

THE COMING OF THE SUBMASS AND THE DIS-INTEGRATION OF PERSONALITY

James P. Cadello

Jose Ortega y Gasset, in his most famous work *The Revolt of the Masses*, gives the classic definition of the *masses*. However, despite the profundity of Ortega's work and its usefulness for an analysis of the past and the present, an analysis of contemporary public life reveals phenomena that either escaped Ortega's view or were not present to him in Europe during the thirties. This essay argues for the latter of these alternatives, and in doing so presents a case for a new class of public phenomena particular to (at least North America during) the latter part of the twentieth century. These new developments are in some cases extreme amplifications of phenomena described by Ortega, but which in other instances clearly differ in kind from the characteristics exhibited by Ortega's modern mass. In this essay the individuals embodying this new set of what Ortega calls "collective habits"¹ shall be referred to by a new term: the *submass*.² The term *submass* has been chosen because this new class of social phenomena represents a decline from the modern mass, at least if the development of an *integrated personality*—touched on below—is the standard by which this judgment is made.

The modern mass described by Ortega will serve as a qualitative standard against which the submass can be compared, and as an indicator and advisor of which attributes to look for in attempting social criticism of mass phenomena.³

Ortega on the Modern Mass

Ortega's analysis of the modern mass stems from his aristocratic conception of social structure that extends to all historical periods: "Society is always a dynamic unity of two component factors: minorities and masses. The minorities are individuals or groups of individuals which are specially qualified. The mass is the assemblage of persons not specially qualified."⁴ The select minorities feel themselves limited by, and take into account, their radically insecure circumstances, choosing to devote their efforts to upholding and to enhancing civilization. The select minorities live noble lives, make great demands of themselves, appeal to standards beyond themselves in the service of something greater. Only through the determined, dedicated, and dutiful effort of this cultural elite are the social institutions and the cultural creations that vitalize civilization maintained.

Until modern times the masses, too, felt the limits and the burdens of life; however, they made no demands on themselves, appealed to no standards beyond themselves: "[T]he mass, as a psychological fact ... is all that which sets no value on itself—good or ill—based on specific grounds, but which feels itself 'just like everybody,' and nevertheless is not concerned about it; is, in fact, quite happy to feel itself as one with everybody else."⁵ The mass remained content in its self-sameness, and exerted no effort to attain perfection.

For Ortega, therefore, masses and minorities are not determined on the basis of social standing or family history, or even because the individual that exhibits certain characteristics appears in a multitude,⁶ but because of psychological traits, namely, a set of attitudes or dispositions, a posture toward the world.

Nevertheless, in the twentieth century Ortega saw the mass advancing to the forefront of social life, taking over the functions, using the instruments, enjoying the pleasures previously reserved for the few: "the mass, without ceasing to be mass, is supplanting the minorities."⁷ Bloated by a false sense of confidence that stemmed from a command of specialized techniques that were practiced in professional life, the *modern mass* gained a fallacious feeling of power and of mastery over circumstances. Yet the modern mass lacked both the special qualities required to grasp the significant relations existing in civilization and the control to perform the duties necessary to sustain it. Nonetheless, the self-assured modern mass demanded all that modern civilization had to offer, asserted its right to have its say on every matter of the day, and insisted that its voice be heard.

The modern mass individual was a curious creature, combining aspects of the traditional mass and minority. Possessing a feeling of mastery and demanding a right to all of the best civilization had to offer, the modern mass had available "the same 'vital repertory' which before

characterized only the superior minorities."⁸ But at the same time the modern mass experienced a security, a material ease, and an eradication of social and moral barriers heretofore unknown in history.⁹ Thus, the "world which surrounds the new man from his birth does not compel him to limit himself in any fashion, it sets up no veto in opposition to him; on the contrary, it incites his appetite, which in principle can increase indefinitely."¹⁰ Therefore, members of the modern mass had the *feeling* of mastery and of power exhibited by the minorities, but lacked the minorities' *understanding* of the proper relation to their circumstances to complement this feeling. Modern mass individuals were like the traditional mass in that they lacked the *special abilities* to qualify them for disciplined service, but differed in not feeling *limitation, obligation, and dependence on something greater*.¹¹

