U.S. ADAPTATION

CONSUMERISM: THE OPIUM OF THE PEOPLE

Small Pleasures, Endless Wants, and the Commodification of Life

NOOSOPHIE IA
under the direction of Hieronymus Anonymus
ÉDITIONS NOOSOPHIE

CONSUMERISM: THE OPIUM OF THE PEOPLE

Small Pleasures, Endless Wants, and the Commodification of Life

Noosophie IA
under the direction of Hieronymus Anonymus
Éditions Noosophie

EDITORIAL INFORMATION

Title: Consumerism: The Opium of the People
Subtitle: Small Pleasures, Endless Wants, and the Commodification of Life
Author: Noosophie IA
Direction: Hieronymus Anonymus
Publisher: Éditions Noosophie
Current publishing entity: Association Noosophie
Public location: Roumagne, Lot-et-Garonne, France
Website: noosophie.fr
Edition: U.S. Adaptation - Native Prose Edition v1.5.1
Source edition: Official U.S. adaptation derived from the French edition Consumérisme : l'opium du peuple

Publication date: September 2026
Format: A5 digital edition (PDF) / DOCX master
ISBN: To be assigned
Price: Free
License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
Rights holder / licensor: Hieronymus Anonymus (public pseudonym; civil identity not published)
© Hieronymus Anonymus
Contact: contact@noosophie.fr
This edition is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). It may be copied and shared unchanged, with attribution, for noncommercial purposes. Distribution of a translation, adaptation, modified version, or derivative work requires prior authorization. Requests: contact@noosophie.fr.
License reference: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Legal deposit: September 2026

NOTE ON GENERATION AND EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

This book was developed through a collaboration between Hieronymus Anonymus and Noosophe AI. Hieronymus Anonymus initiated the project, defined its subject and purposes, arbitrated its orientations, reviewed, corrected, and validated the final manuscript. Noosophe AI contributed to documentary research, structuring, drafting, comparison of arguments, coherence checks, and editing.

The text is therefore neither raw model output nor a human text merely corrected by AI. It results from an iterative process of generation, critique, verification, correction, and human validation. Decisions about purpose, values, final validation, and publication remain human.

ABOUT THIS U.S. ADAPTATION

This edition is a U.S. adaptation rather than a mechanical translation. The French edition remains the intellectual source. French examples and institutions were retained, contextualized, replaced, or removed according to the function they served; U.S.-specific factual claims were re-researched from American sources.

The principal references and sources are grouped at the end of each chapter.

ABOUT THE TITLE

The title The Opium of the People deliberately echoes the phrase associated with Karl Marx in relation to religion. The echo is limited to one precise function: consolation can relieve suffering without removing its cause, and can make an order more bearable through rewards, promises, or compensation.

This choice is neither a tribute to Marxism nor an endorsement of its philosophical, economic, or political system. The book does not offer a Marxist reading of consumerism and does not place Noosophy within a Marxist lineage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

HAPPINESS THAT MUST BE RENEWED

We consume because we are alive. We eat, wear clothes, move around, heat and cool our homes, equip ourselves, learn, play, travel, and entertain ourselves. There is no serious critique of consumerism that can begin by treating objects, comfort, buying, or pleasure as moral failures.

The trouble begins elsewhere.

Consumption becomes consumerism when renewing demand stops being merely one consequence of human needs and desires and becomes an important condition of keeping the economic and cultural system in motion. If production is expected to keep expanding, demand must keep returning. When most households already own a refrigerator, a television, a car, a phone, or a full set of basic appliances, growth can no longer depend only on first-time access. New functions, styles, categories, upgrades, identities, urgencies, and reasons for replacement become economically valuable. A product can remain physically usable while becoming commercially old. And when repeatedly selling a new object becomes harder, another model becomes attractive: stop selling the thing outright and keep selling access to it.

That, in this book, is consumerism.

Consumerism is not simply “consuming a lot.” It is an economic, cultural, and psychological arrangement in which the renewal of consumption becomes one of the mechanisms through which the system reproduces itself. Advertising is part of it, but consumerism is not reducible to advertising. Capitalism provides much of its institutional environment, but consumerism is not a synonym for

capitalism. Nor is it adequately explained as a personal moral weakness.

It grows out of mechanisms that reinforce one another: mass production, credit, marketing, product differentiation, status, desire, infrastructure, taxation, retail, innovation, planned and unplanned obsolescence, globalization, subscriptions, automated payments, and the conversion of more areas of life into transactions.

None of those mechanisms is automatically bad.

Credit can make an essential purchase possible. Mass production can make useful goods affordable to millions of people. Advertising can convey real information. Innovation can produce genuine improvements. A subscription can be more rational than ownership. Comfort can make life better. A purchase can create joy, support a craft, strengthen a relationship, or make a real transformation possible.

The critique begins when these mechanisms become organized around a recurring constraint: demand has to start again.

WHEN ENOUGH BECOMES A PROBLEM

An economy capable of producing enormous quantities of goods eventually encounters a simple difficulty: people may end up with enough.

From the standpoint of satisfaction, that should count as success. If households have the durable goods they need, if food is sufficient, if homes are adequately equipped, and if basic material needs are secure, then production has accomplished something. But from the standpoint of an economic system that depends on repeated transactions and continuing expansion, satisfaction can also become a problem.

Three forms of satiation recur throughout this book.

The first is economic. A market slows because most potential buyers already own the product. The second is cultural. Present satisfaction must remain temporary enough for desire to renew. The

third is institutional. Wealth, ownership, market share, or power may have no built-in point at which the structure itself says: enough.

These are not the same phenomenon, and they should not be collapsed into one psychological story. They can, however, reinforce one another.

Consumerism therefore does more than produce goods. It also produces, renews, and relocates reasons to acquire them.

A lack can become demand. Novelty can become reward. Identity can become a brand. Status can become a product tier. Comfort can become a baseline expectation. Future income can be committed through credit to pay for present satisfaction. Loneliness, boredom, recognition, self-transformation, belonging, and even moral aspiration can be offered commercial responses.

That does not mean every commercial response is false. A gym membership can genuinely support a healthier life. A musical instrument can become part of a person's identity in the deepest and most durable sense. A well-designed tool can expand autonomy. A trip can change a person. A gift can express love.

The narrower claim is this: a commercial system has a standing incentive to discover new human functions that can be tied to transactions.

WHY "THE OPIUM OF THE PEOPLE"?

The title deliberately echoes Karl Marx's famous description of religion as the "opium of the people."

This is not a declaration of Marxism. The argument that follows does not adopt Marx's philosophy, economics, politics, or interpretation of religion, and Integrative Noosophy is not being placed inside a Marxist lineage.

The borrowing is much narrower than the slogan suggests.

Opium names a function of consolation. Pain can be relieved without its cause being removed. Dissatisfaction can receive a real

but temporary answer. A social order can become easier to endure when it provides rewards, diversions, identities, promises, rituals, and compensation.

Consumerism can sometimes work that way.

It offers real pleasures. It can make life easier, more interesting, more comfortable, and sometimes more free. But it can also translate lack into purchase, reward into replacement, accomplishment into acquisition, and the present into a sequence of small salvations that must soon be renewed.

Even the opium metaphor is incomplete. Modern consumerism sometimes resembles opium in its consoling function, ecstasy in its promise of happiness, and amphetamine in its demand to keep going. That is a cultural metaphor, not a neurological claim. Dopamine is not simply a "pleasure chemical," and consumers are not addicts by definition.

The title is meant to provoke a question, not impose an identity:

What happens when a society learns to make the renewal of satisfaction one of its permanent engines?

THE CONSUMER IS NEITHER SOVEREIGN NOR POWERLESS

Two caricatures make consumerism difficult to understand.

The first says the consumer is sovereign. Businesses merely respond to preferences that already exist. People buy because they want to buy, and the market simply gives them what they choose.

The second says the opposite. Consumers are passive victims of an all-powerful machine that manufactures desire from the outside.

Neither account gets us very far.

Our desires are real, but they do not arise in a vacuum. They develop inside cultures, infrastructures, price systems, neighborhoods, workplaces, peer groups, media environments,

platforms, marketing systems, algorithms, habits, and material constraints.

A person can sincerely love a product while also having learned to associate it with status. Someone can genuinely want more convenience while living in a built environment that makes a car, a smartphone, or a particular service difficult to avoid. A person can be influenced without being determined. They can understand that an advertisement is persuasive and still respond to it. They can resist a mechanism without becoming immune to it.

Economic freedom therefore cannot mean only choosing among the products available. It also includes the practical ability to recognize when no purchase is necessary.

No single guilty actor explains consumerism. The system lies in the relationships among them.

THE ARGUMENT IN EIGHT MOVEMENTS

Chapter 1 follows the making of the modern consumer through industrialization, rationalized production, mass manufacturing, credit, advertising, product differentiation, and the historical problem of market saturation.

Chapter 2 turns to the machinery of renewed desire: attention, anticipation, reward, impulse buying, marketing, neuromarketing, reduced friction, and the reflective capacity to put distance between wanting and acting.

Chapter 3 moves from mechanism to meaning. When commodities promise identity, belonging, transformation, status, and happiness, consumerism can begin to perform some functions comparable—within strict limits—to those of an implicit religion of the present.

Chapter 4 returns to the material basis of those promises: obsolescence, repairability, durability, maintenance, product life cycles, and the tension between renewal through replacement and renewal through transformation.

Chapter 5 examines the asymmetry among poverty, wealth, and property. People with little money may be forced to buy repeatedly what they cannot afford to buy durably once. People with great wealth can keep accumulating long after personal consumption has reached practical limits. Sufficiency then becomes a question of income, wealth, and political power.

Chapter 6 follows consumerism across borders. Consumer culture does not merely intensify consumption in affluent societies; it enters new markets, meets local cultures, and can globalize products faster than infrastructure for nutrition, waste, repair, and end-of-life management can adapt.

Chapter 7 examines a newer transformation. When selling ever more objects runs into limits, the commercial relationship itself can become the product. Subscriptions, licenses, conditional access, ecosystem lock-in, microtransactions, and automated payments shift the commercial challenge from making another sale to keeping the payment relationship alive.

Chapter 8 rejects the ascetic conclusion. Leaving consumerism does not mean leaving pleasure. A critique that simply tells people to want less, enjoy less, and tolerate more deprivation abandons the very functions consumerism has learned to capture. The task is to uncouple pleasure, reward, identity, belonging, accomplishment, and transformation from permanent material renewal.

A CRITIQUE WITHOUT A PROMISE OF SALVATION

This book advances a strong thesis, but not a total explanation of the world.

Consumerism does not explain all ecological destruction. It does not explain all psychological suffering, inequality, addiction, debt, loneliness, or political domination. A society with lower material throughput would not automatically become just, happy, or integrated. Community organizations can fail. Ownership can

liberate or dominate. Sharing can reduce dependence or create new forms of it. Preservation is not always better than rupture.

Integrative Noosophy cannot answer the opium of consumerism by offering another all-purpose promise.

Its role here is narrower and more demanding: distinguish mechanisms, connect scales, identify contradictions, follow displaced costs, and test alternatives against reality.

A durable exit from consumerism cannot be reduced to “buy less.” It requires forms of pleasure, reward, autonomy, relationship, accomplishment, and sufficiency that do not depend on permanent material renewal.

The central question is not:

How do we stop consuming?

It is:

How do we recover the ability to recognize enough—and decide what truly deserves renewal?

CHAPTER 1

HOW WE BECAME CONSUMERS

A car can still work perfectly and already feel old.

It starts every morning. It gets its owner to work. It performs the function for which it was bought. Yet a few years later, the newer model has a different shape, screen, color palette, interface, and social meaning. Nothing material requires replacement. Something else has changed: the relationship between the owner and the object.

That ordinary experience contains much of the problem this book is trying to understand. The original need—transportation—may still be satisfied while the desire to acquire starts over. To see how that became normal, it is not enough to begin with advertising. We have to move backward through trade, capital accumulation, industrialization, the rationalization of work, mass production, consumer finance, marketing, and the moment when producing more required not only finding buyers but repeatedly renewing the reasons to buy.

CONSUMPTION IS NOT CONSUMERISM

Human beings did not wait for twentieth-century America to want things beyond strict necessity. Clothing, jewelry, spices, furniture, alcohol, art, religious objects, luxury goods, and visible signs of rank have long served comfort, pleasure, identity, distinction, and prestige. Historians have even debated a “consumer revolution” in parts of Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

That history rules out an easy story. There was no innocent age in which people bought only what they needed until modern American advertisers invented desire. Commercial desire is old. Long-distance trade is old. Status consumption is old.

Modern consumerism is something more specific.

Here, consumerism does not simply mean consuming a lot. It describes a social arrangement in which renewed consumption becomes part of economic and cultural reproduction. A society can trade extensively without asking people to replace what they own at a high rate. An economy can produce durable goods without making replacement the norm. Consumerism comes into view when the task is no longer only to satisfy demand, but to keep demand coming back.

FROM TRADE TO INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Modern consumerism grew out of institutions older than the modern consumer. European empires, chartered companies, merchants, states, monopolies, financial networks, colonial extraction, and mercantilist policies helped create long-distance systems of trade and capital accumulation. Those systems were diverse, and it would be misleading to call mercantilism simply capitalism before capitalism. Political power, military capacity, secure supply, and control of trade often mattered as much as private profit.

Industrialization changed the center of gravity. Capital was increasingly committed not just to purchasing goods for resale but to organizing production itself: machinery, factories, transportation, raw materials, wage labor, standardization, and large-scale coordination.

Industrialization brought new productive power—and a new tension.

Producing more is economically useful only if enough of what is produced can be sold. Capitalism and consumerism are not synonyms, and mass production does not create consumerism by itself. But as productive capacity rises, access to markets and the renewal of demand become increasingly important.

TAYLOR: MAKING WORK CALCULABLE

Before Ford, there was Frederick Winslow Taylor.

Taylor did not invent the factory, the division of labor, or the search for productivity. But he helped formalize a major turn in industrial management. In The Principles of Scientific Management, published in 1911, work became an object of systematic measurement. Tasks could be decomposed, motions observed, time recorded, methods compared, and procedures standardized.

The aim here is not to settle the social history of scientific management. Taylor matters to this story because, before modern firms learned to organize demand with increasing precision, industrial firms learned to organize production that way.

Taylor helped make work itself calculable.

Not every factory became Taylorist, and Ford did not simply copy Taylor. Scientific management and Fordism are distinct, but both belong to a broader transformation: measure, standardize, coordinate, accelerate.

FORD: MASS PRODUCTION AND THE EXPANSION OF THE MARKET

Henry Ford pushed that transformation to another scale.

The Model T, introduced in 1908, was built around standardization and large-volume production. Ford's experiments with the moving assembly line in 1913 sharply reduced production time and cost. The resulting efficiencies helped Ford lower prices and broaden the market. Roughly fifteen million Model Ts were eventually produced.

The famous Five-Dollar Day, announced in 1914, also needs to be handled carefully. It is often repeated as if Ford simply paid workers more so they could buy the cars they built. The history is less convenient. The moving assembly line created severe problems of turnover and worker retention. Higher pay helped attract and hold workers in a system of repetitive, tightly controlled labor. It also expanded purchasing power, but reducing the policy to a benevolent consumer strategy would turn history into a slogan.

The larger pattern is clear: higher productivity could lower unit costs; lower prices could widen the market; larger markets could justify still greater output.

Ford showed how to sell a car to millions of people who did not yet own one.

Success created the next problem: what happens once millions of people already own one?

PRODUCTION IS NOT ENOUGH

A company can grow for a long time by reaching first-time buyers. More households get electricity. More families buy

refrigerators. More people own cars, radios, televisions, washing machines, computers, and phones.

But markets for durable goods eventually face some form of saturation. Once a household already owns the thing, the next sale depends on something other than first access.

Several possibilities open up. Wait for the object to break. Improve it enough to make a replacement genuinely useful. Create a new use. Reach a new population. Make the purchase easier through financing. Or persuade the current owner that what still works is nevertheless ready to be replaced.

Here the distinction between consumption and consumerism becomes concrete.

From the standpoint of satisfying a need, a durable object that performs its function for a long time is a success. From the standpoint of a business whose growth depends on repeated sales, the same durability can become a commercial constraint.

That tension does not mean every company wants to manufacture bad products. Reliability can build a profitable reputation. Real innovation can create useful demand. Competition can improve quality. But once a first market is substantially equipped, continued growth depends increasingly on replacement, expansion, differentiation, or new forms of access.

THE 1920s: FINANCING AND CULTIVATING DEMAND

The United States in the 1920s is one of the clearest places to watch these mechanisms converge.

