New Ahimsa Festival of Business
1. Ravaging the earth is justified by fundamentalist biblical interpretations.	1. “To be as harmless as doves and as wise as serpents” from New Testament.
2. Greedy profiteering is legitimated in struggle of survival of the fittest.	2. Profiteering robs others of the opportunity to survive.
3. Cutthroat business practice is the bottom line (inequality rules)	3. Interdependence of all life is bottom line (economic equality rules).
4. Evolution is Social Darwinian, struggle of the fittest; those who are rich are fitter than the poor.	4. Coevolution means not hampering survival of any life form (equality).
5. Mindless consumption keeps the economy booming.	5. Mindful consumption keeps nature teeming with life.
6. Economy grows for its own sake.	6. Ecology grows to support economy.
7. Business is not responsible for social consequences of production and consumption outcomes.	7. Business is responsible for social and ecological consequences of production and consumption.
8. Humanitarian service is a private act.	8. Humanitarian service is a business responsibility.
9. People motivated by their material values (money, status & power)	9. People motivated by their spiritual values (interdependence, life-respect).
10. Vision by elites doing rational analysis	10. Vision by democratic participation and seeking inner wisdom.
11. Regimented and conformist structures of surveillance and hierarchy.	11. Democratic and participative structures of ownership and cooperation.
12. Status-seeking leaders who are autocratic or fake participation.	12. Servant leaders who coach and facilitate and let others grow their empowerment.

In the Ahimsa business spectacle, entrepreneurs are collectively working to transform and reform the dominant spectacle of production and consumption. How can this be done? I think it takes daily meditation and critical awareness of the violence of the production and consumption spectacles, as well as the opportunities to make Ahimsa choices. The New Testament says, “to be as harmless as doves and wise as serpents in our actions.” Harman (1994: 48) argues “we are moving from a culture dominated by materialistic values to one that recognizes the role of deep intuitive wisdom in guiding our collective future.”

The Ahimsa business paradigm would transform spectacles of production and consumption:

1. Engage in business practices that are non-violent to other species.
2. Limit economic growth to what is ecologically sustainable.
3. Develop ecological awareness through reduce, recycle, and reuse practices.
4. Cultivate personal Self-development through servant leadership, introspection time, and community service.

Both Ahimsa-followers and the Situationists would agree that the capitalist spectacle of production and consumption is eroding the natural resources and beauty of the planet. In Ahimsa, there is respect for the living planet (including humanity, animals, plant, and insect life) by consuming less. In contrast, on bumper stickers we see the slogan “the man with the most toys wins!” In Ahimsa, the person with the fewest material possessions wins. The Jain Monk leaves spectacle altogether, in some cases forsaking even clothing, along with all worldly possessions, in short detaching from the world of spectacle altogether. Jain lay people, in particular business people, do not forsake all spectacles. They only seek involvement with the least violent forms of spectacle, and the most minimal forms of accumulation.

I am learning that each of my possessions, my car, my books, my computer, my house, my furniture, my tools, etc. is an attachment, a weight on my life. With each possession comes the attachment of caring for it. At work, each project, each conference, each dissertation committee, each class, each student, each email is also an attachment. I live in a whole web of material and social attachments. I am learning to choose my attachments, to decide how I spend my time and energy, caring for relationships or caring for material possessions. I am learning, and also failing to learn, to live with less stuff.

There is a second parallel between the Situationists and Ahimsa. In the media society of the spectacle, people track the lives of celebrities. “Media celebrities are the icons and role models, the stuff of dreams whom the dreamers

of the spectacle emulate and adulate” (Best & Kellner, 1997: 90). “The celebrity” says Debord (#60) is “the spectacular representation of a living human being, embodies this banality by embodying the image of a possible role.” Corporations such as Disney, Nike, IBM, Toyota, Intel, and Microsoft also become celebrities. In the Jain philosophy, each person must find their own uniqueness instead of emulating their fantasy about being the copy of another.

Ironically, organizations are learning to live with more technology, but fewer people. I think that the recent spectacle of production and consumption has demonstrated more caring for material than relational attachments. We have downsized and reengineered to keep the material flow efficient and we have created a world of temporary employment attachments less wages, less benefit, and more chaotic relationship patterns than ever before. We speak of this as the evolution of capitalism, as the progress of commerce, and that natural law of the invisible hand of economics. Yet, from a theory of spectacle, we are also designing a new coevolution with nature, machines, and material attachment. Beneath spectacle, we do not evolve. Rather, we design our situations of violence and non-violence.

Besides the Situationist and Ahimsa movements, there are other proposals, we shall examine, to tame spectacles and make them more human-friendly, democratic, and ecologically sustainable. We shall look for example, at non-violent and socially responsible and ethical practices that would reform spectacles. I shall introduce the idea of festival as an alternative to spectacle. Our last chapter looks at antispectacle, the possibility of moving to a different form of production and consumption altogether. Guy Debord (1967) built upon the avant-garde movement to transform passive spectators into self-designers, and into antispectacle.