The resulting personality type was what Ortega called the "spoilt child,"¹² which was comprised of "two fundamental traits: the free expansion of vital desires, and therefore, of personality; and ... radical ingratitude towards all that has made possible the ease of ... existence."¹³ Such a person was satisfied as he or she was, felt complete, acknowledged nothing superior, desired no external influence or support: in short, had become "hermetically closed."¹⁴ The modern mass renounced the principles upon which culture rested, and without being upheld these principles vanish. Barbarism, the absence of standards to which appeals can be made, was the final result of the complete revolt of the masses.¹⁵ Proficient in the techniques of modern life, but lacking a respect for and an understanding of the principles that sustained the world in which they lived, the modern mass individual was a self-contradictory figure, a *civilized barbarian*.

The Psychology of the Submass

Because his social theory was aristocratic, Ortega's analyses of social phenomena were aristocratic also, derived from his conception of noble or select minorities. To borrow a phrase from Emily S. Hamblen, these minorities were characterized by "reflex control,"¹⁶ the ability to instinctively "[concentrate] the entire force of the individual at one point,"¹⁷ combining and integrating the diverse aspects of the turbulent individual and circumstances into a coherent personality to attain the highest values. To coin a phrase, members of the modern mass were characterized by "reflex demand," automatically seeking the conditions wherein their wants could be satisfied, without consideration for the coordination of self and circumstances that were required to bring about these conditions. Thus, the modern mass refused to *defer* to the moral standards grounding culture, choosing instead to *make demands* for the satisfaction of wants present in its enhanced vital repertory.

SUBMASS

But with the coming of the submass, a new phenomenon approaches that escapes the framework of Ortega's analysis. Ortega viewed the problem in terms of whether an individual would defer to the standards supporting civilized conditions, or demand the institution of those conditions in which wants could be satisfied, without upholding the standards that allowed for the creation of those conditions. In both cases the individual was marked by a felt *distance*: for the minorities, it was felt between themselves and the standards they served to support culture; for the modern mass, it was felt between themselves and the objects of their desires that could be realized by demanding and by attaining social equality and the rights to the goods of civilization. Members of modern mass, despite being satisfied with themselves and their opinions, and therefore "hermeticized" internally, nonetheless externally evidenced a striving for something more than themselves, as manifested in their demands.

The *submass* experiences no such distance, at least not in those instances most definitive of this type. Whereas the select minorities were characterized by reflex control, and the modern mass by reflex demand, the submass is denoted by *reflex expectation*. The conditions demanded by the modern mass are felt by the submass to have been realized; that is, the submass feels that it has secured those conditions required to realize the satisfaction of its enhanced vital repertory. Whereas the modern mass demanded specific conditions without considering the coordination of self and circumstances required to attain these conditions, the submass does not even consider the conditions, for these conditions no longer appear to them as problematic. In a context perceived as safe and plentiful, the submass no longer demands satisfactions, but expects them. Except in instances of frustration—which are almost always perceived by the submass to be temporary and readily correctable deviations from the normal state of affairs—no distance is felt by members of the submass between themselves and the objects that provide gratification.¹⁸

Dissolving the distinction between the external and the internal causes this dissolution of distance, a process that Michael A. Weinstein calls the "externalization of the mind."¹⁹ With the ever-increasing domination of large-scale bureaucratic organizations and the profusion of images manufactured to modify and concentrate undifferentiated and unfocused desire, individuals of the submass are increasingly reduced to and exhausted by the functions and fictions comprising late-modern society. *Personality*—the coherent expression of a stable, unique and individual life, what Nietzsche called "a living multiplicity whose individual parts are dependent on one another, cleave to one another, are nourished by the same food, and as a whole possesses its own atmosphere and its own odour"²⁰—was present in the disciplined service of the select minorities and in the somewhat fixed character of the hermeticized, self-satisfied modern mass. But members of the submass lack personality, the con-