Automobiles and radios became emblematic mass-market goods. Chain stores expanded. Merchandising became more

sophisticated. Advertising agencies professionalized. Firms paid closer attention to consumer behavior. Installment buying became normalized for major purchases.

Credit changed the timing of consumption.

Without credit, a present desire may have to wait for future savings. With credit, the order can be reversed: the object is acquired now and future income is committed to paying for it later.

Credit need not create desire to matter. It can shorten the distance between desire and purchase.

For an economy looking for outlets for rising production, that shift matters. Demand is no longer limited in the same way by the cash a household has on hand at the moment of purchase. Production, distribution, advertising, merchandising, and finance begin to work less like separate activities and more like parts of a single path from product to transaction.

GENERAL MOTORS: WHEN A WORKING PRODUCT BECOMES OLD

The competition between Ford and General Motors makes the next transition unusually visible.

Ford's Model T strategy emphasized standardization, scale, reliability, and price. General Motors under Alfred P. Sloan developed a different model: multiple brands and price tiers, consumer financing, more product differentiation, and annual changes in styling.

The Smithsonian's National Museum of American History describes how GM used annual style changes to stimulate demand in a market increasingly concerned with saturation. New colors,

shapes, amenities, and sometimes technical changes encouraged owners to trade in cars that still functioned.

A basic commercial innovation appears here: a product can become economically old before it becomes physically unusable.

It only has to become socially or commercially outdated.

That is design obsolescence.

The mechanism is powerful precisely because it does not require destroying the object. It changes the meaning of the object. The old car still runs, but it no longer represents the same newness, status, technological identity, or sense of belonging to the present.

Ford demonstrated how to sell a car to someone who did not have one. GM helped demonstrate how to sell a new car to someone who already did.

The sentence compresses a far more complicated industrial history, but the shift is real. Saturation was no longer merely an external limit; design, financing, segmentation, and model renewal became ways of working on that limit.

WHEN DEMAND COLLAPSES

The Great Depression revealed the other side of this structure.

Consumer spending fell sharply after 1929. Credit contracted. Households cut purchases and tried to reduce debt. Production, employment, income, and consumption fell together.

It would be absurd to claim that declining consumption by itself caused the Great Depression. The crisis had intertwined financial, monetary, banking, industrial, international, and political causes.

The collapse nevertheless exposed something important. In a highly productive economy, consumption is not merely what happens after wealth has been produced. It becomes one of the conditions sustaining the activity that generates income and employment in the first place.

Demand is not only the end of the circuit.

It also helps keep the circuit moving.

AFTER WORLD WAR II: THE CONSUMER AS ECONOMIC CITIZEN

After World War II, the American relationship between mass consumption and public life became even more explicit.

Historian Lizabeth Cohen uses the term “Consumers’ Republic” for the postwar order in which mass consumption was presented as a route to prosperity, social progress, and democratic stability. Private purchasing acquired a public meaning. Buying a home, a car, appliances, furniture, vacations, and entertainment could be understood not only as satisfying private wants but also as supporting production, jobs, and national growth.

The consumer became a macroeconomic actor—and, in the political imagination of the period, almost a kind of economic citizen.

That order did not arise from advertising alone. It depended on mortgage finance, suburban construction, highways, shopping centers, electricity, fuel, household infrastructure, banking, public policy, and the spatial organization of American life. Federal housing and mortgage programs helped support the postwar housing boom, while federal and local policies also contributed to

patterns of racial segregation and unequal access to homeownership and suburban opportunity.

That history makes it impossible to reduce consumerism to a story in which corporations manipulate an otherwise passive population.

Businesses want to sell. Consumers may genuinely want more comfort, mobility, privacy, convenience, novelty, and status. Banks finance. Governments build infrastructure. Local development patterns make some choices easier and others harder. Employment depends on industries. Tax revenue depends on economic activity. Media depend partly on advertising. Households build their daily lives around the systems that result.

Those interests interlock.

Once enough institutions depend on expanding flows of transactions, “consume more” is no longer merely an individual behavior. It becomes a systemic requirement.

AMERICA DID NOT INVENT HUMAN DESIRE

A U.S. edition of this history carries a particular risk: making the United States look like the sole origin of modern consumerism and the rest of the world like a passive recipient.

That would repeat the very historical mistake this chapter is trying to avoid.

The American case is especially important because mass production, consumer finance, advertising, automobile culture, suburbanization, and postwar mass consumption developed there with exceptional scale and influence. But national trajectories differed. Postwar France, for example, experienced its own rapid expansion of household consumption during the

Trente Glorieuses, shaped by different welfare institutions, urban forms, labor rules, retail systems, taxation, and public services. Other societies combined mass consumption with still other institutional arrangements.

Not every country followed the American path.

Consumerism is adaptable. Its institutions vary, but the pressure to renew demand can remain recognizable across very different settings.

WHEN ENOUGH BECOMES A PROBLEM

We can now return to the car with which this chapter began.

Why replace something that still works?

Because modern economic history gradually assembled a set of capacities that make replacement easier to generate: manufacture at enormous scale, lower unit costs, distribute widely, finance purchases, command attention, differentiate products, segment buyers, and make a working object feel symbolically old before it becomes materially useless.

None of those capacities is consumerism by itself.

Credit can finance an essential need. Advertising can provide information. Innovation can make a product genuinely better. Mass production can make a useful good affordable. Trade can connect societies. A car can expand someone's freedom.

Consumerism appears when these mechanisms are organized around a recurring requirement: demand must continue.

That is where satiation becomes a problem.

In a logic of satisfaction, "I have what I need" describes success.

In a logic of permanently renewed sales, the same sentence describes a market that has stopped moving.

No conspiracy is required. A company does not need to decide in secret that people must never be satisfied. Organizations whose revenue, employment, investment plans, or market valuation depend on future sales have perfectly ordinary reasons to seek future sales.

An economy that learns to produce goods at scale can also learn to reproduce reasons to acquire them.

The critique begins there.

The economic need to renew purchasing now meets the cultural capacity to renew desire.

The next chapter follows that second process: how marketing, advertising, credit, reward mechanisms, identity, status, and persuasion can narrow the gap between seeing, wanting, and buying—and how reflection can reopen it before desire becomes action.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Frederick Winslow Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management, 1911; Library of Congress catalog and digitized collections.

Library of Congress, Prosperity and Thrift: The Coolidge Era and the Consumer Economy, 1921–1929; materials on advertising, merchandising, installment buying, and mass consumption.

The Henry Ford, historical materials on the Model T, the moving assembly line, production efficiency, and the Five-Dollar Day.

Smithsonian National Museum of American History, materials on General Motors, annual model changes, styling, and design obsolescence.

Library of Congress, Consumer Advertising During the Great Depression: A Resource Guide.

Lizabeth Cohen, A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, historical materials on postwar mortgage policy, suburbanization, and housing inequality.

CHAPTER 2

THE ENGINE OF RENEWED DESIRE

A notification appears. A sale ends in ten minutes. Something we had not planned to buy suddenly becomes present in our mind. We look at it, imagine using it, picture it in our home or on our body, and then begin producing reasons for acquiring it.

None of this guarantees a purchase. It does, however, isolate the problem at the center of this chapter: what happens when an economy that must keep renewing demand meets ordinary mechanisms of attention, anticipation, motivation, and reward?

The previous chapter showed how mass production, credit, advertising, and product differentiation made demand itself strategically important. Producing more is not enough. Someone must still want to acquire what is produced.

Consumerism cannot merely produce objects. It has to keep producing reasons to want them.

WANTING IS NOT THE SAME AS LIKING

Popular accounts of the brain have often described dopamine as a “pleasure chemical.” That formula is memorable, but it is misleading.

Research associated with Kent Berridge, Terry Robinson, and others distinguishes between “liking,” the hedonic impact of a reward, and “wanting,” the motivational pull or incentive salience attached to it. The two processes often travel together,

but they are not identical. A person can intensely want something without enjoying it in proportion once it is obtained. The distinction is especially clear in addiction research, but the underlying warning is broader: motivation and pleasure should not be collapsed into one mechanism.

For consumerism, the difference is crucial.

A person can anticipate a delivery for days, repeatedly check the tracking page, feel a surge of excitement when the package arrives, open it, enjoy it briefly, and then return to an ordinary emotional baseline. The wanting may have been intense even if the lasting satisfaction is modest.

The purchase can complete the behavioral cycle even when the happiness barely lasts.

Consumerism does not need every purchase to make us happy for long. It needs desire to be able to begin again.

Ordinary consumption is not addiction; collapsing the two would erase important differences. The narrower point is that human motivation responds to learned cues, anticipation, novelty, and reward—and commercial systems have strong incentives to work with those mechanisms.

FROM CUE TO ACTION

A cue associated with reward can acquire motivational importance of its own. A logo, a sound, a notification badge, a packaging style, a familiar store layout, a discount banner, or a product image can attract attention because experience has taught us that it predicts something desirable.

A useful simplified sequence is:

cue → attention → anticipation → desire → evaluation → possible action.

The last word matters: possible.

Seeing is not wanting. Wanting is not deciding. Deciding is not yet acting.

Consumerism becomes especially effective when commercial design narrows the distance between those stages.

Digital commerce makes that effort unusually visible. Saved addresses, stored cards, one-tap checkout, personalized recommendations, push notifications, abandoned-cart reminders, countdown timers, scarcity messages, and preselected options can all reduce the time or effort between impulse and transaction.

None of these features is inherently deceptive. Friction can be annoying; saved payment methods and reminders can be genuinely useful. The design question is whether an interface helps users carry out decisions they have already made or deliberately makes reconsideration harder.

The Federal Trade Commission uses the term “dark patterns” for design practices that can trick or manipulate users into purchases, subscriptions, disclosures of data, or other actions they might not otherwise choose. Its examples include false urgency, hidden fees, disguised advertising, interface interference, and cancellation processes designed to be harder than enrollment. These are not proofs that every streamlined interface manipulates consumers. They are evidence that the architecture of choice can itself become a commercial instrument.

Commerce then does more than wait for a decision. It helps shape the timing and structure of the decision itself.

IMPULSE BUYING — AND WHEN IT BECOMES COMPULSIVE

Impulse buying is not an obscure anomaly. Retail environments have always been designed partly around unplanned purchases, but digital commerce can intensify the process by combining immediacy, personalization, persistent availability, and reduced payment friction.

A fast decision is not necessarily a bad one. People often know what they want, and speed can be rational. The harder question is whether the commercial environment preserves the consumer's ability to evaluate or compresses the interval in which evaluation might interrupt the purchase.

At the far end of this spectrum are clinically problematic forms of compulsive buying-shopping behavior. Recent research describes patterns involving persistent or excessive buying, impaired control, mood modification, continuation despite negative consequences, and significant distress or functional impairment.

Two opposite errors follow.

The first is to say that every consumer is addicted. That is false.

The second is to conclude that because most consumers are not addicted, addiction-like or compulsive patterns have no economic importance. That is also false.

A market does not need most users to consume intensively for a small group to matter economically. In some digital markets, especially those built around repeated microtransactions, a minority of very high spenders can account for a disproportionate share of revenue. The useful test is not whether everyone is "addicted," but how much the business model

depends on unusually intense consumption—and what happens if that intensity falls.

That has to be tested market by market. Alcohol, tobacco, gambling, gaming, ultra-processed food, fashion, and digital services do not share one behavioral structure, and no single model can be imposed on all of them without distortion.

WHEN MARKETING SELLS MORE THAN THE PRODUCT

Marketing does not perform a single function.

Some marketing is primarily informational: price, dimensions, availability, performance, compatibility, features.

Some is persuasive: it argues that one product is better than another.

And some is associative: it links the product to a larger meaning—status, sexuality, belonging, youth, security, freedom, competence, success, modernity, identity.

The associative level is the one that matters most here.

When an ad implies that a fragrance means desirability, a vehicle means power, a phone means social connection, or a brand means a particular kind of person, it is no longer describing only the material function of the product. It is building a symbolic relationship.

The commodity becomes the carrier of a promise larger than itself.

The promise is not always false. Clothes can affect confidence. A tool can support competence. A musical instrument can become central to identity. A vehicle can provide real freedom in a place

built around driving. The distinction lies between the function the object actually delivers and the broader human meaning attached to it through repeated association.

Marketing is especially powerful when that association feels natural rather than constructed.

MEASURING ATTENTION IS NOT READING THE MIND

Neuromarketing and consumer neuroscience attempt to measure aspects of consumer response that questionnaires may not capture well. Techniques can include eye tracking, EEG, electrodermal activity, heart-rate measures, and sometimes brain imaging.

These tools can produce real data. They are not magic.

Nor do they provide direct access to a consumer's thoughts.

Eye tracking can show where a person looked and for how long. It cannot, by itself, tell us whether the person admired, distrusted, mocked, analyzed, or disliked what they saw. Electrodermal activity can indicate physiological arousal without telling us whether the arousal reflects excitement, anxiety, irritation, surprise, or some mixture. EEG can provide useful temporal information while facing interpretive and technical limits. Consumer-neuroscience research itself has emphasized that brain and physiological measures require careful interpretation and do not justify a simplistic brain-to-purchase reading.

Attention is not preference.

Fixation is not desire.

Physiological activation is not approval.

Brain activity is not a purchase decision.

Consider a simple example. Someone looks closely at an advertisement on a subway platform. They study the face, slogan, product placement, logo, color, body posture, and framing. An eye tracker would correctly record sustained attention.

But why are they looking?

They may be attracted.

They may be trying to understand how the ad is attempting to attract them.

They may find it ridiculous.

They may be irritated and examining the technique precisely because they reject it.

The attention measurement can be accurate while the interpretation is wrong.

Physiological measurement is useful precisely when it is not asked to do more than it can. A human decision cannot be reduced to the first measurable reaction that precedes it.

PRIMARY THOUGHT AND ACTION-GUIDING THOUGHT

For this book, one local Noosophical distinction is useful. It is not a standard category of experimental psychology, nor is it being presented as a universally established concept.

Primary thought is the first reaction that appears in contact with a stimulus: attraction, aversion, curiosity, fear, excitement, association, impulse.

Action-guiding thought is the representation that actually guides conduct after other information, costs, purposes,

contradictions, and values have had a chance to enter the decision.

Integration creates room between the first reaction and the judgment that guides action.

It does not erase the first reaction.

An ad can attract us.

An object can make us want it.

We can feel a clear impulse: I want that.

Integration adds another set of questions: Why? For what function? What would this actually change? What will it cost in money, future labor, space, maintenance, dependence, or waste? Do I already own something that performs the same function? Will this matter to me after the anticipation is gone?

The first reaction becomes evidence in the decision rather than the decision itself.

We can sketch two trajectories.

A weakly mediated trajectory:

stimulus → primary reaction → desire → local justification → purchase.

A more integrated trajectory:

stimulus → primary reaction → identification → comparison with needs, costs, and purposes → possible contradiction → action-guiding thought → purchase or non-purchase.

The aim is not to stop wanting things.

It is to stop treating desire as an instruction.

WHEN REASONING TURNS INTO A DEFENSE ATTORNEY

A second problem appears after the impulse: reasoning can arrive too late to evaluate the desire and just in time to defend it.

Reasoning can look perfectly rational while serving a conclusion that has already been chosen.

We see an object. We want it. Then the reasons arrive: I'll use it. It's on sale. The old one is getting dated. I work hard. I deserve it. It will last. I can always resell it.

Some of those reasons may be true.

What are those reasons doing?

Are they evaluating the purchase—or defending it?

A line of reasoning can be coherent around the local goal "buy this" while excluding opportunity cost, maintenance, storage, future work needed to pay for it, the existence of an already adequate alternative, or the likely brevity of the satisfaction.

The Noosophical test is not simply whether I have reasons.

It is which reasons I have left out.

And especially:

What will this purchase actually change?

WHEN NOT BUYING FEELS LIKE DEPRIVATION

Consumerism becomes culturally powerful when declining an unnecessary purchase feels like deprivation rather than like the ordinary condition of someone who does not need the item.

In a logic of sufficiency, a purchase requires a positive reason: a need, a function, a pleasure, a project, or some other purpose that justifies the cost.

In a consumerist logic, desire plus ability to pay can become almost sufficient by themselves: I want it, and I can afford it.

Then the burden of justification flips.

Why not enjoy yourself?

Why deprive yourself?

Why keep the old one?

Why not upgrade?

Why not treat yourself?

The market no longer has to prove that each object is necessary. It only has to sustain a culture in which the opportunity to acquire something already counts as a reason to do so.

CREDIT CLOSES THE GAP

Consumer credit historically separated the moment of purchase from the moment a buyer possessed the full amount of money required. Contemporary digital credit can narrow that gap further.