In the struggle for multinational corporate domination of cyberspace, there is still the freedom of speech that can become a chorus of voices to resist and transform spectacles of production and consumption. In sum, to study spectacle is to examine the very way in which the body-human and the body-planet have endured a metamorphosis of spectacle technology in the history of organization

and consumption. Some argue that spectacles are escalating out of control into an Apocalypse. Others argue that our spectacle accomplishments have wrought miracles of healing, extended leisure, and allow for cybertech forms of democratic expression. The advanced and late stages of spectacle transformation do indeed offer opportunities for spectators to move from passivity to interactivity, even hyper, virtual interactive explorations of alternatives. However, there are also those who see a future of spectacles that will be as nightmarish as Metropolis, Bladerunner, and the many sour predictions of the Biotech Century (Rifkin, 1998). To read spectacles of production and consumption requires a theory of spectacle. We are taught to not read and to ignore the “technical apparatus of contemporary” spectacles “the means and methods power employs, outside of direct force, which subject individuals to societal manipulation, while obscuring the nature and effects of capitalism’s power and deprivations” (Best & Kellner, 1997: 84).

Why do we have spectacles? At some point in our history we left the market square for the supermarket, the super mall, and most recently the cyber mall. At some point we stopped making the goods we consume and we let others do it for us. In spectacle consumers and producers became separated. We do not see who makes our shoes, or if we make them we do not see who consumes them. Spectacles provide a mirage, a phantasm, and an illusion that allows us to safely avoid looking beneath the fabricated images, product stars, and corporate icons. Spectacles, for the most part, do not want us to reflect too deeply on where products come from, how they are made, who makes them, and the consequences of our own consumptive life style. There is a shroud of official bliss, masking material theatrics of human violence in the addictions to of workaholics and shopaholics. There is in reality, a rampant spectacle a terror and domination: it is a gouging of the planet to sustain spectacle; it is all conveniently restoried by media and socialization into the good life attained through technical progress and reckless consumption without looking at who is footing the bill. Spectacles and their legitimating enacted narratives do not call our attention to our unhealthy acts of conspicuous production and insane consumption, unless of

course that call is part of an advertising campaign, a ruse to sell even the skeptics some new gadgetry.

Interpreting the spectacle world around us. We are socialized to accept the spectacles around us, as inherently normal, right, and common sense. Poverty is explained in spectacle. Poverty, says spectacle, is just Social Darwinian evolution of the richest species, just self-design and self-steering on the so-called edge-of-chaos and just a reinvented tale of the free market the right of the rich to grab it all. Spectacle, says Debord, is an opium, that allows us to sleep walk, as if drugged, stumbling blindfolded through a devolving landscape of ecological and human horror; while cocooned in artificiality and illusion; mind-numbed by cyber media into passive stupefied spectators. This is why it is not easy for people socialized in spectacles and consumption images of the good life through consumption to step outside of its mechanisms of persuasion, and see its impact on nature, social systems, and the manipulation of our own desires. Our life is just too “saturated with spectacles” and we are too pacified in their “permanent opium war” (Debord, 1967: #44).

I do not see the Ahimsa as beyond spectacle. It is just a reform, and one that is opposed by Debord (1967) and SI (1966), as a manifestation of Gandhism. Yet, I do think that as a step toward post-spectacle, there are philosophies rooted in non-violence that point to festival. Willis Harman and John Hormann’s (1993) book *Creative Work: The Constructive Role of Business in a Transforming Society*, Anita Roddick’s *Body and Soul* (1992), Tom Chappell’s *The Soul of a Business* (1993), W. Edward and Jean Garner Stead’s book *Management for a Small Planet* (1996), Ronnie Lessem and Sudhanshu Palsule’s (1997) *Managing in Four Worlds: From Competition to Co-Creation*, and my own book with Bob Dennehy (1993) *Managing in the Postmodern World* have something in common. There is a new business paradigm, a new way of being a business that is socially and ecologically responsible. It is a fledgling paradigm; dwarfed by the dominant spectacle of production and consumption that functions as common sense all around us.

How should we define spectacle? Here, the spectacle is above all a legitimating narrative for social engineering and social control masking the violent acts of production and consumption. The spectacle is a legitimating narrative and theatrical performance to keep us from asking the fundamental question: who or what made our existence so fragmented and so violent? I answer it was capital accumulation, that twin of manic production and conspicuous consumption, on its most global conquest for power over labor and nature. By spectacle I mean Debord's (1967) the *Society of the Spectacle*, the often violent and oppressive social control that masquerades as a celebration of betterment by recycling pseudo-reforms, false-desires, and selective sightings of progressive evolution, never devolution. By violent I mean the willful and careless and often unnecessary disruption or extinction of the life of another, including the life of non-human species. Spectacles are our own day-to-day religious-like practices of capitalist goods-accumulation, worship that Marx called fetish. The spectacle would convince us that production and consumption is godly while nature is godless.