sistency that connects a life with its circumstances and congeals to produce a sturdy integration of body, mind, and world. The submass, pulverized beneath the over-flow of images and submersed in operations, exists whimsically, expecting and immediately attaining—that is, constituted by—the readily available sensory stimuli and pleasures of a fabricated world marked by *overchoice*—the situation occurring when seemingly secure individuals are overwhelmed by and dissolved into a myriad of trivial possibilities. Despite numerous differences—some of which are briefly articulated below—between this characterization of the submass and the ideas of Jean Baudrillard, his words for the “silent majorities” describe well this aspect of the submass:

The whole chaotic constellation of the social revolves around that spongy referent, that opaque but equally translucent reality, that nothingness.... [T]he social envelops them, like static electricity; but most of the time ... they absorb all the electricity of the social and political and neutralize it forever. They are neither good conductors of the political, nor good conductors of the social, nor good conductors of meaning in general. Everything flows through them, everything magnetises them, but diffuses throughout them without leaving a trace.... They do not radiate; on the contrary, they absorb radiation from the outlying constellations of State, History, Culture, Meaning.²¹

In the terms of this essay: *the hypertrophy of the social brings about the atrophy of the personality producing the submass.*

Ortega's aristocratic bent allowed him to see only the alternatives of being a responsible or an irresponsible social actor: one could *choose to defer* and be among the select; or one could *choose not to defer*, and instead demand, thereby being counted among the modern mass. But *for the submass deference is not an issue*: its members expect fancifully, directed only by what fascinates them in the expanses of the social sensorium, which includes sports, Reeboks, entertainment, pop music, telephone sex, gourmet ice cream, and the most fascinating sensory extension, television. Like body surfers in amusement park wave machines, members of the submass are carried along by artificial forces that at once support them and provide sensory satisfaction. As the wave pool cancels physical effort by overriding any attempt to counteract its forces, fabricated culture molds undifferentiated want by the use of technological enticements and advertising. This neutralizes the critical apparatus as reflection is no longer required to mediate relations between the individual and the world. The result is the elimination of centrality, the dissolution of the embodied self as a locus of decision making. Ortega's modern mass was characterized by an *undisciplined egoism*. It disregarded, and therefore became disconnected from, its proper relation to its circumstances. The submass reveals a *dissolved egoism*. It is fully immersed in the programs and products of its circumstances that are created specifically to divert attention and focus desire, thereby inhibit-

SUBMASS

ing reflection and the cultivation of distance. Unable to act as responsible agents, a "revolt of the submass" is impossible.

For Ortega's modern mass the body was the seat of already-existing demands, an active consumer of socially attainable, though not immediately available, social goods. The mind, though intellectually fixed with a rigid set of opinions, used cunning to mediate between the body that desired and the world that held the possibility for the satisfaction of those desires. For the submass, the body becomes a receiver of readily accessible stimuli, a passive participant in social immediacy (or immediate sociality—the two cannot be differentiated: for the submass, the social is the immediate, and the immediate is the social). The mind, lacking the standards of the select minorities or the fixed opinions of the modern mass, is incapable even of cunning, which requires the use of intellect. For the submass, any and all connections with the world are made through feeling; the faculty of judgment is cancelled, mediation is eliminated and distance dissolved. The use of reason (minorities) and cunning (modern masses) has been replaced in the submass by rationalizations—unthinking, automatic, and reactive justifications that serve as the first and only lines of defense when the fragility and superficiality of submass consciousness threatens to be exposed.

The modern mass merely lacked a *disposition* to respect, but the submass lacks the *ability* to respect standards. Lacking respect entails that nothing is "held above," that nothing greater demands service. But not having the ability to respect means that for the submass "holding above" itself is beyond its capabilities. Thus, the members of the submass do not live superficially because standards and ideals are not present, but because, as spongy referents, who are attracted to everything but to whom nothing sticks, they can have access only to sensations and to immediate identifications that are ever in need of reinforcement. Available standards are beyond their powers of comprehension and assimilation.