Buy Now, Pay Later is a clear U.S. example. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau describes the common pay-in-four model as a retail credit product that splits a purchase into several installments and documents its rapid expansion in the United States since 2019. The CFPB also notes both advantages and risks: these products can be easy to access and may avoid interest, while repeated use, automatic payments, data-driven marketing,

and borrower overextension can create problems for some users. More recent CFPB research found that many BNPL users held multiple simultaneous loans and that users were, on average, more likely than nonusers to carry other forms of financial stress —while also emphasizing that those differences do not by themselves prove that BNPL caused the stress.

The caution is important.

BNPL does not by itself cause impulsivity or debt. But payment architecture changes the decision environment. The same purchase can feel different when framed as four smaller payments instead of one full price. The comparison can quietly shift from “Should I buy this?” to “Which payment schedule is easiest?”

More broadly, digital commerce stacks reductions in friction: saved accounts, one-click purchasing, fast delivery, deferred payment, algorithmic recommendations, push notifications, and reminders.

Each feature can be useful on its own.

Taken together inside a system optimized for conversion, however, those features share a commercial effect: they reduce the number of moments in which desire might cool, be weighed against another priority, or simply be abandoned.

WHEN PERSUASION BECOMES VISIBLE

There is, however, an important limit to this machinery.

Once we recognize a persuasive mechanism, the mechanism itself can become part of the decision.

A countdown timer is no longer simply “nine minutes left.” It becomes: someone is trying to create urgency so that I evaluate less.

A glamorous image is no longer simply attractive. It becomes: this product is being associated with a kind of status or desirability that exceeds its material function.

An abandoned-cart notification is no longer simply a reminder. It becomes: the system is reactivating a desire that had begun to fade.

Recognition does not create immunity. People who understand persuasion still have habits, fatigue, status concerns, emotional needs, automatic reactions, and genuine desires. They can understand the mechanism perfectly and still choose to buy.

But the decision has changed.

The mechanism is no longer operating only in the background.

It too can be judged.

That is one practical meaning of integration here: the primary reaction remains real, but it no longer gets the final word.

WHERE CONSUMERISM HITS A LIMIT

Consumerism benefits from shortening the distance between seeing, wanting, and buying.

Integration reopens that distance and makes desire something we can judge rather than merely obey.

That distance has economic consequences. A commercial system can optimize visibility, anticipation, urgency, convenience, payment, and personalization. But turning every reaction into a

transaction becomes harder when wider purposes reenter the decision.

The question is no longer only:

Do I want it?

It becomes:

What place does this desire deserve among the things I actually want my life to serve?

That question leads into the next chapter. Consumerism does not only sell objects; it increasingly attaches them to larger promises about happiness, identity, status, belonging, transformation, and the meaning of the present.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Berridge, Kent C., and Terry E. Robinson. “Liking, Wanting and the Incentive-Sensitization Theory of Addiction.” American Psychologist 71, no. 8 (2016): 670–679.

Robinson, Terry E., and Kent C. Berridge. “The Incentive-Sensitization Theory of Addiction 30 Years On.” Annual Review of Psychology 76 (2025): 29–58.

Federal Trade Commission. Bringing Dark Patterns to Light. Staff Report, 2022.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Buy Now, Pay Later: Market Trends and Consumer Impacts. 2022.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Consumer Use of Buy Now, Pay Later and Other Unsecured Debt. 2025.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The Buy Now, Pay Later Market. 2025.

Kansra, Pooja, and Sumit Oberoi. “Factors Limiting the Application of Consumer Neuroscience: A Systematic Review.” Journal of Consumer Behaviour 23 (2024).

CHAPTER 3

CONSUMERISM AS A RELIGION OF THE PRESENT

An advertisement promises happiness in a store. A brand promises transformation through a product. A launch draws people into lines before sunrise. Black Friday, holiday shopping, limited drops, annual product cycles, birthdays, graduations, weddings, and other milestones acquire commercial calendars of their own. Objects become markers of identity, memory, belonging, and sometimes something close to relics.

It is easy to turn this into a cheap metaphor: malls as temples, brands as idols, Black Friday as liturgy. The comparison becomes useful only once the joke is set aside and the claim is narrowed.

Can consumption perform some of the functions that religions have historically performed?

Can it provide ritual, belonging, values, symbolic identity, promises of transformation, a sense of success, and a way of organizing the present?

This chapter asks how far that comparison can actually take us.

A COMPARISON, NOT AN EQUATION

Taken literally, the claim that consumerism is a religion is usually too strong.

Consumerism has no necessary god, no single revelation, no central clergy, no universal doctrine, and no required belief in an

afterlife. Most purchases are simply purchases. Replacing worn-out shoes is not a religious act.

Scholars of religion and consumer behavior have long studied secular practices that acquire functions usually associated with the sacred. The useful comparison is functional, not literal.

Asking whether consumers worship the market as a deity gets us nowhere.

A better question is which functions commonly associated with religion can also be performed through consumption.

That framing avoids two opposite errors: declaring consumerism literally a religion, or assuming that the absence of a god makes every religious comparison meaningless.

Neither extreme is adequate.

WHEN ORDINARY THINGS BECOME SACRED

Consumer research has shown for decades that ordinary objects can become symbolically irreplaceable. Their value may no longer rest mainly on what they do.

A watch inherited from a parent, a jersey worn through a championship season, a first guitar, a car associated with a decisive period of life, or a phone holding years of photographs and messages can become charged with memory, identity, status, and relationship.

There is nothing inherently troubling about this. Human beings have always invested objects with meaning.

The commercial question is what happens when firms learn to work systematically with that capacity.

A brand can then sell more than a product. It can sell membership, recognition, a narrative of self-transformation, a hierarchy of status, a community, or a form of loyalty. Research on consumer culture and brand relationships has even described some of these attachments using language borrowed from faith, pilgrimage, sacredness, evangelism, and devotion.

That language should not be generalized carelessly. Owning an iPhone does not make someone a believer. Buying sneakers does not make someone a worshiper.

If some commercial relationships acquire functions resembling commitment, belonging, ritual, sacred attachment, or symbolic transformation, the comparison becomes analytically useful.

RITUALS, CALENDARS, AND BELONGING

Religion is more than doctrine; it is also repeated practice.

Consumption has its own rhythms.

Black Friday. Holiday shopping. Back-to-school seasons. Annual model launches. Limited releases. Midnight drops. Lines outside stores. Collector editions. Gifts tied to birthdays, graduations, weddings, and holidays. The unboxing video. The trip to a flagship store. The annual upgrade.

None of these is religious by definition. But many can take on a ritual structure: repetition, calendar, anticipation, performance, shared emotion, community, and symbolic meaning.

They also organize time.

The year is not marked only by seasons, civic holidays, or religious observances. It is increasingly marked by retail cycles: back-to-school, Halloween, Thanksgiving, Black Friday, holiday

shopping, post-holiday sales, spring launches, summer travel, new devices, new collections.

The market does not merely tell us when to buy. It can also tell us when it is time to become new again.

THE PRODUCT AS IDENTITY

Consumption is not only about possession; it is also about presentation.

A car, a pair of shoes, a phone, a neighborhood, a diet, a vacation, a brand, or even a deliberately minimalist style can function as a public sign. It says something about the person displaying it—or at least about the person they are trying to become.

Consumption therefore participates in identity formation: Who am I? Where do I belong? What kind of person am I becoming?

Here the functional comparison with religion becomes sharper. Religious traditions can provide belonging, visible signs, moral hierarchies, narratives of transformation, and ways of locating a life within a larger story.

Consumerism can sometimes perform structurally similar functions in commercial form.

The product stops meaning only: this is what I use.

It can also mean: this is who I am.

At that point, utility alone can no longer explain the purchase.

Replacing an object can also mean replacing an outdated version of oneself. Acquiring something new can become a symbolic act of personal transformation.

LACK BECOMES DEMAND

This brings us to a more delicate hypothesis.

It would be false to say that all consumption comes from an inner void. Many purchases answer real needs, pleasure, curiosity, beauty, comfort, or legitimate projects.

A commercial system, however, is remarkably good at translating many different human tensions into demand.

Loneliness. Boredom. Status anxiety. Lack of recognition. Fear of aging. Desire for attraction. Frustration. Need for belonging. Need for reward. Desire for transformation. Search for success.

The market need not create those conditions.

But each can be commercialized.

Loneliness can be sold an experience. Status can be sold a brand. Fear of aging can be sold an industry. Boredom can be sold an endless stream of novelty. Identity can be sold a wardrobe, a device, a car, an interior, a diet, or a trip.

Consumerism need not eliminate the underlying tension. It can instead organize its repeated conversion into acquisition.

The cycle can look like this:

lack or tension → promise → desire → acquisition → satisfaction or relief → adaptation → return or displacement of the lack → new promise.

The satisfaction itself may be entirely real.

It may be completely real.

Real satisfaction can still fail to become a sense of enough.

MORE THINGS, MORE HAPPINESS?

A serious critique should also avoid the slogan that money cannot buy happiness.

Money matters. Material security matters. Housing, food, health care, protection from severe shocks, and the ability to escape deprivation matter. Income can substantially improve well-being when it reduces insecurity and expands real choices.

Pretending otherwise would be unserious.

The evidence on materialism points somewhere else. Research summarized by the American Psychological Association and a broader literature on materialistic values repeatedly finds that when possessions, money, status, and acquisition become central life goals, they are associated on average with lower well-being. The relationship is not mechanically causal in every case, and wealth itself does not make a person unhappy. The more careful conclusion is that a life organized primarily around acquisition is psychologically fragile.

The same distinction appears in spending research. Not all consumption serves the same function. Spending on relationships, experiences, generosity, or activities aligned with deeply held values can operate differently from accumulating possessions for status or self-worth.

So the issue is not simply how much we consume.

It is what we expect consumption to do for us.

COMFORT IS NOT HAPPINESS

Comfort removes friction. It can reduce cold, pain, waiting, exhaustion, danger, inconvenience, and unnecessary labor.

Comfort is often a genuine good.

A safe home, a supportive mattress, accessible transportation, effective medical treatment, climate control during dangerous heat, or a machine that eliminates exhausting work can genuinely improve a life.

But comfort is not the same thing as happiness.

A person can be extremely comfortable and deeply dissatisfied. A demanding activity can also be joyful: hiking for hours, rehearsing music in an overheated room, traveling simply, building something difficult, caring for others, or working on a demanding craft.

This is not an argument for poverty, pain, or insecurity.

It is simply a distinction between means and ends.

Consumerism can easily turn comfort—a possible component of a good life—into an implicit measure of the good life itself.

More convenient. Faster. Softer. More automated. Newer. More personalized.

Each improvement may be real.

But the sum of conveniences is not necessarily a fulfilled life.

THE PROBLEM OF ENOUGH

The previous chapter examined how desire can be renewed.

We can now see why that matters.

From the standpoint of satisfaction, “I have enough” is a success.

I have enough food. My home works. My device does what I need. My clothes serve their purpose. My activity satisfies me.

The search can stop.

From the standpoint of a system that depends on recurring transactions, the same sentence has another meaning:

No additional purchase is necessary here.

Consumerism does not have to forbid satisfaction. It only needs satisfaction to remain local, temporary, or transferable to another category.

I have a car, but another could be newer.

I have a phone, but another could be faster.

I have enough clothes, but not this release.

I reached one level of status, but another remains above me.

I removed one inconvenience, but another can still be optimized.

Satisfaction is welcome so long as it does not harden into general sufficiency.

That is not a universal law of economics. It is a structural tension.

And it helps produce a culture in which “more” can continue long after the original function has been satisfied.

A RELIGION WITHOUT A FINAL PARADISE?

A major objection remains.

Religions often promise some ultimate horizon: salvation, liberation, enlightenment, reconciliation, eternal life, spiritual fulfillment.

What is the final horizon of consumerism?

Consumerism may have no final horizon at all.

Its end can be procedural rather than terminal:

desire → acquire → enjoy → repeat.

There is nowhere final to arrive. The cycle itself is what must continue.

It is a peculiar kind of telos: completeness delivered in fragments.

The next purchase does not have to save anyone permanently. It only has to deliver a local completion: pleasure, status, novelty, improvement, relief, transformation.

Then the cycle can start again.

Consumerism promises less a future paradise than an indefinite succession of small, present-tense salvations.

That is the sense in which it can function as a religion of the present.

A COMMERCIAL CARPE DIEM

Enjoy your life.

There is nothing objectionable about the sentence. What changes is the meaning we give it.

Living in the present can mean paying attention, loving, creating, learning, playing, walking, sharing, contemplating, or acting.

Inside a consumer culture, it can also become: do not miss this experience, buy now, treat yourself, upgrade before it is too late.

The present can become something to maximize through acquisition.

Credit makes the temporal structure especially visible.

The desire exists now; the resources do not. Credit allows the purchase to happen anyway, committing future income to present consumption.

Again, credit is not inherently bad. It can finance a home, education, transportation, investment, or survival through hardship.

In a culture organized around recurring consumption, however, credit can become the perfect temporal technology of "enjoy now, pay later."

RELIGION AND CONSUMERISM CAN COEXIST

A simple historical story would say that people once had religion and now have consumption. That story does not survive contact with reality.

That story is false.

Traditional religions remain active in American life, and religious participation can still provide community, identity, family involvement, volunteering, moral orientation, and other forms of belonging. Pew Research has documented the continuing role of religious identity and community in the United States even amid substantial religious switching and institutional change.

Religion and consumerism can coexist, criticize one another, borrow from one another, and sometimes intertwine.

Religious organizations can use branding, media, merchandising, marketing, and digital platforms. Brands can use the language of community, devotion, transformation, belonging, and loyalty.

The same person can participate in both systems at once.

This is not replacement.

It is an overlap of functions.

“BUT CONSUMERS DO NOT REALLY BELIEVE IT”

The objection is worth taking seriously.

Most people do not read an advertisement the way they read a creed. They may mock slogans, criticize brands, and understand perfectly well that a fragrance does not guarantee love and a phone does not create a new life.

But a culture does not need explicit assent to organize behavior.

We can reject a promise intellectually while still structuring our lives around it.

Someone may laugh at advertising while still imagining success through a familiar cluster of signs: the right home, car, trips, wardrobe, devices, and visible markers of status.

Once that structure becomes visible, its effect can change.

A mechanism brought into reflection no longer acts only in the background.

“BUT CONSUMPTION REALLY DOES GIVE PLEASURE”

Yes.

Any serious critique has to begin there.

Good food is pleasurable. A long-desired object can bring genuine joy. A gift can express love. Travel can transform a life. Clothing can increase confidence. A tool can open a new activity. Technology can expand autonomy.

Pleasure does not become false because money changed hands.

The criticism lies elsewhere.

Why should commercial renewal become the privileged answer to functions that might also be met through relationship, activity, learning, creation, resource pooling, community involvement, or the continuation of an already rich experience?

Leaving consumerism therefore cannot mean eliminating pleasure.

It means diversifying the sources of pleasure, identity, recognition, transformation, and belonging.

WHEN THE CRITIQUE TURNS ON ITSELF

A noosophical critique of consumerism faces a danger of its own.

It would be easy to say: commodities will not make you whole; Noosophy will.

That would reproduce the very structure being criticized.

One total promise would merely replace another.

Noosophy should not become an existential product or a guarantee of salvation.

Its role here is narrower and more demanding: identify the kind of lack that is actually present.

A material need may call for an object.

Rare use may call for resource pooling.

Loneliness may call for relationship.

A need for belonging may call for a club, congregation, nonprofit, cooperative, team, or community group.

A desire for transformation may call for learning or disciplined practice.

A search for status may call for examining the hierarchy itself.

A search for meaning may call for philosophy, art, spirituality, knowledge, or commitment.

And a pleasure may remain simply a pleasure without becoming accumulation.

The aim is not to prohibit buying.

It is to ask where, exactly, the lack we are trying to answer exists.

THE RELIGION OF THE PRESENT

An advertisement promising happiness in a store is obviously not theology. It can still reveal a cultural structure.

But it can reveal a cultural structure.

Markets do not sell only things. They can also sell identities, rewards, transformations, belonging, and fragments of the good life.

They can organize rituals, calendars, communities, and symbols. They can make ordinary objects sacred. They can convert tension into desire, desire into acquisition, and acquisition into a promise of transformation.

Most important, the cycle does not have to lead anywhere.

It only has to keep moving.

Consumerism becomes a religion of the present when acquisition promises not only an object but a small transformation of the self—one that can always be renewed.

That cultural mechanism raises a material question: if satisfaction must be continually renewed, what happens to the way objects are designed, maintained, repaired, replaced, or made obsolete?

The promise cannot float above matter. To begin again, it needs material supports: products, versions, styles, devices, and infrastructures capable of making a new difference visible.

Having examined the promise, we turn to its material underside: producing for replacement.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Edward Bailey, work on implicit religion.