Guy Debord, cofounder of the Situationist Internationale movement, defines spectacle in many ways. "The spectacle is not a collection of images, but a social relation among people, mediated by images" (#4). Spectacle is about stuff. As Guy Debord (#65) puts it the spectacle gives an apologetic story for making/consuming more and more stuff, "the undisturbed development of modern capitalism." "In all its specific forms, as information or propaganda, as advertisement or direct entertainment consumption, the spectacle is the present model of socially dominant life" (#6).). Spectacle builds on Marx's concept of commodity fetish, "where the tangible world is replaced by a selection of images which exist above it, and which simultaneously impose themselves as the tangible par excellence" (1967: #36). "The spectacle" says Debord "is the material reconstruction of the religious illusion" (#20). "The spectacle is the moment when the commodity has attained the *total occupation* of social life" (#42). "In particular the ways in which technical development becomes a substitute for natural development (#24, 36).

The spectacle is both local and global displays of power; it is organizational power, a popular global discourse that is “an integral part of the total spectacle” including its “pseudo-negation and support” (#57). “The spectacle is the existing order’s uninterrupted discourse about itself, its laudatory monologue ... the self-portrait of power” (#24). The spectacle is also the permanent presence of this justification, since it occupies the main part of the time lived outside of modern production” (#6).

Spectacle covers everything from the Super Malls with thrill rides and theatrical performance, the simulated replicas of ancient culture such as Luxor and Caesar’s Palace in Las Vegas, the proliferation of Disneyland everywhere, and the Nike Swoosh, Harley Davidson tattoos, and other icons of corporate power through sports, life style statements, and virtual corporate structure. There are of course not the only technologies of spectacle you work within and consume. We must also include spectacles of digital storytelling, postmodern theatrics, cyberspace, virtual reality and other late manifestations we must explore. The invention of virtual reality device allows us access to “cyberworlds” in which we simulate “interactive citizenship and democracy,” and Internet “cybersex” and Nintendo “cyberviolence” in rehearsal for actually living one’s life in the real world” (Best & Kellner, 1997: 88-89).

Five Components of Spectacles There are five components to spectacle I want to introduce here. First there are the stakeholders (those playing a part in or with a stake in the outcome) doing the theatrics of spectacle, while pretending that no violence is anywhere to be found. Second, spectacles are part of the economics of our “coevolution,” our mutuality with machines, animals, plants, and microbes. And, part of the stories we legitimate about our evolution and our rights to coevolve rationalizes a Social Darwinian theory of the right of the rich to survive through violence to the poor. One contribution to Debord’s and Best and Kellner’s project is for me to assert that spectacle is the leading edge of the coevolution of nature, humans, and machine systems. Third, spectacle is about the accumulation of stuff, the result of our entire spectacle of production and accumulation. Stuff is violent, it is choking our lives and the life of our planet, and

even the junk we litter in outer space is violent. And fourth, spectacle is a very postmodern view of managing and organizing. Postmodern is about reality, and the illusion of reality, and the interplay between real and fantasy in spectacle. Finally, spectacle is the phantasm of invention, the seduction of advertising, and the mirage of our daily life. It is equating material accumulation with happiness. A bit more about each of these five points.

First, there are many stakeholders in spectacle theatrics. Workers, managers, owners, customers, consultants, politicians, and activists are designers, reformers, and accumulators of spectacles of organization are all bit players. My project is to extend work begun by Guy Debord (1967¹), a neo-Marxist critic of production and consumption spectacles, author the “Society of the Spectacle.” Debord sought to update Marx in ways similar to the neo-Marxist and emancipatory project of the Frankfurt School. Marx focused on production, while the Situationists focused on the “new modes of the consumer and media society that had developed since the death of Marx” (Best & Kellner, 1997: 81).

Second, spectacles of production and consumption has much to do with economic survival and what I will call, “coevolution.” Too much food overwhelms the digestive system; too much addictive consumption overwhelms family life with unnecessary attachment; too much trash overwhelms the landfill; too much work leaves me no time for leisure; too many spectacles makes us dizzy so we no longer see the situation of our own decisions about coevolution. Spectacle, according to Debord does modify “the conditions of existence of human groups as conditions of survival,” that following Marxian labor process theory “transformed human labor into commodity-labor, into wage-labor, “ in other words “economic growth frees societies from the natural pressure which required their direct struggle for survival” (#40). The very nature of authentic struggle for survival has been fragmented in so many ways by spectacles of production and consumption, that “authentic” evolution is lost; there is only coevolution. My reading of Debord is that the spectacle of production and consumption has

transformed the world of nature's struggle for survival into a world of spectacle, as nature is transformed into "pseudo-nature" (#40). And the spectacle seeks to convince us that commodity accumulation rules nature, and that commodity spectacle is itself natural law. Spectacle inverts real into fiction, fiction into nature, where the totality of the commodity world appears as a whole.