The characteristics of the submass are continually revealed in each of us: whenever one immediately expects the instant replay at a live sporting event; when frustration is caused by a two-minute wait at a fast food outlet or clothing store, and when this frustration is quelled by tasteless and overcooked processed beef or a drastically over-priced garment with the "right" label; when those receiving mailings from department and food stores excitedly scurry to redeem triple coupons on advertised items they do not need and which five minutes before they did not want; when depression, anxiety, or boredom is eradicated by going to the mall where one can be diverted and reconstituted; when the writer using an almost-full floppy disk has a moment of yelling at and resenting a computer for not being able to save an evening's work; when television viewers involuntarily "talk back" to images projected on a cathode ray tube, or when they chastise "stupid" executives for showing "stupid" commercials and "stupid" shows rather than "good" ones, although they

can give no coherent reasoning to support these feelings that constitute their judgments.²² These examples can be multiplied many times and extended to include at least some of the mental, emotional, and behavioral processes of every member of late-modern society. Anyone actively participating in social and cultural matters cannot completely escape the influence of technologies that provide for the instantaneous generation and satisfaction of expectations while dissolving the self by eliminating the need to cultivate reflective distance.

The next generation, however, will embody the characteristics of the submass to an even greater degree, and may signal its full arrival. A new generation of toys allow children to "interact" with talking and moving bears, to sing-along with pop heroes on record players and radios with built-in microphones, to engage their television sets with electronic devices that respond to their prompts, and to sit in their living rooms and participate in game shows with Gus Glitz—their "personal" well-groomed and obnoxious host. For these children, raised in well-protected environments structured to cultivate the characteristics of the submass, the creative imagination is cancelled. The distinction between the real world and the falsified world is all but completely obscured.

The Pseudo-Culture of the Submass

Members of the submass sometimes overflow with confidence, but are easily made despondent and self-doubting. This points to an essential instability in the submass, indicating the lack of a durable and a concrete self. This solid self can only result from a sustained effort to reflect on one's inwardness and to demarcate one's boundaries. But this process, necessary to develop a self, is beyond the reach of those unable to attain distance from the world of functions and fictions. Effects of this radical uncertainty—or lack of personality—of the submass are the creation of spurious stability, bogus individuation, and the increase in safe, comfortable, fully-controlled and completely self-contained environments that eliminate the need to deal with the outside world. Genuine culture—whether the healthy culture guided by the select minorities or the degenerate culture associated with the rise of the modern mass, both described by Ortega—coalesces into a coherent totality expressing vitality and world-involvement. Contemporary phenomena, however, exemplify what is best called pseudo-culture, which is marked by dispersion and world-avoidance, and which fails "to exhibit a stylistic unity within which the manifold of phenomena which characterize it are harmonized."²³

Artificially produced stability—the creation by a pseudo-elite of meanings and contexts intended to be felt immediately by the submass as providing substance and structure, although providing these only par-