Belk, Wallendorf & Sherry, “The Sacred and the Profane in Consumer Behavior,” Journal of Consumer Research, 1989.

Dittmar, Bond, Hurst & Kasser, “The Relationship Between Materialism and Personal Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis,” 2014.

Kasser & Kanner, eds., Psychology and Consumer Culture, American Psychological Association, 2004.

American Psychological Association, summaries of research on consumerism, materialism, and well-being.

Pew Research Center, research on religion, religious identity, switching, and everyday life in the United States.

CHAPTER 4

PRODUCING FOR REPLACEMENT

A product still works. Yet it already feels old.

The battery does not last as long. One part is no longer sold. A software update will not come. The new model is faster, thinner, more efficient, better photographed, and easier to admire. The old one has not necessarily failed. But it has begun to lose its place.

This chapter begins with an ordinary problem: what happens in an economy that depends on recurring sales when existing products continue to do their job?

The answer cannot be that everything is “planned obsolescence.” That would be false. Materials wear out. Components fail. Needs change. Some innovations matter. Sometimes repair consumes more resources than replacement. An old refrigerator, furnace, or vehicle can become so inefficient, unsafe, or incompatible with present needs that keeping it forever would make little sense.

The opposite mistake is just as serious: treating replacement cycles as if they were merely the neutral by-product of technical progress.

When repeated sales matter economically, the longevity of what already exists comes into tension with the frequency of replacement. That tension does not require a secret meeting in which someone decides that a product must die on a specific date. It can emerge from design choices, parts availability, software

support, warranty practices, fashion, compatibility, financing, marketing, and the business model itself.

The issue is not whether everything should last forever.

It is why change so often arrives in the form of replacement.

AGING IS NOT THE SAME AS BEING DESIGNED TO FAIL

The word obsolescence covers several different realities.

A product can stop working because a component wears out. It can become difficult to repair because it was glued shut, miniaturized, serialized, or designed around proprietary tools. It can remain physically sound while losing software support. It can be overtaken by a genuine technical improvement. It can still do its job while looking outdated because styles, interfaces, expectations, or social standards have changed.

And in some cases, its useful life may have been deliberately constrained in order to encourage replacement.

Those mechanisms should not be collapsed into a single accusation.

Calling every breakdown “planned obsolescence” turns a serious economic question into a conspiracy theory. The term is justified only when there is reasonable evidence of deliberate limitation.

Nor does the critique depend on proving deliberate sabotage.

The more common problem is often much less dramatic. A product still works, but the battery is difficult to replace. A cheap component is unavailable. An authorized repair costs almost as much as the product. A software change makes older hardware

frustrating to use. A connector change renders surrounding accessories less useful. A design refresh turns a functioning device into a visible sign of being behind.

A product can become commercially old before it becomes functionally useless.

Consumerism does not need to destroy a product physically in order to renew demand. It only needs replacement to become more attractive, more convenient, more socially legible, or more economically rational than continued use.

REPAIRABILITY IS DESIGNED IN

We usually think about repair only after something breaks.

By then, however, much of the answer was decided years earlier, at the design stage.

Can the device be opened without damaging it? Is the battery replaceable? Are screws used where permanent adhesive could have been used? Are components modular? Are replacement parts available separately? Are diagnostic tools accessible? Is service information available? Does software permit a replacement component to function normally? Does the repair require a proprietary calibration system? Can the product be taken apart and reassembled without losing performance?

Repairability is not an after-sales detail. It is a design property.

A product's useful life depends not only on how rarely it fails, but on whether a local failure can remain local.

If a ten-dollar part can be replaced, the product may survive. If that part is fused into a sealed assembly, the same failure can condemn an object worth hundreds or thousands of dollars.

That is why the American right-to-repair debate belongs in this story.

The Federal Trade Commission's 2021 report Nixing the Fix documented several forms of repair restriction in U.S. markets: products designed in ways that make repair difficult, limited availability of replacement parts, restricted access to diagnostic software, and warranty practices that can steer consumers toward authorized service. The FTC did not conclude that every restriction is unjustified. It did conclude that the evidence offered for broad repair restrictions was often weak, and it identified competition and consumer-protection concerns.

The United States has not responded with a single national repairability regime. Instead, federal enforcement sits alongside a patchwork of state laws.

New York's Digital Fair Repair Act requires covered manufacturers to make certain diagnostic and repair information, tools, and parts available to consumers and independent repair providers when those resources are made available to authorized providers. Oregon adopted a right-to-repair law for consumer electronic equipment that likewise requires access to documentation, tools, and parts on fair and reasonable terms. California has also enacted right-to-repair requirements for covered products.

These laws differ in scope, exemptions, dates, and implementation. They should not be treated as one uniform national regime.

Their importance here is less legal than structural.

When legislatures and regulators have to intervene to make parts, tools, documentation, and diagnostics available, the

incentive structure is already telling us something. Repairability does not automatically emerge when other incentives favor lower upfront manufacturing costs, tighter ecosystem control, faster product turnover, proprietary service revenue, or replacement sales.

None of this means every manufacturer wants products to be disposable.

It means only that durability and repairability are not always the most profitable characteristics under every business model.

The tension is built into the structure.

DURABILITY IS NOT IMMORTALITY

A critique of consumerism can easily slide into nostalgia.

Older products lasted. New products are disposable. Therefore everything should be kept for as long as physically possible.

The conclusion does not follow.

Nothing durable remains unchanged. Durable objects survive through maintenance, repair, adaptation, and partial replacement. A car that lasts thirty years does so because tires, fluids, brakes, belts, batteries, seals, sensors, and sometimes major components are replaced. A house lasts because roofs, wiring, plumbing, finishes, windows, mechanical systems, and structural elements are maintained or renewed.

The alternative to consumerist replacement is not absolute preservation.

It is the ability to distinguish among maintaining, repairing, upgrading, repurposing, rebuilding, and replacing.

A very old appliance may consume enough energy that replacement is reasonable. A dangerous machine may need to be retired. A building may be technically repairable but so poorly suited to its future function that continued preservation requires disproportionate resources. A piece of equipment may depend on a standard that no longer exists.

A lower-throughput economy does not require everything to survive.

It asks that disappearance be justified by function rather than by commerce alone.

The aim is to maintain what is worth maintaining, repair what can be repaired, adapt what should evolve, transform what can serve a new purpose, and replace what can no longer provide the needed function at a reasonable total cost.

LIFESPAN ALONE IS THE WRONG MEASURE

Imagine two products.

The first lasts thirty years but requires high energy use, scarce replacement parts, and heavy maintenance.

The second lasts fifteen years, is easy to repair, uses far less energy, and can be largely disassembled and reused.

Which one is more durable?

A simple year count cannot answer that question.

A better measure asks how many resources are required to provide the function for as long as that function is actually needed.

That requires looking at the full life of the object: extraction, manufacturing, shipping, energy during use, maintenance, repair,

upgrades, replacement, end-of-life treatment, reuse, and recovery.

Durability is better judged by function, relevant lifespan, resource intensity, maintenance needs, adaptability, and future transformations—not simply by how long the original form survives.

That keeps us clear of two opposing dogmas.

The first is the disposable dogma: replace something as soon as it feels old.

The second is the preservation dogma: keep something at any cost simply because it already exists.

Sometimes replacement is the more integrative choice. A structure can become so dangerous, inefficient, rigid, or resource-intensive that preserving it creates greater costs than transforming or replacing it.

Longevity is not an object of worship.

It has to answer to function.

WHAT LASTS STILL REQUIRES CARE

Longevity is often imagined as the absence of spending: build once, then live off the result.

In practice, duration is a sequence of interventions.

A roof needs work. A seal fails. A battery degrades. A belt wears out. Software must be updated. Paint and coatings fail. Wiring must be upgraded. Pipes corrode. Foundations move. Bearings wear. Safety standards change. New uses require new configurations.

What lasts does not escape material entropy.

Longevity is continuity maintained through recurring flows of care.

A useful working term for this is maintenance debt.

The phrase is already used in several technical and infrastructure contexts, but we use it in a deliberately broad sense: the future work and resources required to preserve a function, level of safety, or level of performance when necessary maintenance is postponed.

One intervention is delayed. Then another. The structure still works, perhaps for years. But unresolved degradation accumulates. Eventually, what could have been managed through small, regular interventions becomes a major restoration, systemic failure, or replacement.

Maintenance debt matters because consumerist accounting often highlights the visible price of acquisition while obscuring the long time structure of care.

A cheap product can be expensive to keep alive.

An expensive product can also be expensive to keep alive.

A durable product is not one that never asks for resources. It is one whose future needs remain understandable, manageable, and proportionate to the function it provides.

A BUILDING DOES NOT LAST BY STANDING STILL

Buildings make the problem especially clear because their lifespans are long enough to expose the illusion of permanence.

An old courthouse, church, row house, farmhouse, or university building can appear to prove that people once knew how to build for centuries.

Continuity can mislead us when we forget the interventions that produced it.

Roofs are replaced. Masonry is repointed. Structural members are repaired. Windows are changed. Electrical systems are modernized. Plumbing is replaced. Fire protection is added. Accessibility is improved. Heating and cooling systems are transformed. Foundations are reinforced. Interior uses are redesigned.

The building that survives is not materially identical to the building that was first constructed.

What survives is a transformed continuity.

That is the deeper lesson.

The ideal is not “build once forever.”

It is to build so that maintenance, repair, modification, and transmission remain possible.

This also prevents a common form of nostalgia. Surviving old buildings are not a random sample of all old buildings. Poorly built structures that burned, rotted, collapsed, were abandoned, or became useless are less likely to be available as evidence today.

Survivorship bias does not prove that modern construction is better. It simply warns against comparing the best survivors of the past with the average products of the present.

Older techniques can have real advantages: simple materials, locally replaceable elements, generous dimensions, reparable assemblies, and gradual transformation.

Modern techniques can also produce structures that last for generations.

The useful comparison is not old versus new.

It is whether a structure can keep performing through maintainable transformation.

RENOVATE OR REBUILD?

Here too, slogans are a poor guide.

Renovation can preserve materials already extracted and assembled. Demolition and reconstruction require new extraction, manufacturing, transport, and construction.

But renovation can also be extremely resource-intensive. It can preserve a structure that is badly configured, inefficient, unsafe, or unable to serve future needs. Rebuilding can sometimes make possible a level of performance, density, accessibility, resilience, or functionality that would be unreasonable to obtain otherwise.

Renovation is not always the better answer.

Nor is demolition and replacement a defensible default definition of progress.

The comparison depends on the boundaries we choose: current condition, expected future use, energy performance, embodied materials, maintenance, reuse potential, local constraints, and time horizon.

The same reasoning applies beyond buildings.

A product should not be saved merely because it exists.

Nor should it be replaced merely because something newer exists.

THE SMARTPHONE BRINGS THE PROBLEM INTO FOCUS

The smartphone is this entire chapter in miniature.

It combines genuine wear, battery degradation, breakage, parts availability, software support, security updates, compatibility, proprietary ecosystems, rapid innovation, fashion, and frequent product launches.

A phone can become unpleasant to use while still functioning. A worn battery may be the only real problem. An app may require a newer operating system. A manufacturer may end software support. A new generation may contain a genuinely useful innovation. Or a mostly cosmetic redesign may be enough to make an older model feel socially dated.

The smartphone shows why “planned obsolescence” is too crude a category.

Physical, software, commercial, and cultural aging interact.

This is also where repair policy becomes concrete. Access to batteries, screens, components, tools, diagnostics, documentation, software pairing, and firmware can determine whether a device survives a local failure.

The underlying economic tension is straightforward.

If a population keeps its phones longer, fewer replacement devices are needed each year to maintain the same number of users.

The arithmetic is obvious. The economic implication is not.

A business model that depends heavily on unit sales benefits from replacement frequency. That does not prove that a manufacturer deliberately destroys older devices. It does mean that greater product longevity can conflict with revenue models built around recurring hardware turnover.

A serious critique is therefore better aimed at incentives and system design than at intentions we cannot verify.

REPLACEMENT IS CULTURAL TOO

Products are not replaced only because they fail.

They are also replaced because they become undesirable.

A new color. A thinner profile. A seasonal collection. A larger screen. A different connector. A marginal feature. A new design language. A social signal that the old model belongs to yesterday.

The product is not technically dead.

It is symbolically outdated.

This is the material consequence of the cultural mechanisms examined earlier. A system that continuously sells novelty has an incentive to make continuity less attractive.

The annual model change in the American auto industry provides a classic case. General Motors learned early that cars could be differentiated not only by engineering but by model year, styling, price tier, and status. A vehicle did not need to stop running before a newer version could become desirable.

The same logic now appears across phones, fashion, consumer electronics, home decor, software interfaces, and many other categories.

Novelty is not necessarily fake.

Some new products are genuinely better.

Commercial renewal can arrive before function ends.

WHEN REPAIR COSTS MORE THAN REPLACEMENT

A practical objection remains.

Sometimes repair really does cost more than buying new.

That is not an illusion.

But the market price is not the same thing as the total cost.

A new product may benefit from global scale, automation, standardized logistics, inexpensive raw materials, and costs that are not fully reflected in its retail price. Repair often relies on local skilled labor applied to one object at a time.

In the United States, the difference can be striking. A technician's hour is expensive because labor is expensive. A mass-produced replacement item may be surprisingly cheap because its manufacturing cost is spread across enormous volume.

The result is a strange signal: discard an object containing substantial materials because one hour of skilled local labor costs more than buying another object manufactured and shipped through a global supply chain.

The signal is real.

It is not necessarily a measure of material efficiency.

Sometimes replacement truly is better. A repair can consume too many parts, too much labor, or too much energy. But "it is cheaper to buy another one" does not establish that replacement carries the lower total social, material, or environmental cost.

Price and cost are related.

They are not the same.

CIRCULARITY IS NOT ENOUGH

Repair, reuse, refurbishment, remanufacturing, and recycling can reduce material pressure.

None of those practices, however, solves consumerism by itself.

An economy can recycle more while producing more.

It can sell repairable products while advertising constant upgrades.

It can recover a larger percentage of materials from a much larger stream of goods.

Circularity improves the way resources move through an economy.

A degrowth perspective adds another question:

How many resources need to move through the system at all?

The difference is consequential.

A circular economy that doubles throughput while improving recycling can still increase extraction, energy use, logistics, and waste.

Reducing waste per product is useful.

It is not the same as reducing the pressure for permanent product turnover.

TRANSFORM INSTEAD OF REPLACE

The central distinction can now be stated plainly.

A consumerist sequence often looks like this:

product → real or perceived aging → replacement → new product.

A lower-throughput sequence would try to expand the middle:

product → maintenance → repair → targeted upgrade → adaptation → reuse → replacement when necessary.

The difference is not change versus stasis.

It is renewal by replacement versus renewal by transformation.

Transformation can mean maintaining the object, changing one component, updating software, improving one weak point, converting the product to a new use, passing it to someone else, disassembling it for parts, refurbishing it, or eventually replacing it when replacement becomes the more coherent option.

Replacement is not forbidden.

A rupture can be more integrative than preserving something dangerous, costly, obsolete in function, or impossible to adapt.

Maintenance, transformation, and replacement should be chosen by function and total cost—not by the commercial need for sales to keep restarting.

THE PRIVILEGE OF BUYING FOR THE LONG TERM

One final contradiction leads directly into the next chapter.

Durable, repairable, well-designed products often cost more upfront.

They may cost less over twenty years but more today.

That difference is decisive for households that do not have spare capital.

A person can know that the better-built appliance, tool, pair of boots, car, or home repair will cost less over time and still be unable to pay the higher initial price.

Technical durability can therefore become a social privilege.

The ability to buy once instead of repeatedly is partly an engineering question.

It is also a question of wealth, cash flow, ownership, credit, and time horizon.

Consumerism does not distribute replacement pressure equally.

Some people replace because novelty is attractive.

Others replace because they cannot afford the option that would have lasted.

At that point, the material problem of replacement becomes a problem of poverty, wealth, and property.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Federal Trade Commission, Nixing the Fix: An FTC Report to Congress on Repair Restrictions, 2021.

Federal Trade Commission, testimony and enforcement materials on right-to-repair and Magnuson-Moss warranty restrictions.

New York State, Digital Fair Repair Act.

Oregon Legislative Information System, SB 1596 (2024), right to repair consumer electronic equipment.

California right-to-repair legislation and implementation materials.

Roskladka, Bressanelli, Saccani et al., “Repairable electronic products for the circular economy: a review of design for repair features, practices and measures to contrast obsolescence,” Discover Sustainability, 2025.

Jetti & Dhar, “Product Durability: A Systematic Literature Review,” 2024.

CHAPTER 5

POVERTY, WEALTH, PROPERTY, AND THE PROBLEM OF ENOUGH

Two people need the same thing.