Third, we live in "geological layers of commodities" instead of geological layers of fossils in a metaphoric tree of life (#42). Or, more accurately, we walk on both. I would like this book to say something important about managing in the postmodern world of virtual production and consumption spectacles, in the manufacture and accumulation of stuff.

Fourth, spectacle is the stuff of both modern and postmodern managing and organizing. And the two are inseparable, with modern production and consumption spewing forth the infrastructure and the media of advertising in a postmodern epoch. A recent abundance of postmodern books are giving increased attention to the interplay of spectacle, narrative, and postmodern theory: time and space fragmentation (Francese, 1997), complexity (Cilliers, 1998), chaos theory (Best & Kellner, 1997), postmodern theatric[k]s (Geis, 1995), postmodern/drama (Watt, 1998; Simard, 1984; Whitmore, 1994), postmodern fables (Lyotard, 1997), postmodern narrative theory (Currie, 1998), postmodern environmental ethics (Pulido, 1996; Oelschlaeger, 1997), film spectacles (Dixon, 1998), postmodern cosmology (Rifkin, 1998), and theaters of consumption (Fiat and Dholakia, 1998). My task is to pull this diversity together into a revised theory of Debord's society of the spectacle and apply it to the spectacle of organization and late capitalism.

Fifth, and finally, spectacle is about the American Dream, not just in America, but colonizing the entire planet. What is globalization, but the pursuit of Americanization, the multinational corporate attempt to make the whole world spectators and producers of spectacle? In the postmodern, there is focus on how spectacles are organized, how do the postmodern theatrics, and

¹ La Société du Spectacle was first published in 1967 by Editions Buchet-Chastel (Paris); it was reprinted in 1971 by Champ Libre (Paris). The full text is available at

postmodern narrative, interact to give us spectacle? And how is it that the modern and postmodern are equally complicit in spectacle? To answer these questions, I had to reach out to teachers, beyond my dad the inventor-showman, to people who could teach me something about the new business paradigm, the spectacle of organization.

And there is also the resistance to the new stages of spectacle in our late global capitalism stage, as well as those who live beneath the stage, the several billion still beyond the reach of the spectacle dreams. You and I live in contact with and consume hundreds of spectacles each and every day. We view them on television, see them at the movies, participate in them in theaters, and consume them at the Mall, the university, and the local hardware store. Spectacles are produced and consumed all around us, and some are more violent, while others are more playful and even fun. You need to be able to read spectacle behavior, understand spectacle management, the consequences of spectacles, and how to change spectacles. I shall give some introductory answers to these questions.

Consequences of Spectacles There are important consequences from spectacles of production and consumption. It takes a goodly amount of social spectacle control to keep us all from becoming acutely aware of how our production and consumption habits affect the devolution of life on this planet. There is something quite important to understand about our role in spectacle management and spectacle consumption. Spectacles equate material-accumulation with happiness and the American Dream, while ignoring the three billion people living on less than a dollar a day and the exhaustion of finite planet resources. The third world exhausts its resources so that the spectacle world can continue. I think it is possible to begin a revolution in everyday life by posing a critique of spectacle-ideology, then surpassing spectacle in the free “reconstruction of all the values and patterns of behavior imposed by alienated reality” (SI, 1966: 14).

<http://www.nothingness.org/SI/debord/index.html>

How can we change the run away spectacle of production and consumption? Is it possible to tame manic consumption before the planetary resources run out, before virtual classroom replace face to face classrooms, and virtual sex replaces the risks of real sex? The spectacle is after all nothing but the political economy of the body and the planet caught in the will to power and our own lost will to resist spectacle addictions.

In organizational development (OD) workers and managers are presented with “the spectacle of a revolt to distract them from the possibility of participating in one” (SI, 1966: 6). OD is the handmaiden of the producers and managers of spectacles of production and consumption. OD has not been about the task of suppressing or replacing spectacle, though there is a lot of rhetoric about transformation, reinvention, even reengineering. For the Situationists OD would be like our political parties, and unions – just part of the colonization of our entire life space to simulate reform, with no substantive change in spectacle. The role of OD in the spectacles of production and consumption is to lower resistance to spectacle while making it appear that empowerment, learning communities, and knowledge work is collapsing leisure into our work space. We are “commodity slaves” seeking “empowered” in functionary jobs in the status quo, made to appear to be in a constant state of reform, just jogging in place.