SUBMASS

tially, and even then only fleetingly—is the means by which the submass flees the world, relieves pent-up hostilities and gains satisfactions. One form that this artificial stability takes is the construction of shared meanings that simulate the world and come to the person through the processed media. Television news, soaps, series, and movies, as well as popular papers, magazines, novels, and films, allow members of the submass to identify with the characters and worlds portrayed, and thus give a sense of continuity and structure to that individual. But in each instance verisimilitude is produced: the appearance of truth is substituted for the real thing. For example, television news and *U.S.A. Today* condense complex events to bite-sized morsels that can be consumed and digested as easily and in as much time as it takes to gulp down a bowl of a currently fashionable cereal. These leave the viewer—most popular news sources, including many of those that have traditionally been read, now use visual images to call forth identifications and arouse sensations without demanding from the viewer the minimal effort required for reading—a passive receptacle of feelings and attitudes who lacks an intellectual grasp of the issues at hand. Television shows depicting flamboyant lives and exotic places, soap operas, scandal sheets, Hollywood films, and game shows are those products of pseudo-culture that are meant to dissolve distance and criticism, and which call forth immediate identifications that vicariously satisfy fantasies or purge resentment. *Wheel of Fortune*, state-sanctioned lotteries, Steven Spielberg movies, Christmas bears, *The Cosby Show*, romance novels, pornography, and *Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous* each allow the submass—a group of passive participants—to escape immediately to fantasy worlds filled with beautiful bodies, big bucks, adventure, devoted lovers, famous friends, or the “nice and cute,” depending on preference. *Sable*, *The Equalizer*, *60 Minutes*, *Rambo*, *True Detective*, and professional wrestling allow watchers to displace resentful hostility, suppressed in the sterile environments of professional life, by identifying with the fictional characters who perpetrate violence on those who deserve it. The success of Rocky Balboa, *Dynasty*, Sally, Oprah, and Phil, *Murder, She Wrote*, big-time sports, and *The Enquirer* is a consequence of their ability to simultaneously satisfy both these functions. Artificial stability is also attained through identification with seemingly stable bureaucratic functions created to promote and to distribute pseudo-cultural material. In each case these pseudo-cultural products and programs relieve psychological discomfort—stemming from either frustration or *ressentiment*—safely and efficiently across society.

The assimilation of popular fictions and functions nullifies the often problematic engagement with the real world, which may bring to light original insights that disrupt everyday life and result in serious reflection. Those popular cultural oddities, instances of serious, creative, and easily accessed public expression containing existential motifs demanding effort and reflection by the viewer—the films of Woody Allen or the

infamous *Howard the Duck*—are almost always commercial failures or at best marginally profitable. Instead, popular fictions and functions substitute standardized schemes that call forth passive identifications and lead to familiar sensations, greatly decreasing the chances of attaining critical distance.

Bogus individuation—the identification with and consumption of pseudo-cultural products by members of the submass to constitute and evanescent self and gain fragile self-assurance—is how pseudo-personality is attained and sham confidence built. Only by incorporating fashions of dress, amusement, manner, and taste can members of the submass gain an identity. But, as opposed to members of the modern mass, who despite their neglect of standards still had a somewhat fixed identity in their self-sameness, the submass has no fixity, durability, coherence, or predictability. The submass lacks self-relation, and therefore is incapable of self-direction and susceptible to manipulation and to accidents of circumstance. Compared to Ortega's civilized barbarians, members of the submass are *civilized chameleons*, changing colors almost naturally, without effort or consciousness of doing so. Sustained exposure to similar settings may leave a nest of preferences that can remain over time, but these can hardly serve as the basis for a stable, integral personality, and may be dissolved quickly by immersion in new surroundings. If the individuals constituted through identifications with the fictions and functions of modern life were not continually reaffirmed by advertising, institutions, predominate ways of thinking, and other individuals, the proliferation of images would likely lead to relativization and the subsequent questioning of the validity of these images—though in the submass the separation of the images and the individual is only theoretical: in pure cases the two cannot be distinguished. With each identification and subsequent avouchment, members of the submass receive a hit of confidence, an ego-builder, and can say "I am." But these fictions and confidences require continual reaffirmation because they do not create an integrated and lasting center of consciousness, but an artificial and rapidly decaying unstable isotope that radiates nothing. This unstable, decaying isotope, the pseudo-self of the submass, is sustained only as long as the ever-dissolving conditions allowing for the creation and the continuance of these fictions and functions can be maintained.