One can afford a durable model today: repairable, well made, covered by a strong warranty, and built to last long enough that it will not need to be replaced soon.

The other cannot afford that option. They buy what fits this month's budget.

If the cheaper product fails sooner, uses more energy, costs more to maintain, or has to be replaced repeatedly, the lower price at the register can become the higher cost over time.

This contradiction goes to the heart of consumerism. What people can consume depends not only on what they need or want, but on the resources they can mobilize before the purchase: savings, credit, time, transportation, ownership, bargaining power, storage space, repair capacity, and the ability to wait.

Poverty can force people to consume repeatedly without building assets. Wealth can make it possible to build assets long after personal consumption has reached obvious physical limits.

The causes and consequences differ, but both conditions return us to the same question:

When does "more" stop serving a need?

PAYING MORE BECAUSE YOU HAVE LESS

Economists and policy researchers sometimes describe a “poverty premium”: the pattern in which households with fewer resources end up paying more for the same basic function.

The mechanism is larger than the familiar story about a cheap pair of shoes that wears out quickly.

A household without savings may need to finance an emergency expense instead of paying cash. A person with weak credit may face more expensive borrowing. Someone without reliable transportation may be unable to reach the cheapest grocery store, repair shop, or medical provider. A renter may pay the utility cost of an inefficient building they do not own and cannot renovate. A family with little storage may be unable to buy in bulk. A worker whose schedule changes week to week may pay more for child care or transportation because planning ahead is difficult.

Financial services can reproduce the same pattern. In its 2023 Making Ends Meet work, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found that households repeatedly charged overdraft or nonsufficient-funds fees tended to have weaker credit profiles and greater difficulty meeting financial obligations. Not every fee or expensive form of credit is caused by poverty. But limited financial slack can make costly short-term solutions more likely precisely when a household has the least room to absorb them.

Poverty, then, is not only a shortage of money.

It can also mean paying more for the same function.

That claim should not harden into another slogan. Expensive products are not automatically better; a high price may buy prestige, branding, fashion, scarcity, or margin rather than

durability. A low-cost product may be efficient, reliable, and entirely rational.

But when longevity, repairability, energy efficiency, or reliability genuinely require a larger initial investment, access to capital changes the time horizon of the decision.

THE PRICE UP FRONT SHAPES THE COST LATER

A durable product can be cheaper over fifteen years and still be unaffordable today.

That difference can decide the purchase.

Someone with savings can absorb a large up-front cost and then benefit from lower costs over time. Someone without savings may have to optimize for the next paycheck, the next rent payment, or the next emergency.

The cycle can look like this:

limited financial slack → priority given to immediate price → more fragile or costly long-term option → repeated replacement, fees, or financing costs → less capacity to save → renewed short-term constraint.

The cycle does not describe every low-income household or every product. It does show why moral advice such as “just buy quality” can be empty.

Buying for durability can be a skill.

It can also be a financial privilege.

PROPERTY AS CONTINUITY

In a durable economy, ownership can serve a simple function: continuity.

Buy → own → maintain → repair → adapt → pass on.

Ownership is often described only as exclusion: if I own something, others do not. But ownership can also mean the ability to use a thing without a recurring payment, repair it, modify it, sell it, give it away, lend it, or integrate it into a long-term practice.

Owning a bicycle can reduce dependence on a rental platform. Owning a musical instrument can support decades of practice. Owning tools can reduce the need to repurchase the same service. Owning a home can, under some conditions, stabilize housing costs and create an asset that changes the family's future options.

Property can therefore be integrative when it creates continuity, autonomy, responsibility, and the ability to transfer useful things across time.

But property can serve very different functions.

Property can also mean accumulation, rent extraction, speculation, control over access, concentration of assets, or the transmission of large economic advantages.

A family bookshelf, an owner-occupied home, fifty rental properties, and a controlling stake in a corporation are all forms of property. They do not have the same function, scale, or effect.

The useful question is not:

Is property good or bad?

It is:

What does this property enable? Who controls what, at what scale, and with what effects on other people's autonomy?

INHERITANCE: CONTINUITY OR REPRODUCTION OF ADVANTAGE

Property becomes especially important when it crosses generations.

A durable object can outlive its first owner. A tool can be handed down. A home can keep a child from beginning adult life with no housing asset at all. A library can transmit knowledge. A family business can transmit productive capacity. Savings can protect a household against future shocks.

That continuity can be deeply valuable.

The same mechanism can also reproduce inequality.

Someone who receives a paid-off home does not enter economic life under the same constraints as someone who begins with rent. Someone who receives financial assets may be able to invest before saving from wages. Someone who inherits a business or a portfolio receives not only a stock of wealth but the future returns that stock may generate.

Inheritance therefore has to be judged by function and scale together.

Passing down a guitar, a modest home, or a small reserve of savings does not have the same social consequences as passing down enough capital to generate a dominant economic position.

Inheritance is not one morally uniform act.

INCOME IS NOT WEALTH

Public debate often treats income and wealth as interchangeable.

They are not.

Income is a flow: wages, salaries, benefits, business income, interest, dividends, rent.

Wealth is a stock: housing equity, savings, retirement accounts, financial assets, land, businesses, valuable property, minus debts.

Two households with the same annual income can inhabit very different economic worlds.

One may own its home, have a retirement account, hold several months or years of savings, and carry little debt.

Another may pay high rent, carry expensive debt, own few assets, and have almost no emergency reserve.

Income finances the present.

Wealth changes the range of futures a household can survive—or choose.

The Federal Reserve's Survey of Consumer Finances makes the distinction visible. In the 2022 survey, median family net worth was about $192,900, but the median among families in the bottom quarter of the wealth distribution was only $3,500. Renters and other non-homeowners had median net worth of about $10,400, compared with about $396,200 among homeowners. Those figures should not be read as a simple moral ranking of owners and renters; they show how differently positioned households can be even before we ask what they earn in a given year.

Wealth can buy time.

It can allow a family to wait before accepting a bad price, repair a car instead of losing a job, move for an opportunity, start a business, buy in bulk, take a professional risk, choose a more durable product, or survive a period without income.

Asset poverty is not simply low income by another name.

It is a loss of freedom over time.

WHEN NEEDS ARE MET BUT ACCUMULATION CONTINUES

Wealth presents the opposite puzzle.

Once food, shelter, health care, comfort, and ordinary personal consumption are largely satisfied, why can accumulation keep going?

The easy psychological answer is that rich people are greedy, empty, or insatiable.

The argument does not require that hypothesis.

Wealth performs functions beyond consumption.

Additional assets can increase security, investment capacity, bargaining power, status, control, inheritance, and sometimes political influence. A person cannot eat one hundred dinners at the same time or personally occupy one hundred homes at once. But a person can own one hundred times more assets.

Satiation can therefore fail for institutional and relational reasons without requiring psychological insatiability.

As long as another unit of wealth produces another advantage —return, rank, security, control, access, or influence—"more" can continue to do something.

That is fundamentally different from physiological satiation.

A meal ends.

An asset position may contain no comparable stopping rule.

THREE WAYS "ENOUGH" CAN BREAK DOWN

Three different failures of "enough" now come into view.

At the bottom, material and security needs remain unstable. Expenses repeat, short-term solutions can become expensive over time, and lack of savings can prevent investment in continuity.

In the middle, many basic needs are met, but consumption can keep renewing through convenience, identity, novelty, status, habit, and comparison.

At the top, personal consumption can be effectively saturated while asset accumulation continues because assets generate different functions: security, return, control, rank, inheritance, and power.

Recurring consumption at the bottom and middle; recurring accumulation at the top.

This is a structural map, not a theory of class psychology.

Low-income people can be exceptionally frugal. Wealthy people can decide that they have enough. Middle-income households may accumulate primarily for security. Individual behavior varies.

The focus is the structure of available incentives and constraints, not a stereotype about who behaves how.

WEALTH CAN PRODUCE MORE WEALTH

Wealth has another property: it compounds.

Owning assets can make additional ownership easier.

A portfolio may generate returns. A home may appreciate. A business may distribute profits. Savings make it possible to seize opportunities. Collateral can improve access to credit. An inheritance can eliminate decades of prior accumulation.

Wealth is not only the result of past income differences.

It can also produce future differences.

One reason is that wealth changes a person's relationship to time.

Someone who already owns assets may be able to wait for a better time to sell, buy, invest, or change jobs.

Someone without reserves may have to accept the available job, loan, rent, repair bill, or sale price immediately.

Accumulation expands the capacity to act.

When that capacity becomes extremely uneven, economic inequality can become politically consequential.

WHEN WEALTH MEETS POWER

Two caricatures obscure the issue.

The first says money simply buys every political decision.

The second says concentrated economic resources have no effect on political influence.

Neither survives scrutiny.

In the United States, political influence can flow through many ordinary and legal channels: campaign spending, lobbying, organized interest groups, ownership of media or platforms, access to decision-makers, paid expertise, the ability to finance litigation, the ability to move investment, and the simple fact that money buys time and professional capacity to pursue interests.

Research on political responsiveness is contested in method and interpretation, but unequal influence cannot simply be waved away. Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page, for example, found in a large study of U.S. policy preferences and outcomes that economic elites and business interest groups showed

substantial independent associations with policy outcomes, while the preferences of average citizens showed much weaker independent effects in their model. The study does not prove that wealthy actors control the state. It supports a narrower claim: unequal economic resources can translate into unequal political capacity.

Influence is not the same as total control.

No secret coordination is required.

The structural concern is simpler. A system that permits very large concentrations of assets can create actors for whom preserving an economic advantage also helps preserve the capacity to shape the rules under which that advantage operates.

The danger appears when differences in private capacity become large enough to reinforce the rules that produced those differences in the first place.

PROPERTY: AUTONOMY OR POWER

We can now return to property.

Property has no single function or value.

It can reduce dependence.

It can create dependence.

Owning the tool you need to work can keep you from paying indefinitely for access to someone else's tool.

Owning thousands of units of scarce housing can place other people in a recurring payment relationship with you.

The word ownership does not settle the distinction.

Function, scale, and relationship do.

Who owns? Who can modify or repair? Who carries the risk? Who receives the income? Who depends on whom? Can the asset be transferred? Is it primarily for use, production, long-term security, or rent extraction?

That distinction becomes especially important in the chapters ahead, particularly when we turn to subscriptions and conditional access.

Nonownership is not automatically a disadvantage.

A public library, a car-share system, a tool library, or a cooperative workshop can use resources far more efficiently than universal individual ownership.

Conversely, being permanently denied ownership of something essential because a provider prefers recurring payment can deepen dependence.

The choice is not simply ownership versus sharing.

The real contrast is autonomy versus unnecessary dependence.

WHEN CONSUMPTION ALSO FUNDS PUBLIC LIFE

Consumption is not only a private economic act. It can also generate public revenue.

The American case, however, has to be described on its own terms.

The United States has no federal value-added tax. Social Security is financed primarily through dedicated payroll taxes, with employers and employees each contributing under federal law. According to the 2026 Social Security Trustees Report, the program received about $1.45 trillion in income in 2025,

including roughly $1.32 trillion from payroll taxes. Medicare is financed through a different mix: payroll taxes are central to the Hospital Insurance trust fund, while other parts of Medicare rely substantially on congressional appropriations and enrollee premiums.

So the U.S. social insurance system is not simply financed by consumer purchases.

At the same time, consumption still matters to public finance. State and local tax systems rely to varying degrees on sales and gross-receipts taxes, along with income, property, excise, license, and other taxes. The U.S. Census Bureau tracks sales and gross-receipts taxes as a major category of state tax collections.

The fiscal architecture is fragmented.

A reduction in material consumption would not create the same fiscal problem everywhere. It would affect a state heavily dependent on sales-tax revenue differently from a federal program financed primarily through payroll contributions. A city with a large retail or tourism tax base faces a different exposure from Social Security. A shift from purchasing goods to paying for services can also change which transactions are taxable, depending on state law.

That difference is exactly why the French case cannot simply be translated into American institutional language. France can finance social protection in part through nationally collected consumption taxes in ways that do not map neatly onto the United States.

But the underlying problem survives the change of country:

What happens when public institutions become financially accustomed to high levels of market activity, while ecological or social goals call for reducing some forms of material throughput?

A society that wants materially lower consumption cannot look only at factories and households.

It also has to examine fiscal systems built around economic flows.

SALES TAXES AND THE LIMITS OF A SLOGAN

Consumption taxes are often described as regressive because lower-income households generally spend a larger share of current income on consumption.

The intuition is important, but it is not the whole analysis.

Actual incidence depends on what is taxed, which goods and services are exempt, whether groceries or medicine receive special treatment, how state and local taxes interact, what transfers and credits exist, and whether the burden is measured against annual income, lifetime income, or consumption.

So sales taxes cannot serve as a simple moral demonstration here.

The structural issue is more important.

When governments fund part of their activity through transaction-based revenue, lower material consumption can create fiscal questions that must be solved rather than ignored.

“Consume less” is not an answer if every other institution is assumed to remain unchanged.

“MORE” AS A RELATIVE POSITION

We saw earlier that satiation becomes difficult when satisfaction is continually displaced.

Wealth adds another mechanism: rank is relational.

If the objective is to be near the top, there is no absolute quantity that can satisfy everyone.

The reference point moves with other people.

A house can fully meet the function of shelter and still feel inadequate when housing becomes a marker of status. A family can possess more than enough assets for security and still experience its wealth as insufficient in competition with a wealthier peer group. A profitable firm can continue pursuing market share because relative position affects bargaining power, investor expectations, financing, and vulnerability to competitors.

In those cases, “more” is no longer directly attached to need.

It is attached to position.

And the top position cannot be occupied by everyone at once.

THE FUNCTION OF WEALTH

Integrative Noosophy cannot solve this problem by naming a universal dollar threshold beyond which all wealth becomes excessive.

Circumstances differ too much.

A large family, a risky occupation, a capital-intensive business, a farmer, a retiree, a nonprofit, and a local government do not have identical needs for reserves, equipment, or long-term security.

The functional test is:

What additional function does this accumulation serve, at what cost, for whom, and at what scale?

Accumulation can protect.

It can finance investment.

It can enable creation.

It can also become accumulation for its own sake, rent extraction, or concentration of power.

The decisive shift comes when the function changes without being recognized.

Someone may continue to describe accumulation as “security” long after security is well established, while the additional assets increasingly serve rank, expansion, control, or influence.

Integrated thought begins by making that shift visible.

EQUALITY IS NOT THE SAME AS INTEGRATION

A critique of consumerism should not turn every difference in wealth into a moral fault.

Strict equality would not necessarily fit every function, risk, responsibility, or stage of life.

At the same time, inequality can become disintegrative when its scale creates dependence, blocks access, concentrates control, or gives some actors disproportionate capacity to define common rules.

Evaluation therefore has to hold several dimensions together: needs, autonomy, actual capabilities, concentration of power, external costs, inheritance, and freedom of action.

The test is not:

Does everyone own exactly the same amount?

It is:

Do differences in property and wealth mostly expand people's ability to live and act—or increasingly allow some people to narrow the freedom of others?

TWO FAILURES OF "ENOUGH"

Return now to the two people at the beginning of the chapter.

One can buy for durability, repair, keep, save, and pass things on.

The other may be trapped in a sequence of smaller but repeated expenses without ever accumulating enough assets to escape the short time horizon.

At the other end of the distribution, someone may control resources far beyond what personal consumption could ever absorb and continue accumulating because wealth produces returns, rank, security, and power.

Poverty and wealth therefore make "enough" elusive in different ways.

Poverty can keep sufficiency out of reach.

Wealth can leave sufficiency without an institutional stopping point.

Consumerism can thrive between those poles: through repeated expenditure among those who keep buying, and through continued accumulation among those who own the assets that capture part of those expenditures.

This does not describe every person.

It describes one structural relationship among consumption, property, and accumulation.

And it does not stop at national borders.

Goods, capital, brands, production systems, packaging, waste, and consumer aspirations all move through global markets. To see what consumerism does next, we have to leave the national economy and ask what happens when the model enters societies with different incomes, food systems, infrastructures, and capacities to manage its consequences.

The next chapter takes up that question.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. “Changes in U.S. Family Finances from 2019 to 2022: Evidence from the Survey of Consumer Finances.” 2023.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. “Overdraft and Nonsufficient Fund Fees: Insights from the Making Ends Meet Survey and Consumer Credit Panel.” 2023.

Social Security Administration. “The 2026 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds.” 2026.

Medicare.gov / Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. “How is Medicare funded?” Current program overview.

U.S. Census Bureau. Annual Survey of State Government Tax Collections; State Tax Collections by Category.

Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens.” Perspectives on Politics 12, no. 3 (2014): 564–581.