As a contribution to organizational development (OD), I would like extend the work of Situationists and Ahimsa to change. The solutions proposed by the rebel student-Situationists (SI, 1966: 2-12) are these. First, we could choose to be the Bohemian rebel living within the spectacle, while preaching sedition in open and hostile contempt for that system. Second, we could take the similar route of many postmodernists, reject or even accept nihilism practices of the spectacle without offering any possibility of life beyond the spectacle. Baudrillard, for example accepts that technology has propelled us into a hyperreality more real than real, and one that has replaced real, “a nihilistic acceptance of the triumph of the object” (Best & Kellner, 1997: 103-105). Third, we could engage in a Neo-Marxist revolutionary critique of the society of the spectacle, awaken people to the hidden and mono-vocal history of power, and incite revolution

against conspicuous and life-harming consumption. Fourth, we can democratize the workplace in hopes that democratic workers' councils would tame the corporate charter (Korten, 1996) of firms not behaving in socially conscious and eco-sustaining ways. Fifth, we could try festival, the self-management of our work/leisure time and space, while dissolving the power of spectacle into a self-managed coevolution with other species. These are not independent choices.

My intention is to write a book that reconstructs and deconstructs the spectacular organization of global capitalism, in its masked relation to our human coevolution, with more festive applications of technology and an ethical relation to non-human species. The reconstruction I propose is to create a situation of non-violence behavior, theory, and development of organizations into festivals. No organization I know of lives completely outside the spectacle of violent production and consumption. The Ahimsa philosophy argues that it is possible for monks to live outside spectacle, but the rest of us have to make do.

From Spectacle to Festival

The Situationist answer to the ideological social control of spectacle, is festival, by which we self-manage and self-produce our own production and consumption practices. In this way we redefine our needs and desires. This book is about how we might go about doing that. It is about trying to do more than critique the exploitation of capitalist modes of production. It is looking introspectively at our own needs and desires and how these impact our life and the lives of other living species.

I see a delicate line of connection between Ahimsa and the Situationists. I would like to explore how Debord's (1967) dream of the demise of spectacle could take place by looking at the festive (SI, 1966) options presented in an unsigned document during the time of the student revolutions of the late 1960s in France, Japan, U.S., and elsewhere. It is this festive sense of work and play that I also see in Ahimsa. Festival is the "very keynote of the life" I see beyond a critique of spectacle ... *Play* is the ultimate principle of this festival, and the only rules it can recognize are to live without dead time and to enjoy without restraint" (SI, 1966: 14).

Festival Spectacle is not the same as what I will call festival. Ahimsa is a modification and reform of spectacle, a way to live spectacles that are non-violent. Festival can be antispectacle; it can lie beyond spectacle, in ways that I envision being non-violent. Festival is usually intertwined with spectacle, like the Woodstock Music Festival of 1969 and the many Renaissance Festivals throughout the world. These festivals offer a chance to play, to be a participant in the theatrics, and to get crude. The practical concern of Ahimsa is with worker and community health and safety; alternatives to child labor and prison labor; living wages; enlightened work conditions; freedom of worker-association; ecological sustainability; globally equitable production and consumption practices; future generations. The festival is an attempt to make leisure more important than work.

Table Three: Spectacle and Festival

Spectacle	Festival
1. Work	1. Play
2. Work or play time	2. Work and play
3. Imposed patterns of behavior	3. Freely constructed behavior
4. Dead time	4. Live time
5. Religions of consumption	5. Self
6. Pseudo desires	6. Transparent desires
7. Pseudo needs	7. Transparent needs
8. Loss of Self	8. Self-Management
9. Colonized spaces	9. Free spaces
10. Spectator	10. Participant/Co-designer
11. Functionary	11. Self-Managed
12. Survival of the Fittest/Richest	12. Coevolution and Co-survival

Festival was a different from of art than cyberart, a different necessity than mass consumption, a different form of social intercourse. Festival did not get completely supplanted. Festival is what could happen if we could ever get beyond spectacles of hyper production and consumption, balance the passive with more interactive television, use the web to resist Affluenza (addiction to image consumption), and to live in sensible patterns of coevolution with other species. Festival is the self-management and self-design of our own leisure time and space, the realization of what we need to live and evolve as a species, with the most minimal harm to any other species. Festival is a way of doing business

that respects people, communities, and the ecology. Festival balances stakeholder interests in the future generation (stakeholders include workers, managers, owners, investors, customers, local communities, future generations, and the ecosystem).

Festival has practical implications for individual living. Festival is freely constructed patterns of post-work behavior (Rifkin, 1995; Aronowitz & Cutler 1998) in a world dominated by slavish and addictive work-spectacles that divide work from play time, while colonizing all our free time and transforming every space into unbounded work and consumption space. Festival is play and spectacle is work and conspicuous material consumption.