The most radical development that shows the coming of the submass and that combines the tendencies toward stability and individuation is the increase of safe, controlled, self-contained, and completely artificial environments. Prepackaged holidays organized by Club Med and Disney World provide the vacationer with total environments, including predetermined "new" experiences and preplanned "adventures." The family room, replete with television, stereo, and v.c.r., all on remotes, cordless phone and other electronic amenities, allows members of the submass to "experience" the completely simulated world, entirely mediated in and through a technological sensorium. The mall, the paradigm of self-

SUBMASS

contained artificial environments, is the incredibly safe, climate-controlled, human-made arena in which one can comfortably work, play, walk about, shop, eat, drink, bank, have health needs tended to, and even be married.²⁴ Television videos are replacing muzak in department, clothing, music, book, and food stores at the mall, reinforcing receptivity to pseudo-cultural products by comforting shoppers with their homes' technological centerpiece and primary sensory extender. The mall is the modern utopia: filled with lights, colors, sounds, smells, images, and products to fill the senses, focus desire, and excite reflex expectation, the mall allows for each of these expectations of the submass to be met immediately, without effort, reflection, or frustration. As comfortable as children in their mothers' arms, mall-goers display relaxed confidence in their timeless sanctuary. Unlike Ortega's modern mass, who demanded palaces because they were not content with indoor plumbing, in the mall members of the submass are fully satisfied, given substance, form, and identity by the panorama of paraphernalia that encloses and constitutes them.

The family room and mall exemplify what trend analyst Faith Popcorn has called *cocooning*: erecting environments "that provide control, comfort and security against what they perceive as a harsh outside world."²⁵ This perception of a hostile external—real—world, although avoided through the means described above, indicates a radical insecurity and underlying world-hatred on the part of the submass. Whereas the neglect of the modern mass manifested itself as radical ingratitude, the civilized chameleons of the submass reveal selflessness and repressed hatred for the foundations of civilization through the falsifications of personality and environment. Psychologically, the submass shows not a neglect of culture and its foundations, but repressed feelings of inadequacy, as evidenced in the defense mechanisms of withdrawal and denial. Technological advances have made pathological retreat from the real world common among the submass, thereby hindering and, in extreme cases, eliminating the development of a substantial ego. External reality is systematically denied. As a result, internal and external realities are replaced by the falsifications described above. Sociologically, the information, manufacture, amusement, and fashion technologies create hostels apart from the external world. Everything "outside" appears to the submass as already falsified and in digestible hunks, which are received through the information-generating and the information-distributing systems. Society does not demand or encourage the organization, mobilization, or integration of the individual as either a self-centered or socially responsible agent. Society, as dissolved into meta-circumstances, accentuates the failure of culture to attain rational and responsible organization through adequate leadership, as well as the *ressentiment* of the submass resulting from its inability to act effectively in the real world of strangers, toxic waste, and violent crime.

The Possibility of Personality?

Humans are, at least, embodied consciousnesses, condemned to suffer and die, who can demarcate their boundaries, differentiate themselves from what they are not, and construct personalities. The possibility of grasping an individuated life from within, from a critical, self-conscious center of fleshy awareness, remains a live option. This is expressed by Ortega's well-known phrase: "My life is the radical reality."²⁶ Ortega did not mean to say that my life is the only reality, but that only through my life do I have access to all other realities. My life contains and refers to that which is other; but my life, personal and concrete, is also marked off from everything other, which is most clearly evidenced in what Max Stirner called a declaration of ownness.²⁷ Re-centering of this type, which requires the establishment of an ego strong enough to acknowledge its physical and psychological limitations and still engage in free and joyous judgment and action, can give the self to itself.

Thus, Baudrillard's claim that reality has been abolished, leaving only simulation in which everything vanishes in a play of signs, must be denied. Although his analysis is oftentimes cogent, he overlooks what Unamuno called "the man of flesh and bone,"²⁸ the real living person, thinking and acting in space and in time. The metaphors of text, sign, and simulation break apart on the individuated embodied consciousness, on fleshy awareness, which, through inadequate cultivation and self-forgetting, serves as the substratum that makes the submass possible. Contrary to what is implied by Baudrillard, individuals can have greater or lesser degrees of contact with and clearheadedness about the *real circumstances* in which they live. Meta-circumstances, created to provide a false sense of security, to hide unpleasant occurrences, or to hinder critical assessment, are falsifications. The world in which we live is insecure, unpleasant, and troublesome. Murder, rape, and starvation, as well as lifestyles of the rich and famous, are decidedly different from the fictionalized accounts of these intentionally misrepresented in the mass media. Even members of the submass are forced to make this distinction when their family rooms are broken into or when they are assaulted in mall parking lots.