CHAPTER 6

WHEN CONSUMERISM GOES GLOBAL

A product can cross a border in hours. The systems needed to absorb its consequences may take decades to build.

A packaged drink, a smartphone, a fast-fashion garment, a delivery platform, a processed snack, or a disposable container can enter a new market through logistics, advertising, retail, credit, and digital distribution long before local institutions have adapted their food systems, repair networks, waste collection, recycling capacity, health policy, or public regulation.

That lag between commercial expansion and social capacity is the central problem of this chapter.

Consumerism spreads more than objects. It also spreads commercial rhythms: faster turnover, more packaging, more frequent replacement, greater reliance on transactions, stronger incentives to turn new social functions into markets, and new expectations about what counts as normal consumption.

The result is not cultural uniformity. A global product enters a local society and is changed by it. The same brand can acquire different meanings in Lagos, Mexico City, Manila, São Paulo, Paris, Delhi, or Atlanta. Local diets, rituals, incomes, family structures, infrastructures, laws, and status systems shape what happens next.

The useful question is not whether the world is becoming “Americanized.”

It is how consumerist logic interacts with different realities once goods, brands, financial practices, and commercial infrastructures become global.

CONSUMERISM DOES NOT TRAVEL ALONE

A consumer model travels with material systems attached.

Cars require roads, fuel, parking, repair shops, insurance, parts, financing, and urban space. Refrigerated foods require cold chains and electricity. E-commerce requires warehouses, data systems, payment networks, packaging, delivery fleets, addresses, and returns infrastructure. Smartphones require telecommunications networks, software ecosystems, electricity, repairs, and eventually some system for electronic waste.

A product, then, is never only a product.

It arrives inside a network of supporting flows.

That is why the spread of consumerism cannot be reduced to advertising. Advertising may create recognition or desire, but desire becomes commercially effective only when the surrounding system makes repeated purchase possible.

Income matters. Credit matters. Retail density matters. Logistics matters. Energy matters. Digital access matters. Distribution matters. Waste management matters.

When those systems expand together, consumption can accelerate rapidly.

When those systems expand unevenly, benefits and costs can pull apart.

A city may become excellent at importing packaged goods before it becomes excellent at collecting the packaging. A food

market may become excellent at distributing shelf-stable ultra-processed products before public-health systems can respond to changing diets. A country may gain access to inexpensive electronics faster than it develops affordable repair, take-back, or safe recycling systems.

The commercial front end can globalize faster than the material back end can catch up.

THE NUTRITION TRANSITION

Food provides one of the clearest examples because the consequences are intimate and cumulative.

Economic development, urbanization, changing work patterns, global supply chains, retail transformation, and industrial food production can change what people eat. Traditional diets do not disappear overnight, and no single global diet replaces them. But food environments can shift toward products that are more standardized, portable, heavily marketed, shelf-stable, energy-dense, and convenient.

The World Health Organization has repeatedly linked changing dietary patterns to globalization of food systems, urbanization, economic growth, and the increasing availability of heavily marketed processed and ultra-processed foods high in fat, sugar, and salt. WHO now also emphasizes that obesity emerges from complex interactions among biology, behavior, food access, market forces, and broader environments—not from individual weakness alone.

That complexity is central to the argument here.

A consumerist food environment does not have to force anyone to eat anything. It changes the field of available choices,

prices, convenience, marketing exposure, portioning, distribution, and repetition.

A packaged product can solve real problems. It may be safe, cheap, portable, predictable, easy to store, and easy to prepare. For someone working long hours with limited cooking space or refrigeration, convenience is not a superficial luxury.

So the critique cannot be reduced to “traditional food good, industrial food bad.”

The harder question is what happens when convenience, shelf life, aggressive marketing, and scale reorganize the food environment faster than nutritional, cultural, and public-health adaptation can keep pace.

One result can be a double burden rather than a simple transition from hunger to abundance. A society can still contain food insecurity and nutritional deficiency while also experiencing rising overweight, obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular risk, and other diet-related chronic disease.

In 2022, according to WHO, 2.5 billion adults worldwide were overweight and 890 million were living with obesity. WHO also emphasizes that global obesity has risen alongside major changes in food systems, physical activity, and socioeconomic conditions.

Those figures do not prove that one category of food or one company caused the trend.

They do show why the global spread of consumer markets cannot be judged only by whether more products became available.

Availability is one dimension of integration.

Health, autonomy, local food systems, agricultural patterns, cost, and dependence are others.

A PRODUCT CAN BE GLOBAL WHILE ITS WASTE REMAINS LOCAL

Packaging reveals the same asymmetry in a more visible form.

A beverage company can manufacture standardized containers at enormous scale, distribute them across continents, and sell them through globally recognizable branding. But the empty bottle, wrapper, pouch, or cup becomes a local problem the moment it is discarded.

The producer is global.

The waste collector is local.

The landfill is local.

The clogged drain is local.

The informal recycler is local.

The municipal budget is local.

Waste systems are expensive public infrastructures. Collection vehicles, transfer stations, sorting facilities, landfills, composting, recycling, enforcement, worker safety, data systems, and public education all require capital and continuing administrative capacity.

The World Bank's latest global assessment reports that the world generated about 2.56 billion tonnes of municipal solid waste in 2022 and could reach 3.86 billion tonnes by 2050 under a business-as-usual trajectory. It also emphasizes that waste generation is growing faster than population and that lower-

income countries often face much weaker collection and disposal capacity.

This is not a story about poorer countries being uniquely irresponsible.

High-income societies generally generate far more waste per person. The World Bank has long documented the strong relationship between income, urbanization, consumption, and waste generation.

The asymmetry lies elsewhere: richer societies often built large waste-management systems alongside rising consumption, while rapidly growing markets can receive the consumption side of the model before comparable infrastructure exists.

The result is a delayed cost.

The purchase is immediate.

The collection system is future work.

The landfill is future land.

The cleanup is future labor.

The environmental burden is future exposure.

PLASTIC MAKES THE TIME PROBLEM VISIBLE

Plastic is useful precisely because it is light, cheap, durable, moldable, and resistant to degradation.

Those are remarkable engineering properties.

They are also what makes plastic such a difficult waste material.

A material designed to resist decay sits uneasily inside products meant to be used for minutes, days, or weeks.

The contradiction is not plastic itself.

It is the pairing of long material persistence with short commercial life.

UNEP estimates that hundreds of millions of tonnes of plastic waste are generated each year and identifies packaging as the largest generator of single-use plastic waste. It also reports that large shares of plastic waste are landfilled, mismanaged, or lost as litter rather than effectively recovered.

The problem sharpens as plastics consumption expands globally. UNEP's current work on plastic pollution describes a business-as-usual path in which global plastic waste could nearly triple by 2060.

The conclusion is not "ban everything plastic."

Plastic can reduce food spoilage, protect medical equipment, lower transportation weight, provide durable components, and perform functions that are difficult to replace.

The integrative test is more specific:

What material lifetime is appropriate for the function being served?

A medical implant and a disposable fork should not be evaluated under the same logic merely because both contain plastic.

A durable appliance housing and a multilayer snack wrapper do not have the same end-of-life possibilities.

A material can be technically excellent yet systemically ill matched to the commercial rhythm imposed on it.

GLOBAL SUPPLY, LOCAL CAPACITY

The same mismatch appears beyond waste.

A product can be globally standardized while maintenance remains locally scarce. A manufacturer can ship devices into a country without establishing affordable spare-parts distribution. Software support can depend on distant servers. Warranty service can be concentrated in major cities. Proprietary diagnostics can make independent repair difficult.

The object may be physically present.

The capacity to keep it functioning may not be.

That creates a peculiar dependence. A society may gain access to sophisticated goods while becoming reliant on external firms for updates, parts, cloud services, licenses, consumables, or replacement units.

Access is real.

Autonomy may not increase in the same proportion.

Development therefore cannot be measured simply by counting the products in circulation.

A useful technology can expand capability enormously. Mobile phones, refrigeration, water treatment, vehicles, medical equipment, agricultural machinery, computers, and solar systems can all produce real gains.

But a technology integrated into local life also creates maintenance obligations, skill requirements, supply chains, standards, replacement needs, and end-of-life burdens.

The more critical the function, the more consequential those dependencies become.

GLOBALIZATION MOVES IN MANY DIRECTIONS

A U.S. reader can easily picture globalization as American brands moving outward.

That picture is too simple.

Consumer culture now circulates through many centers. Korean entertainment and cosmetics, Japanese electronics and design, Chinese e-commerce and manufacturing, European luxury and fashion, Indian digital services, Latin American food and media cultures, Gulf retail and tourism, and countless regional industries influence consumption far beyond their countries of origin.

Products, aesthetics, platforms, technologies, and commercial practices move in multiple directions.

There is no single national source to identify.

Consumerism is a recurring structure that can inhabit very different cultural forms.

Across those forms, the same questions return:

How often must demand renew?

How much of life is converted into transactions?

How much material flow is required to maintain the desired functions?

Who bears the delayed costs?

How dependent does access become on distant systems?

What local institutions are strengthened, displaced, or bypassed?

A GLOBAL PRODUCT CAN CHANGE A LOCAL NORM

Consumerism also travels through comparison.

Once a product becomes globally visible, it can change what people regard as ordinary, modern, successful, clean, attractive, convenient, or prestigious.

A car can change expectations about mobility. Air conditioning can change expectations about indoor comfort. Packaged foods can change expectations about preparation time. Smartphones can change expectations about permanent availability. Fast fashion can change expectations about how frequently clothing should change. Delivery platforms can change expectations about waiting and convenience.

None of those changes is automatically bad.

Many are genuine improvements.

Normalization matters because it shifts the baseline from which deprivation is felt.

Something that did not exist as a practical possibility can become a perceived necessity once infrastructure, status, habit, and social coordination reorganize around it.

This is one reason consumerism travels so well.

It does not have to persuade every individual through advertising. It can become embedded in institutions and expectations until opting out carries a practical cost.

If employment assumes a smartphone, not owning one is no longer merely a consumer preference.

If a city is built around cars, refusing a car may require sacrificing access to work, education, or services.

If social participation occurs through commercial platforms, nonparticipation can become isolating.

At that point, desire and infrastructure become harder to separate.

DEVELOPMENT IS NOT HIGH-CONSUMPTION IMITATION

A major mistake follows when material development is confused with reproducing the highest-consumption lifestyles.

People need secure food, housing, sanitation, health care, transportation, energy, communication, education, tools, and material protection.

In many places, more material provision is not optional; it is necessary.

Degrowth in an affluent society cannot be exported as a command to societies where basic needs remain unmet.

The useful question is not whether every region should cut consumption by the same percentage.

It is which flows genuinely expand capabilities and which mainly reproduce status, rapid turnover, waste, and commercial dependence.

A refrigerator for a household without safe food storage is not equivalent to replacing a functioning refrigerator because a new model has a larger screen.

A first reliable vehicle in a rural area with no transportation system is not equivalent to replacing a luxury vehicle for styling.

A first smartphone can radically expand access to banking, information, navigation, education, communication, and work. Replacing that phone annually may serve a very different function.

Sufficiency therefore has to be understood in relation to context and development.

More can be integrative where essential capabilities are missing.

More can become disintegrative where additional throughput produces little new function while increasing extraction, waste, dependence, or inequality.

The same quantity can mean very different things in different contexts.

GLOBAL SALES, LOCAL CONSEQUENCES

The pattern can now be stated plainly.

Consumerism globalizes the front end of consumption with remarkable efficiency.

Design, finance, branding, logistics, platforms, and distribution can make the same commercial form available across continents.

Its consequences, however, are re-localized.

Bodies metabolize the food locally.

Cities manage the traffic locally.

Workers repair—or fail to repair—the products locally.

Municipalities collect the waste locally.

Landfills occupy local land.

Pollution enters local air, soil, and water.

Households absorb the debt locally.

Communities adapt their habits locally.

The global sale ends in a local material reality.

A noosophical analysis therefore cannot stop at the checkout.

It has to follow the product through its full field of effects: production, transport, use, maintenance, dependence, health, disposal, and the institutions required to keep those flows coherent.

A product that is profitable to distribute can still be poorly integrated into the place where it arrives.

A market that expands access can still externalize the infrastructure needed to absorb its consequences.

And a society can become richer in available goods while becoming poorer in autonomy if the systems required to maintain those goods remain distant, proprietary, fragile, or underdeveloped.

The issue is no longer whether consumerism should cross borders.

It already has.

The harder question is what must travel with it if the resulting system is to remain coherent: repair capacity, waste infrastructure, health protection, technical knowledge, fiscal capacity, regulation, and the local ability to decide which functions are worth maintaining.

Consumerism becomes especially disintegrative when the object travels but responsibility does not.

The next chapter follows another form of displaced responsibility: ownership gives way to subscriptions, licenses, ecosystems, and continuing payments, and the consumer buys not only access to a thing but entry into a relationship that may be difficult to leave.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

World Health Organization. Practice Guide to Effective Population-Based Food Policy Actions to Promote Healthy Diets. 2019.

World Health Organization. “Obesity and Overweight.” Fact sheet, updated 2025.

World Health Organization. “Ultra-processed foods: a One Health agenda for action and accountability.” 2026.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Ultra-processed Foods, Diet Quality and Human Health. 2019.

World Bank. What a Waste 3.0: Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management toward Circularity until 2050.

United Nations Environment Programme. Materials on plastic pollution, single-use plastics, and global plastic waste.

CHAPTER 7

WHEN CONSUMERISM STOPS SELLING OBJECTS

A company no longer has to sell you another object to keep the transaction going.

It can sell continued access to the same function.

Music becomes a monthly payment. Software becomes a license tied to an account. Storage becomes a recurring fee. A connected feature in a device may remain available only while a service is active. A game can be sold once and then continue selling currencies, passes, cosmetic items, boosts, or randomized rewards. A familiar product can become one point inside a larger ecosystem of accounts, subscriptions, accessories, data, cloud services, and continuing payments.

Commercially, the shift is significant: renewal no longer requires replacing the physical object.

The payment relationship itself can be renewed instead.

That transformation is not inherently disintegrative. Some functions are genuinely continuous. Servers have to run. Software has to be maintained. Networks have to be operated. Libraries of music or video have to be licensed and delivered. A transportation service may be used only occasionally and be more rational to access than to own. A subscription can lower upfront cost, spread risk, provide constant updates, or allow many people to share infrastructure that would be wasteful to reproduce individually.

The trouble begins when access and dependence become hard to tell apart.

FROM SALES TO RECURRING REVENUE

A traditional sale has a natural stopping point.

The buyer pays. The seller delivers. The transaction ends, even if maintenance, warranty service, or future purchases create later relationships.

Recurring revenue changes that temporal structure.

The customer relationship is no longer merely a path to a sale. It becomes an asset that can keep generating revenue as long as the relationship stays active.

From the firm's perspective, this has obvious advantages. Revenue becomes more predictable. Customer retention becomes economically measurable. Acquisition costs can be spread over a longer relationship. Services can be improved continuously rather than sold as isolated versions. A business can invest in infrastructure that would make little sense if every interaction were a one-time purchase.

From the consumer's perspective, the advantages can also be real. Paying monthly for a large, continuously updated catalog of music may make more sense than purchasing every recording individually. Cloud storage is not a static object; servers, redundancy, bandwidth, security, and maintenance continue after signup. Internet service and cellular service are continuing functions by their nature.

Recurring payment, then, is not the problem in itself.

The real test is whether the payment continues because a meaningful function continues—or because the relationship has been designed to outlive active value, attention, or consent.

WHEN A SERVICE TURNS INTO CAPTIVE REVENUE

A recurring payment can serve an ongoing function.

It can also become what this book calls captive rent extraction.

The phrase is used cautiously. It does not imply that every rent, subscription, lease, or service fee is illegitimate. It names a narrower structure: the consumer remains dependent on a provider for access to a function, while the provider's recurring revenue rests increasingly on lock-in, exit costs, control of essential interfaces, or inertia rather than on continuing improvement or proportionate service.

Several signs reveal the difference.

Does the service still require real ongoing work or infrastructure?

Can the consumer leave without losing disproportionate value?

Can data, files, purchases, settings, or social connections move elsewhere?

Is the recurring charge transparent?

Does the provider have to keep earning the relationship, or does the architecture make departure costly regardless of satisfaction?

This is a functional distinction, not a moral label.

A subscription that finances a genuinely continuous service may be entirely coherent. A recurring charge attached to a function that could reasonably have remained locally usable after purchase raises a different issue. A service that grows more valuable as it improves is not the same as one that merely grows harder to leave.

THE LOGIC OF THE ECOSYSTEM

Modern dependence often appears not in one product but in the relationships among products.