I see spectacle and festival as interactive, with blurred lines between them. For the moment I will introduce them as if they were different. We might even say that festival is what we had before three and half centuries of capitalism, and festival is the postmodern dream that we could reintegrate fragmented spaces of work and play. But, this is illusion since modernism absorbs all the reforms and presents itself as unending self-reform.

For three thousand years a premodern form of festival has survived, and for the past three and half centuries coexisted with modern capitalism. To me, and this is just my personal view, festival means suspending material values in order to look at the situation of workers, consumers, and nature within the premodern philosophy of Ahimsa. Ahimsa is part of the three millennia Jain philosophy of India (Yashovijayji, 1974). Ahimsa means non-violence; it is *not* the same revolution of the Situationist, and the antispectacle of festival. Ahimsa-spectacle and SI-festival are different. The Jain monk vows “to refrain from all injury to sentient beings” (Yashovijayji, 1974: 216). This translates to both monk and layperson as “behaving towards all living beings with proper restraint and control” (p. 216).

All living creatures (that are in this world) desire to live. Nobody wishes to die. And hence it is that the Jain monks avoid the terrible (sin of) injury to living beings (p. 216).

My purpose is to write a book that celebrates Ahimsa (non-violence) in ways that suppresses spectacle, and invokes the Situationist-festival. Until we can see spectacle control, festival is not attainable. This book is not the typical evolutionary model of progressive or Darwinian evolution found in organization theory texts. We do not live in natural systems of evolution, or population ecologies, and any semblance of an “authentic” nature and an “authentic” human left us during, even well before the Industrial Revolution. And finding evolution got trickier this Information Revolution, and in the artificial life experiments we see happening in the Biotech Revolution, with its origins of human/machine, and human/animal species through the magic of genetic reengineering. The best we can do is to compose a spectacle of coevolution that respects natural life forms and gives (regulated) space to the emergence of artificially intelligent life forms. We have mated with the cyber machine and entered the virtual world of virtual organization evolution, but that evolution is coevolution, in interplay with nature, including human, animal, and plant species.

My personal view is that the only way to abolish the material spectacle of production and consumption is to develop an alternative philosophy of the *situation*, a celebration of leisure, or what I call the *festival*. Festival is what we had before the spectacle of factory production and mass, now turned fragmented and manic (over) consumption. And festival is what we nostalgically seek, the reconstitution of face-to-face community, the authenticity of the village square, the open market, rather than the Super Mall or the separation from life through home shopping.

In sum, this book is a genealogy (Foucault, 1977) of the coevolution of spectacle from premodern festivals of circus frivolity and public torture, to modern spectacle treadmills and slaughterhouses of bureaucratic capitalism, to the late postmodern capitalism of cyber and biotech spectacles.

Worldviews in Spectacle Organization Theory

We all live the Society of the Spectacle, but interpret it quite differently. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce five perspectives of spectacle. The standards of life in one worldview are often diametrically opposed to those of

other worldviews. The problem I have is how to communicate the differences in ways that do not alienate.

PART I: SPECTACLE ORGANIZATION WORLDVIEWS

Introduction to Five Worldviews

In Table One, I give a brief overview of five main spectacle worldviews, as well as four hybrid views. They hybrids are important to me, because, I do not want to leave the impression that there are firm boundaries between these worldviews. I have located the most dominant view of management and organization theory, the Knowledge Work and Management Spectacle in the center to highlight its hegemonic status in the Academy of Management. Hegemony refers to its taken-for-granted appeal as politically more correct than the surrounding worldviews. The Knowledge Work spectacle is the only one of the nine displayed in Table One that gets any coverage in the best selling management and organization theory texts. It is the “received” view, the one that the other worldviews are currently playing off.

In this chapter we will briefly introduce the worldviews and develop the Knowledge Work worldview in some detail. Subsequent chapters will develop the surrounding worldviews.

Table Four: Summary of Five Spectacle Worldviews

<p>Chapter 2. Corporate Imperialism Spectacle Colonization of native lands, corporate colonization of social and leisure spaces.</p>	<p>Hybrid of 2 and 3 Anti-Colonialism <i>A hybrid of Ahimsa or nonviolence resistance and nonviolent attempts to resist colonialism (See Chapter 8 on Americanization).</i></p>	<p>Chapter 3. Ahimsa and Simplicity Spectacle Nonviolence approaches of Gandhi, Kumar, Chitrabhanu, and King Jr. Encompasses simplicity in consumption and nonviolent approaches to production.</p>
<p>Hybrid of 2 and 4 Corporate Charter <i>A hybrid of political economy critique with movements towards rewriting corporate charters for more local control (See Chapter 14 on university charter).</i></p>	<p>Chapter 1. Knowledge Work and Management Spectacle Focus on the new Digital economy of information technology. Includes knowledge workers, knowledge managers, and knowledge consumers, as well as the global division of virtual labor.</p>	<p>Hybrid of 3 and 5 New Age Postmodern <i>A hybrid of the spirituality in business and ecology with certain postmodern positions (See Chapters 12 to 14).</i></p>
<p>Chapter 4. Political Economy Spectacle A focus on the critical and labor process theory of Marx. Includes an analysis of the political and economic uses of technologies.</p>	<p>Hybrid of 4 and 5 Critical Postmodern <i>A hybrid of critical theory and certain postmodern perspectives (See Chapters 11, 12, 13)</i></p>	<p>Chapter 5. Postmodern Spectacle Positions that range from Lyotard's focus on local narratives, Baudrillard's hyperreal, Bauman's analysis of Holocaust, to Best and Kellner's extension of Debord to postmodern sensibilities.</p>