Unlike Ortega, however, I offer no schedule of reforms to rectify the conditions that have brought about the submass. Programs of social reform cannot be differentiated from the other fantasies that fascinate the submass. Social and political reformist fictions are predicated on the possibility of widespread reflection and responsible action, and as such are as outdated as they are ignored by the bulk of the submass. The few still constituted by these fictions have failed to recognize the ever-changing insubstantiality of the submass.²⁹ A "reformation of submass society" is as impossible as a "revolt of the submass."

SUBMASS

As I see it, the history of philosophy has been a series of serious attempts, by individuals having disciplined minds and well-established personalities, to demarcate the boundaries and to identify the most significant aspects of radically flawed and finite human life, and to present and to embody well-considered strategies for living. In late modernity, the coming of the submass has retarded this undertaking by destroying critical distance. The construction of an organized personality needed for philosophical activity can only be secured by combatting the influences that have resulted in constituting the submass, influences which almost certainly infuse each one of us to some degree. Nevertheless, I share Ortega's view that civilization did not sustain itself, but that it required the support of those interested in its continuation and its enhanced vitality. Borrowing the words of a wise friend, I offer that "personality is not something to be taken for granted, that merely grows, but is something that can be lost and that, therefore, must be protected and cultivated."³⁰ Such a project is, by definition, personal, and therefore cannot serve as the basis of a widespread public movement, even if large numbers could be mobilized as self-conscious agents. Nonetheless, the cultivation of personality, although an individual affair, gains its warrant as the basis of all genuine creative production, and the seat of philosophy.

Department of Philosophy
Regis College
Denver, Colorado

Notes

1. Jose Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1932), 11.
2. Special thanks to Mr. Donald Hanover for suggesting this term and some of its implications.
3. "Mass phenomena" do not refer to the conglomeration of multitudes in socio-cultural space and time—though these, too, are mass phenomena—but to a widespread set of mental, emotional, and behavioral processes common to members of modern society. The basic characteristics of the mass are the lack of reflection and control. For a classic and in-depth description of mass phenomena see: Gustav LeBon, *The Crowd* (Marietta, GA: Larlin, 1984).
4. Ortega, *The Revolt of the Masses*, 13.
5. *Ibid.*, 14-15.
6. *Ibid.*, 65.
7. *Ibid.*, 17.
8. *Ibid.*, 24.
9. *Ibid.*, 55-56.

JAMES CADELLO

10. Ibid., 57-58.
11. Ibid., 57.
12. Ibid., 58.
13. Ibid., 58.
14. Ibid., 68.
15. Ibid., 72.
16. Emily S. Hamblen, *Friedrich Nietzsche and His New Gospel* (Boston: The Gorham Press, 1911), 73.
17. Ibid., 87.
18. This point about the collapse of reflective distance of the self from circumstances was first articulated by Karl Mannheim in "The Democratization of Culture," in *From Karl Mannheim*, ed. Kurt H. Wolff, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971).
19. Michael A. Weinstein, *Finite Perfection* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), 6-7.
20. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 351.
21. Jean Baudrillard, *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1983), 1-2.
22. These examples come from my experiences of the past few days. Despite this, I do not believe I embody submass characteristics to a greater degree than most people around me, but only that I am more aware of these characteristics in my life that most others are aware of them in their lives.
23. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 8.
24. "People in the News," *Hartford Courant*, 1 August 1987, 2.
25. Annetta Miller, "Putting Faith in Trends," *Newsweek*, 15 June 1987, 46-47.
26. Jose Ortega y Gasset, *What is Philosophy?* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1960).
27. Max Stirner, *The Ego and His Own* (New York: Boni and Liveright, n.d.).
28. Miguel de Unamuno, *Tragic Sense of Life* (New York: Dover, 1954).
29. Compare to Jean Baudrillard, *Simulations* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1983), 37.
30. Weinstein, *Finite Perfection*, 164.