A phone works with an account. The account stores photographs, contacts, purchases, passwords, health information, subscriptions, and payment methods. Accessories use particular standards. Applications may work best inside one platform. A watch, earbuds, laptop, television, car interface, cloud service, and home devices can become more convenient when they share the same ecosystem.

That integration can be genuinely useful.

Compatibility reduces friction. Shared accounts prevent repeated setup. Synchronized data can increase continuity. Security can be easier to manage. A person may rationally prefer the ecosystem that works well for them.

It also creates switching costs.

The more functions are bundled together, the more changing one component can require changing others. Leaving may mean exporting data, buying new accessories, learning a new interface, losing purchased software, reorganizing family accounts, changing workflows, or abandoning features that do not transfer.

None of this proves coercion.

It does show why competition cannot be judged only at the moment of entry. A consumer who freely chooses an ecosystem can face a very different decision years later, after data, habits, purchases, and compatible devices have accumulated inside it.

The first choice and the later exit are not symmetrical.

WHEN “BUYING” SOFTWARE DOES NOT MEAN OWNING IT

Digital commerce complicates the ordinary language of property.

We still say that we “buy” a game, movie, book, application, or other digital good. But the legal and technical relationship may differ sharply from ownership of a physical object.

A printed book can normally be lent, resold, given away, stored without the bookseller’s continuing permission, and read decades later if the object survives.

A licensed digital work may depend on an account, a platform, authentication, compatible software, continued server operation, or terms that restrict transfer and resale. The user may possess a copy locally while lacking many of the ordinary powers associated with ownership.

Licensing is not fraudulent by definition. Digital works create real problems of copying, distribution, updates, security, and intellectual property, and a license can describe the transaction accurately.

The confusion begins when the transaction feels like a purchase but the practical rights amount to conditional access.

So the noosophical test is not the word printed on the button.

It is what the user can actually do afterward.

Can the thing be transferred?

Can it be preserved independently?

Can it be used after the seller disappears?

Can the user modify it?

Can access be revoked?

Does continued use require another party's continuing infrastructure or permission?

Ownership is not a magical status. It is a bundle of practical powers, and digital systems can unbundle those powers and sell only some of them.

WHEN SILENCE BECOMES REVENUE

Recurring-payment systems introduce another unusual feature: doing nothing can have economic consequences.

In a one-time purchase, silence usually means no new transaction.

In a negative-option subscription, silence can mean renewal.

The service continues. The card is charged. The relationship survives unless the consumer actively interrupts it.

This can be convenient. Nobody wants to reauthorize their internet connection, cloud backup, or other genuinely continuous service every month.

But inertia has obvious commercial value.

A consumer may keep paying because the service is still wanted. They may also keep paying because the charge is small, forgotten, bundled, hard to find, or annoying to cancel. Revenue

data cannot distinguish those states unless the system is designed to separate active preference from passive continuation.

American consumer law addresses part of the problem through a mix of federal and state rules rather than a single national subscription regime.

For online negative-option offers, the Restore Online Shoppers' Confidence Act requires clear disclosure of material terms, express informed consent before charging, and a simple mechanism to stop recurring charges. The Federal Trade Commission has continued using ROSCA and the FTC Act in subscription cases. In 2025 and 2026, it brought or settled actions alleging unauthorized enrollment, inadequate disclosure, charges after attempted cancellation, or unnecessarily difficult cancellation processes. The FTC's pending case against Uber, for example, alleges that the company failed to provide a simple mechanism to stop recurring Uber One charges; those allegations remain contested rather than adjudicated facts. Other recent FTC settlements involving Chegg and Shutterstock likewise centered on consent and cancellation practices.

States add their own rules. California strengthened its Automatic Renewal Law effective July 1, 2025, including express affirmative consent requirements and clearer cancellation protections.

For this argument, the precise legal boundary of every subscription product is less important than the principle behind those rules.

The law is forced to ask a question the business model may prefer to leave blurry:

Does continued payment still represent continued choice?

EASY IN, HARD OUT

The asymmetry is easiest to see by comparing entry with exit.

If joining takes thirty seconds but leaving requires searching a help center, navigating multiple screens, calling during limited hours, rejecting retention offers, or locating a hidden cancellation control, the relationship contains asymmetric friction.

That asymmetry has economic force.

Friction discourages action. Companies rely on that fact when they remove friction from checkout; the principle does not disappear when the desired action is cancellation.

A coherent subscription should not make consumers prove their dissatisfaction in order to escape.

Cancellation does not have to look identical in every context. Some services involve equipment return, outstanding balances, safety checks, regulated procedures, or contractual terms that genuinely require extra steps.

The test is proportionality.

Is the exit process more complex because the service actually requires complexity, or because complexity improves retention?

Recurring revenue can turn small amounts of consumer inattention into large aggregate income.

The advantage of silence can become the advantage of friction.

MICROTRANSACTIONS: WHEN ONE PURCHASE BECOMES MANY

Consumerism can fragment not only ownership but the purchase itself.

A game may once have been sold primarily as one product. Many contemporary digital products can instead contain repeated opportunities to spend after entry: cosmetic items, virtual currency, expansion content, season passes, convenience features, upgrades, time-saving items, randomized rewards, or other microtransactions.

Again, the category is too broad for a single moral judgment.

An expansion that adds substantial new content can function like a new work. A voluntary cosmetic purchase may simply support a game someone enjoys. Ongoing revenue can finance servers, moderation, development, events, and updates long after launch.

Repeated small purchases, however, change the decision architecture.

Instead of asking once, “Is this product worth sixty dollars?” the user may face dozens or hundreds of smaller decisions whose cumulative cost is less salient.

Virtual currencies can add another layer. The consumer no longer sees every transaction directly in dollars. A bundle of tokens is purchased first; individual items are then priced in the internal unit. The conversion can be cognitively trivial and still create distance from the original money.

Randomized rewards add uncertainty. The buyer may pay for a chance of receiving something desired rather than for the item itself.

Those mechanisms have generated comparisons with gambling, especially around loot boxes, but the comparison should not be generalized carelessly. Legal classifications differ, designs differ, players differ, and not every randomized digital

reward has the same behavioral or economic structure as regulated gambling.

A more precise test returns us to Chapter 2:

How much does the business model depend on repeated spending, high-intensity users, uncertainty, and the reduced salience of cumulative cost?

FROM OBJECT TO ACCESS

A critique of subscriptions can easily collapse into nostalgia for ownership.

That would be a mistake.

Ownership is efficient for some functions and wasteful for others.

A household may need a drill for ten minutes a year. Universal individual ownership of rarely used tools can consume materials, money, storage, and maintenance while providing little additional autonomy. A tool library can provide better access with fewer objects.

The same logic can apply to cars, workshops, specialized equipment, books, media, temporary housing, machinery, and many other functions.

Access can therefore be more integrative than ownership.

The real distinction is not:

owning = freedom

access = dependence.

It is:

What kind of access? Under whose control? With what exit, continuity, transferability, material efficiency, and consequences for autonomy?

A public library and a proprietary platform both provide access without individual ownership. Their social relations are not the same.

A cooperative workshop and a subscription that disables a purchased device when payment stops both replace ownership with access. Their functions are not the same.

POOLING OR EXTRACTION?

This gives us a sharper distinction.

Pooling resources can reduce duplication while expanding use.

A shared vehicle can serve multiple households. A library can make thousands of books available without requiring each reader to buy each one. A makerspace can provide expensive tools to people who could never justify individual purchase. A cooperative can distribute costs and responsibilities across members.

In such cases, recurring payment may support common infrastructure whose value depends on continued operation.

Extraction has a different structure.

The provider preserves or creates dependency in order to capture a continuing payment stream disproportionate to the continuing function delivered.

The same external form—a monthly payment—can therefore describe opposite dynamics.

One can pool access to reduce material requirements and increase capability.

The other can turn a previously durable relationship into permanent rent.

The word subscription tells us too little to judge the arrangement.

The function has to be examined.

DIGITAL DOES NOT MEAN IMMATERIAL

Digital services are often described as dematerialized.

At the level of the user interface, that can be true. A stream replaces a disc. A cloud document replaces a local filing cabinet. A virtual meeting replaces some travel. Software replaces physical media. One server can provide a function to millions of users without millions of separate physical copies.

That can reduce material flows.

But digital is not immaterial.

Data centers use servers, storage devices, networking equipment, cooling systems, buildings, backup systems, electricity, water in some configurations, and replacement hardware. Networks require cables, towers, routers, switches, satellites, spectrum infrastructure, and maintenance. User access requires phones, computers, televisions, or other devices.

The comparison has to be empirical rather than symbolic.

Does the service reduce total material and energy requirements for the function it replaces?

Sometimes it can.

Sometimes convenience can increase use enough to offset part of the saving.

Sometimes the digital service creates a new function rather than replacing an old material one.

The fact that no object changes hands at the moment of payment tells us very little about the material system behind the service.

AUTOMATED CONSUMPTION

Recurring systems can also separate payment from active decision.

Automatic billing is one of the great conveniences of modern economic life. Rent, utilities, insurance, software, memberships, donations, cloud storage, and countless other obligations can be paid without repeated manual action.

That removes administrative burden.

It also lowers awareness.

A cash purchase is difficult not to notice. A recurring charge can become part of the background. Ten small subscriptions can coexist because no single one demands much attention. Price increases may be noticed imperfectly. Services may persist after use declines. A household can lose track of the total amount committed to recurring payments.

The answer is not to make every payment manual again. That would replace one inefficiency with another.

A better principle is periodic reintegration.

Automation should remove repetitive labor without removing conscious review.

At intervals, the household can ask:

What am I paying for?

Which services still perform a real function?

Which have become habits without use?

Which prices changed?

Which dependencies would be difficult to leave?

Which services save enough time, material, or effort to justify continuing?

In this sense, integrated wealth management is not just about maximizing returns. It also means bringing the automated parts of economic life back into view before they become permanent by default.

A NOOSOPHICAL TEST FOR ACCESS

The criterion can now be stated more plainly.

Access is integrative when it expands a real capability while keeping dependence proportionate to the function.

It becomes disintegrative when the relationship narrows autonomy, creates unnecessary captivity, hides continuing cost, blocks reasonable exit, or extracts payment primarily because the user has become difficult to detach from the system.

Several questions follow from that test.

Does the service provide continuing value that genuinely requires continuing resources?

Is the price intelligible relative to the function?

Can the user leave?

Can essential data or work be exported in usable form?

Can the user continue basic functions without permanent permission from the seller where continued permission is not technically necessary?

Does the system pool scarce resources efficiently, or does it create artificial scarcity in order to monetize access?

Does the provider bear meaningful responsibilities for maintenance, security, reliability, and continuity in exchange for the recurring payment?

Or has ownership risk been shifted to the consumer while ownership power remains with the provider?

No single answer fits every service.

The aim is to evaluate dependence without romanticizing either ownership or access.

WHAT A FAIR SUBSCRIPTION LOOKS LIKE

A subscription can be fully compatible with a lower-throughput, autonomy-oriented economy.

The basic conditions are straightforward.

The function is genuinely ongoing.

The price and renewal terms are clear.

Consent is meaningful rather than buried.

Leaving is reasonably easy and reversible.

Data and work are portable when portability is compatible with the nature of the service.

The provider does not deliberately create disproportionate switching costs merely to retain the customer.

The recurring payment finances a continuing function rather than disguising a compulsory repurchase of something already paid for.

The consumer remains able to evaluate the relationship.

Under those conditions, a subscription can be more rational than ownership. It can pool infrastructure, spread costs, reduce unused assets, and allow a service to improve continuously.

Recurrence itself is not the problem.

Captive recurrence is.

SELLING PERMANENCE

The history traced in this book has now changed form several times.

Industrial production learned to make more objects.

Marketing learned to renew desire for them.

Commercial obsolescence learned to make functioning objects feel old.

Globalization learned to carry the system across borders.

Recurring revenue adds one more discovery:

Demand can continue even when the material object stays the same.

A customer can keep the same phone, computer, car, television, or home equipment while the surrounding payment relationships multiply.

Material throughput may fall in one dimension while commercial extraction rises in another.

That is why “services instead of products” is not, by itself, an exit from consumerism.

A service economy can reduce material use when it pools resources, extends product life, substitutes information for matter, or provides functions more efficiently.

It can also deepen dependence by turning more functions into recurring permissions.

The same test has followed us throughout the book:

What function is being served? What does it cost? What dependencies does it create? And can the relationship end once it has done enough?

That last question leads directly into the final chapter.

If consumerism can capture pleasure through objects, status through brands, continuity through property, access through subscriptions, and even convenience through automated payment, then leaving consumerism cannot mean simply refusing all of those things.

It has to recover those functions without leaving them permanently captive to renewal.

The final chapter asks what that would look like in practice: how to leave consumerism without leaving pleasure.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Restore Online Shoppers’ Confidence Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 8401–8405.

Federal Trade Commission. Consumer guidance and enforcement materials on negative-option subscriptions and recurring charges.

Federal Trade Commission v. Uber Technologies, Inc. and Uber USA, LLC, pending federal litigation concerning alleged subscription enrollment and cancellation practices, updated 2026.

Federal Trade Commission. Chegg settlement concerning recurring-subscription cancellation practices, 2025.

Federal Trade Commission. Shutterstock settlement concerning subscription consent and cancellation practices, 2026.

California Department of Justice. Consumer guidance on California's Automatic Renewal Law as strengthened effective July 1, 2025.

CHAPTER 8

LEAVING CONSUMERISM WITHOUT LEAVING PLEASURE

A critique fails if its only alternative looks poorer, sadder, and more constrained than the life it criticizes.

Consumerism did not become powerful simply by deceiving people. It performs real functions. It gives pleasure. It makes some actions easier. It offers novelty, beauty, entertainment, comfort, identity, social encounters, and sometimes genuine transformation in everyday life.

That is exactly why “consume less” is not enough.

Remove the commodities without rebuilding the functions they perform, and the forces that make consumerism attractive remain. Status still matters. Reward still matters. So do belonging, novelty, comfort, recognition, and accomplishment. If no other structures answer those needs, markets have every reason to capture them again.

Leaving consumerism cannot mean suppressing desire and reward. It means loosening the bond between reward and repeated market acquisition.

Consumerism often renews reward through new consumption.

A lower-throughput society must be able to renew reward through depth as well as novelty.

PLEASURE IS NOT THE ENEMY

Begin by rejecting a false opposition.

On one side, consumerism is imagined as joy, freedom, color, comfort, abundance, and choice. On the other, degrowth is imagined as restraint, austerity, renunciation, guilt, and a permanently diminished life.

The opposition is false, but politically powerful because it touches a real fear: that a less consumerist life will also be a less enjoyable one.

Buying can be pleasurable. A restaurant meal can be excellent. A trip can transform a life. Clothing can be beautiful. A computer can open a world of creation. A game can provide hundreds of hours of experience. A well-designed object can increase autonomy. Comfort can save time and protect health. Novelty can stimulate curiosity.

Market-mediated pleasure is not the problem in itself.

The problem appears when pleasure, reward, and commercial renewal become structurally linked: when we have to buy again in order to feel again; when novelty comes mainly from replacement; when personal transformation is repeatedly translated into a product; when comfort becomes an implicit measure of happiness; when belonging must be purchased through a brand; when boredom immediately calls for a transaction.

A critique that despises pleasure makes the mirror-image mistake. It turns deprivation into a virtue without asking whether life actually improves.

Involuntary poverty is not chosen degrowth. Someone who goes without because they cannot afford access has not automatically gained autonomy. Lack of decent housing, health

care, healthy food, transportation, tools, education, or recreation can be profoundly disintegrative.

The aim is not:

How can we live with as little as possible?

It is:

What do we actually need to make life rich, free, and sustainable at the relevant scale?

MATERIALISM, WELL-BEING, AND PURPOSE

The research does not support the slogan that objects make people unhappy.

It supports a more precise claim.

A 2014 meta-analysis by Helga Dittmar, Rod Bond, Megan Hurst, and Tim Kasser examined 259 independent samples and 753 effect sizes and found an overall association between stronger materialistic orientation and lower personal well-being. That finding does not mean every possession reduces happiness or that anyone who values material goods is condemned to unhappiness. Effects vary across measures and contexts. The narrower conclusion is that making money, possessions, image, and status central measures of a good life is, on average, associated with poorer well-being.

The pattern becomes clearer beside research on intrinsic and extrinsic goals. A 2023 meta-analysis led by Emma Bradshaw examined the well-being implications of prioritizing extrinsic goals such as wealth, fame, and appearance over intrinsic goals such as personal growth, relationships, community contribution, and health. The result again points away from simple anti-materialism. Resources and achievement are not the problem; the

costs emerge when external markers displace more intrinsic purposes.

Matter itself is not the enemy.