A brief overview follows:

1. **Knowledge Work and Management Spectacle Worldview**

- ✓ In management and organization studies this is the dominant worldview. There is an unlimited celebration of progress-through-technological development, be it Virtual Universities, biotech gene splicing or cybertech virtual commuting across the globe. The received view is that the third wave is here, the knowledge society has won out over the second wave of industrial revolution, and the first wave of agrarian feudalism. Bureaucracies are being transformed into non-hierarchical information networks governed by the newest theories of complexity, chaos and virtual management. The worldview is in every new management and organization book under the label knowledge worker management systems, or substitute titles like learning organization, network organization, cyber or virtual corporation. The Knowledge Worker and Management perspective is critiqued by the other worldviews.

2. **Corporate Imperialism Spectacle Worldview**

- ✓ I am aware that most students of organization eschew this worldview because the 1st world is blamed or judged harshly for the problems of the 3rd world. Corporate Imperialism, for example, looks at the other half the world's population (3 billion) that do not own telephones, much less computer systems with which to sign on to a world of knowledge chat rooms. It also looks harshly at the colonization of social spaces by corporate production and marketing. The corporate imperialism worldview concludes that the richest fifth of the world dominates the other four fifths of the world in terms of resource utilization, property rights, and it decimates the planet resources at an accelerating pace. It also looks sourly on the continuing corporate manufacture of the status quo of all life space. There is a strong focus on the history of imperialism, from colonizing nations, conquistadors, to contemporary forms of economic inequality. This worldview has much sympathy with the political economy worldview (#4 below), but is quite opposed to what it considers a Pollyanna philosophy of the Knowledge Work and Management worldview. In parts there is appreciation for the next view.

3. **Ahimsa (non-violence) and Simplicity Spectacle Worldview**

- ✓ This worldview answers a practical question: is there a way to transcend violent forms of production and consumption? There are three movements in this perspective: Ahimsa focus on nonviolent production and consumption, the simplicity movement to adopt more responsible consumption patterns, and the ecology movement which looks at sustainability and may include a focus on Animal Rights. There is a spirituality movement in the Academy. In addition, the simplicity and ecocentric perspectives are gaining legitimacy in the Academy of Management, and have fostered a new division, ONE (Organization and the Natural Environment). The simplify your life, live simply, recycle and everywhere reduce perspective and Ahimsa spirituality are not as reliant upon government regulation as is the ecology movement. There is also a

gray area, in which nonviolent resistance seeks to bring about government policy change. As with Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., the focus can be on individual and collective non-violent resistance to colonial domination. This focus on changing the status quo is therefore consistent, in parts, with the anti-Corporate Imperialism worldview, and at odds with the free market economy logic of the Knowledge Management perspective. The point here is that the worldviews intermingle.

4. **Political Economy Spectacle Worldview**

- ✓ The political economy (or critical theory) worldview is popular outside the U.S., and is recently making some headway as a critique of the Knowledge Work worldview and Americanization (the spread of Americana icons, products and consumptive styles). Rooted in Marx, Adorno, Marcuse, Horkheimer (the Frankfurt School), and many contemporary thinkers, the political economy worldview does not have much patience for spirituality, ecology (religion is considered the opiate of the people), or consumer fetish. It is skeptical of most guru work, for example Charles Handy, Alvin Toffler and Tom Peters, who are viewed in the main as espousing a apologetic story (e.g. Knowledge Worker worldview) for Social Darwinian forms of capitalism. The focus of this worldview is more on human emancipation from regimes of domination and oppression that expand the gap between haves and have-nots. This includes a critique of Spencer's Victorian Social Darwinian worldview of the survival of the fittest, which they translate to survival of the richest at the expense of everyone else's survival. This is seen as another apology for free market economics, when they see quite obvious consequences to unregulated self-organizing schemes. This worldview is compatible with the Imperial worldview and most distant from the Knowledge Worker and Management worldview, which is seen as another reincarnation of deskilling and oppressive, work routines. There is uneasy relationship to the next worldview.

5. **Postmodern Narrative and Theatrics Spectacle Worldview**

- ✓ The postmodern turn is not a break with or succession to the other worldviews. Ahimsa (premodern) spirituality, modern critical theory, and (systemic) modern knowledge worker viewpoints are simultaneous with postmodern. The postmodern worldview (in its many fragments) is both resistance to, and a critique of, the first world view of Knowledge Management and has roots in the other views. There is a good deal of crossover, for example, with political economy in looking at how popular culture privileges some economic classes, ethnicities, races, and male-logic. There is a new age postmodernism (eschewed by other postmodern perspectives) that finds easy compatibility to the Ahimsa worldview and with certain factions of ecology seeking to re-enchant the earth as Gaia or living system. Consistent with the Imperial Corporation worldview, there is a postmodern critique of knowledge work and cyber tech that extends into

a critique of Biotech Century and exploitative ecology and animal cruelty practices. There is also a hybrid, “critical postmodernism,” that takes the political economy narrative as a given and looks at ways in which popular culture extends or subverts it. Postmodern also contains positions such as Lyotard that has no patience for grand narratives or Baudrillard who sees modern reality as now irrevocably transformed to simulation and the hyperreal. I follow Best and Kellner who seek the interplay between grand (e.g. evolution of knowledge work) and local narrative (i.e. how consumers try to live outside spectacle; how firms attempt to set up non-violent forms of production), and the interaction of premodern, modern and postmodern. To me, it is the hybrid quality of looking at material conditions of exploitation, idealist visions of reform, and the potential for emancipation from escapism, pseudo reform, and ongoing domination, that is intriguing.

These are, to me, five interacting worldviews about spectacle that struggle for audience and text space. In between these views, as indicated in Table One are important hybrid positions. The worldviews are not independent and I do not mean to present them with stable boundaries between them. Each is generating scores of books. I invite you to read some or all of these books in Table One for yourself to get more depth in each worldview. The table is presented in five parts, distributed across succeeding chapters.

Conclusions The techniques of spectacle are worshiped in both the modern and postmodern world. Spectacle is both micro as in Demaray’s (1998) analysis of “spectacles of strangeness” in the transformation of renaissance theatrical forms into the more postmodern theatrics (Simard, 1984; Geis, 1993; Whitmore, 1994; Watt, 1998). It is in these more postmodern theatrics, not only on the stage, but also on film (Dixon, 1998); we can see ways to make the micro-politics of power through spectacle more transparent through parody, juxtaposition, and irony. It is also in the postmodern theatrics that the audience is seduced or required to surrender their passive spectator role and become one of the live actors on the stage, or in the case of Tamara theater on many stages, becoming the wandering audience chasing stories and actors, themselves now actors, from room to room (Boje, 1995). And, this means that spectacle and narrative theory are some how intermingled. Spectacles are also macro-power, able to invoke ideologies and fetish on a global stage. Currie (1998) for example, develops a theory of the narrative turn, which to me allows us to see spectacle as

having something to do with cultural even global narratology. Spectacle is both micro, strange events we tune into here and there, but parts to fashion more macro spectacles, like Las Vegas and Disneyland, and more macro patterns of the very logic of late schizophrenic, postmodern capitalism that has colonized our being and our landscape.

I think that my trip to India was life changing. As I learned to meditate, saw the disparity between wealth for a few and poverty for the multitude, I decided it must be possible to coevolve in a more enlightened way. In mediation there is a possibility of breaking free of the “specialized mediations: of spectacle (Debord 1967: #18). By enlightenment, I mean Eastern, not Western enlightenment. In Eastern Enlightenment there is mediation on our attachments and equanimity; in Western Enlightenment since Newton and Hume’s mechanistic rationality, there is a focus on how rationality achieves greater accumulation of stuff. I would like to master non-violence in all forms by overcoming my dependency on material attachment, by respecting all forms of life, and by not damaging what is left of the natural evolution of other species.

A focus on spectacle is a study of how we are socialized in our schools, family, and media to engage in non-Ahimsa practices. We could be socialized quite differently. As a postmodernist and critical theorist, I am crossing a threshold. That is, in most postmodern and critical theory writings there are no solutions offered. Still I think that a non-violent form of commerce and consumption does change, even overthrow spectacle.

I have therefore included chapters on restorying spectacles. How can we look at examples of non-violent approaches to industry and consumption? I have included chapters on postmodern theater. From postmodern theater I hope to communicate both a critique and a reformation of spectacles of production and consumption. Finally, I include a genealogy of various meanings of the word “evolution.” In particular I see the field moving from a Social Darwinian meaning to Darwin’s natural selection in the survival of the fittest business, to a punctuated equilibrium model of catastrophic waves of change, to our affection with chaos and complexity models of evolution. In the most recent versions we

are looking at coevolution, the dance of humans, machines, nature, and I would add, spectacles of production and consumption.