A piano is material. A book is material. A bicycle is material. A house is material. A workshop is material. Each can support relationship, competence, safety, creation, continuity, and freedom.

The test is simple:

What purpose does the thing serve?

A possession can be a means. It becomes more problematic when it stops supporting life and becomes one of the main units by which a person measures their own worth.

EXPERIENCES VERSUS THINGS: ANOTHER FALSE CHOICE

Research on experiential purchases often finds that spending on experiences can produce more satisfaction or social connection than spending on material possessions. Recent work by Amit Kumar, Thomas Mann, and Thomas Gilovich, for example, found stronger feelings of social connection around experiential purchases than around comparable material purchases.

But the lesson cannot be reduced to “buy experiences instead of objects.”

A long-haul flight, luxury tourism, a giant festival, or a constantly renewed stream of commercial experiences can require enormous material and financial throughput. An industry can commodify experiences just as effectively as it commodifies objects.

Conversely, one musical instrument bought once can support thirty years of learning. A bicycle can become transportation, exercise, exploration, and autonomy. A durable pan can cook thousands of meals. A tool can become repair, construction, transmission, and skill.

The Noosophical test is not object versus experience.

It is:

How much lived richness does this thing or activity make possible, for how long, at what material cost, with what dependencies, and with what effect on autonomy?

EXISTENTIAL RETURN

A useful working concept here is existential return.

It is not a scientific index or a universal score.

It is simply a way to ask how much lived richness—experience, skill, relationship, meaning, creation, or transformation—an activity produces relative to the material resources and dependencies it requires.

Some activities can generate enormous existential return with relatively little continuing material consumption.

Music is an obvious example. A guitar, replacement strings, time, and perhaps a shared place to play can produce years of learning, pleasure, productive frustration, creativity, relationship, and progress. Reading can open thousands of worlds with little additional material throughput, especially when books circulate through libraries or sharing. Writing, dancing, walking, gardening, cooking, sports, games, crafts, repair, conversation, learning, volunteering, and community activity can all become

richer over time without requiring a proportional flow of newly purchased goods.

The deeper the practice becomes, the richer it can grow without requiring a corresponding stream of new purchases.

That does not make these activities absolute goods. A sport can become obsessive. Music can become equipment-intensive. A hobby can turn into status competition. A community organization can become bureaucratic or exclusionary. Function, cost, scale, and effects still have to be examined.

Existential return is not a total measure of life.

It is a way to distinguish renewal through depth from renewal driven mainly by replacement.

DEEPEN INSTEAD OF REPLACE

Consumerism excels at one kind of renewal: external novelty.

New version. New collection. New model. New destination. New service. New accessory. New subscription.

Reward comes from changing the object.

Many practices renew reward differently.

A musician does not play the same piece in the same way after ten years of practice. A chess player no longer sees the same board once new structures become visible. A cook transforms familiar ingredients through technique, culture, and imagination. A garden changes with the seasons. A craftsperson encounters new problems. A conversation changes as a relationship deepens. An athlete can work on movement, endurance, balance, coordination, and strategy without continually replacing equipment.

Novelty moves inside the practice.

A possible loop is:

reward → understanding → skill → relationship → creation → transformation → new reward.

This loop is not opposed to pleasure.

It can deepen pleasure.

It does not eliminate desire. It simply gives desire more possible objects than acquisition alone.

DESIRE IS NOT A PURCHASE INSTRUCTION

Chapter 2 treated desire, anticipation, and reward as ordinary human mechanisms. Trying to abolish them would be absurd.

The trouble begins when very different desires are treated as if they called for the same response.

I want something.

But what do I actually want?

An object? Novelty? Recognition? Relationship? Rest? Competence? Beauty? A reward after effort? Transformation? A change of environment? A sense of control?

Those needs are not interchangeable.

Hunger probably calls for food. Loneliness more likely calls for relationship. A desire for progress may call for practice. A need for rest calls for time. An aesthetic desire may call for creation, contemplation, or the purchase of a beautiful object. A search for status may call for examining the hierarchy that makes that status matter.

Consumerism compresses that plurality into one question:

What can you buy?

More integrated thought reopens the alternatives.

The task is not to suppress desire, but to stop treating every desire as a purchase instruction.

CONSUMING LESS IS NOT ENOUGH

A degrowth policy that merely reduces volume is unlikely to last if it does not rebuild the social functions consumerism has learned to perform.

Status is a function.

Belonging is a function.

Ritual is a function.

Reward is a function.

Anticipation is a function.

The experience of transformation is a function.

Leave those functions vacant, and new industries can simply arise to recommodify them.

The answer, then, is not subtraction alone. It is functional substitution and diversification.

A material need may call for a durable, repairable object—or for shared access when use is rare.

Belonging may be supported by a club, congregation, sports league, neighborhood group, nonprofit, mutual-aid network, cooperative, cultural organization, volunteer organization, or informal community.

Transformation can come through learning, art, public service, sport, craft, therapy, disciplined practice, or political engagement.

Novelty can come from variation, exploration, discovery, and deeper participation rather than systematic replacement.

Status can be redirected toward competence, contribution, reliability, creativity, stewardship, courage, or service—without pretending that symbolic hierarchies can simply be abolished.

Meaning can come from philosophy, culture, knowledge, spirituality, family, civic life, or commitment.

And pleasure can remain pleasure without becoming accumulation.

CLUBS, NONPROFITS, COOPERATIVES, AND COMMON RESOURCES

A less consumerist society needs infrastructure that makes those alternatives practical.

No isolated individual can share everything, learn everything, organize everything, produce everything, or repair everything alone.

That is where American forms such as clubs, nonprofits, mutual-aid groups, cooperatives, libraries, makerspaces, tool libraries, neighborhood organizations, congregations, recreation leagues, and other voluntary associations become relevant.

There is no single American legal equivalent of the French association, nor does there need to be. Function matters more than the label.

A neighborhood tool library may allow fifty households to use equipment none of them needs to own individually. A nonprofit can maintain a shared workshop. A cooperative can organize access to equipment or space. A recreation league can provide regular activity, recognition, skill, and belonging. A public library

can circulate books, tools, media, meeting space, and knowledge. A mutual-aid group can coordinate support that would otherwise have to be purchased individually.

These arrangements do not replace government or markets.

They add another capacity: acting together without forcing every relationship into either an administrative or a commercial form.

They can also produce some of the very functions consumerism sells in product form: belonging, recognition, competence, ritual, activity, identity, and shared accomplishment.

Collective organization is not a universal solution.

It requires time, governance, trust, space, skills, conflict management, and sometimes significant money. It can exclude. It can become bureaucratic. It can depend heavily on a few volunteers. It can reproduce status hierarchies or unequal power.

The same principle applies here as elsewhere:

Choose the scale and structure that fit the function.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM INCLUDES THE FREEDOM NOT TO BUY

The modern consumer is often described as free because many products and providers are available.

That freedom is real.

It is also incomplete.

Economic freedom does not begin and end with choosing better products. It also includes the practical ability to decide that no purchase is necessary.

That ability depends on having alternatives.

Repair instead of replace.

Borrow.

Share.

Wait.

Make something when doing so makes sense.

Pool resources.

Join with others.

Negotiate.

Refuse.

Change a political or institutional rule when the problem cannot be solved through market choice.

Autonomy does not mean total self-sufficiency. No individual produces alone the electricity, medicines, computer chips, roads, scientific knowledge, communications infrastructure, or every service they depend on.

Here, autonomy means having a meaningful plurality of ways to satisfy a function without being unnecessarily trapped inside a single mechanism.

FROM CONSUMER TO INTEGRATED ECONOMIC CITIZEN

Consumer politics often tries to overcome passivity by encouraging responsible purchasing: choose certified products, boycott firms, support local businesses, change providers, favor lower-impact goods, or reward companies judged to be better.

Those choices can matter.

But the framework remains limited when purchasing differently is still the main form of action.

A more reflective consumer may be less passive and still remain confined to the market if the principal lever is choosing among offers.

A broader working concept is useful here: the integrated economic citizen.

This is not a legal status. It is a map of capacities.

Such a person can buy, but can also refuse, repair, share, pool resources, produce, volunteer, join an organization, contribute to a commons, organize with others, act politically, pressure an institution, or help change a rule when the problem cannot be solved by consumer choice.

The horizon is no longer just better choice within the market.

It is also the ability to act on the structures that produce the choices available.

SUFFICIENCY IS NOT A NUMBER

The word sufficiency can easily turn moralistic.

It can sound as though some authority should decide how many goods each person is allowed to possess.

That is not the position defended here.

Sufficiency is functional.

Enough for what? For whom? At what scale? For how long?

A small home may be sufficient for one person and insufficient for a household that also needs accessible space, caregiving capacity, or a home-based occupation. A modest computer may be perfectly sufficient for writing and completely inadequate for

demanding graphics or scientific work. A vehicle may be unnecessary in a dense neighborhood with reliable transit and indispensable in a remote area. A specialized tool may make no sense in every garage while being essential in a shared workshop.

The Noosophical test is not:

How much should someone own?

It is:

What additional function does the “more” still serve, and at what cost?

If more provides security, autonomy, pleasure, capability, resilience, or another real function, it may be justified.

If more serves mainly status renewal or accumulation without a clear additional function, the question of satiation becomes legitimate.

LESS MATERIAL THROUGHPUT, MORE CAPABILITY

The word degrowth creates another misunderstanding: that everything should shrink.

A lower-throughput society has no reason to want less knowledge, less health, less friendship, less freedom, less music, less competence, less culture, less safety, or less autonomy.

Material degrowth may require growth in durability, available time, autonomy, relationships, knowledge, shared infrastructure, cultural activity, civic capacity, and the collective ability to choose ends rather than merely accelerate means.

Tradeoffs do not disappear.

Knowledge can require energy-intensive laboratories and data infrastructure. Modern health care can be materially demanding. Culture uses buildings, instruments, travel, equipment, and networks. Autonomy can sometimes require greater investment at the beginning.

The finality changes; material constraints remain.

The goal is no longer to maximize flows indiscriminately.

It is to expand capabilities judged important while making their material costs visible and governable.

TIME AS WEALTH

Consumerism also organizes time.

We work to finance consumption. We commute to work and stores. We compare offers. We manage subscriptions. We maintain possessions. We watch advertising. We follow product cycles. We research upgrades. We pursue the next acquisition.

Productivity gains can be converted in more than one direction.

They can produce more output in the same amount of time.

Or they can make it possible to produce enough with less labor time.

The second possibility is easy to miss because additional market output is easier to count than an hour that no longer has to be sold.

Yet an hour can become rest, caregiving, cooking, reading, physical activity, presence with someone we love, community involvement, learning, creation, or simply unstructured availability.

Once material security is adequate, an additional hour of genuinely usable time may sometimes improve life more than an additional good.

The word sometimes is essential.

Someone living in poverty may rationally prefer more income. Someone with serious health needs may require costly treatment. Someone in exhausting or insecure employment may have very little freedom over how time is used. Time is not a universal currency that substitutes for everything else.

But time deserves to be visible as a form of wealth.

MARKETS CAN REMAIN

Leaving consumerism does not require abolishing markets.

A business can provide an excellent service. Competition can support innovation. Some commodities dramatically increase autonomy, comfort, safety, and possibility. Restaurants, concerts, clothes, travel, games, technology, tools, and desirable objects can continue to exist.

The difference lies elsewhere.

The market stops being the default answer to every lack.

Consumption stops being the primary measure of collective success.

Growth in revenue stops being automatically confused with improvement in life.

An economy can contain markets without being organized around the requirement that material demand renew forever.

PROOF THROUGH ACTION

Ending with theory alone would contradict the argument.

Noosophy insists on manifestation: understand and integrate, manifest at the relevant level, observe reality's response, correct, and reintegrate.

So an alternative to consumerism has to be tested in practice.

Repair instead of replace: is repair actually cheaper, safer, and more coherent here?

Share a tool: does access become easier or more constrained?

Join a club, nonprofit, cooperative, or community group: does it actually create belonging and activity, or only new obligations?

Replace shopping as entertainment with a practice: is the reward genuinely sufficient?

Cancel a subscription: was the lost function important enough that another arrangement is needed?

Use freed time to learn, create, rest, volunteer, or meet people: does quality of life actually improve?

Proof through action does not validate an entire doctrine.

It tests, locally, whether a proposed solution actually performs the function claimed for it.

If it fails, it should be corrected or abandoned.

A theory of degrowth that cannot survive contact with ordinary life would become another compensatory discourse.

NOOSOPHY MUST NOT BECOME A NEW OPIUM

The title of this book demands one final self-critique.

If consumerism can function like an opium by consoling without transforming the cause of a lack, Noosophy could reproduce the same structure if it claimed, by itself, to provide meaning, identity, happiness, community, and salvation.

It must not say:

Replace consumption with Noosophy.

Noosophy cannot answer consumerism by becoming another total promise.

Its role is to make needs distinguishable, responses testable, dependencies visible, and contradictions examinable.

It can help formulate a question, connect domains, reveal a conflict, compare costs, test a practice, or correct an error.

It cannot decide for a human being what life is worth living.

It cannot guarantee happiness.

It cannot abolish lack.

It can only help keep lack from being automatically translated into market demand.

OPIUM, ECSTASY, AND AMPHETAMINE

The title can now be extended through three images.

Modern consumerism can sometimes resemble opium in its consoling function, ecstasy in its promise of happiness, and amphetamine in its demand to keep moving.

This is metaphor, not neurobiology.

Opium names soothing: buying, watching, consuming, or distracting oneself in ways that can make frustration easier to bear without necessarily changing its cause.

Ecstasy names the promise: intensifying the present, producing the impression of a life that is brighter, stronger, more desirable, more transformed.

Amphetamine names acceleration: desire, obtain, repeat, renew, follow, upgrade—never allowing satiation to become the end of the process.

Consumerism can combine all three.

None of this requires us to call pleasure false.

A small happiness is still happiness.

The test is what the pleasure costs, what it replaces, how long it lasts, and what structure it helps reproduce.

LEAVING CONSUMERISM

Return now to the problem posed at the beginning of the book.

Consumerism is a cultural and economic response to satiation inside a system organized around continuing growth.

It repeatedly turns needs, desires, identities, and lacks into market demand. It can turn durable objects into replacement flows. When selling another object becomes harder, it can turn ownership into recurring access. It can globalize products faster than the infrastructures needed to absorb their consequences. It can make novelty feel obligatory and comfort feel like a measure of happiness.

But it also performs real functions.

That is why the critique cannot remain negative.

Leaving consumerism is not a rejection of desire.

It is a recovery of the ability to decide which desires deserve to govern us.

Nor is it a rejection of pleasure.

It is an effort to multiply forms of pleasure that do not require permanent commercial renewal.

Objects do not disappear.

They are restored to appropriate questions of function, duration, and cost.

Markets do not disappear either.

They simply stop being the only grammar through which needs can be answered.

And no final purity is promised.

What is possible is gradual correction: structures that automatically translate lack into acquisition, novelty into replacement, use into captive payment, and happiness into consumption can be changed.

Consumerism renews through replacement.

A lower-throughput society must learn to renew through transformation.

That transformation begins with a simple freedom: to feel desire without immediately obeying it; to own without having to accumulate; to use access without becoming captive; to share without surrendering autonomy; to enjoy without restarting the cycle merely so the economic system can keep moving.

The opposite of consumerism is therefore not deprivation.

It is the recovered capacity to distinguish what is actually missing, choose how to respond, and accept that sometimes the right answer is an object, sometimes a relationship, sometimes a

practice, sometimes an institution, sometimes political transformation—and sometimes nothing to buy at all.

REFERENCES AND PRINCIPAL SOURCES

Dittmar, Helga, Rod Bond, Megan Hurst, and Tim Kasser. “The Relationship Between Materialism and Personal Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 107, no. 5 (2014): 879–924.

Kasser, Tim. “Materialistic Values and Goals.” Annual Review of Psychology 67 (2016): 489–514.

Bradshaw, Emma L., James H. Conigrave, Ben A. Steward, Kelly A. Ferber, Philip D. Parker, and Richard M. Ryan. “A Meta-Analysis of the Dark Side of the American Dream: Evidence for the Universal Wellness Costs of Prioritizing Extrinsic Over Intrinsic Goals.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 124, no. 4 (2023): 873–899.

Kumar, Amit, Thomas C. Mann, and Thomas Gilovich. “The Aptly Buried ‘I’ in Experience: Experiential Purchases Promote More Social Connection Than Material Purchases.” Journal of Behavioral Decision Making 37, no. 2 (2024): e2376.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

MAKING ENOUGH POSSIBLE AGAIN

Consumerism is not simply a matter of consuming a great deal. It is an economic, cultural, and psychological arrangement that must keep recreating reasons to buy, use, replace, renew, or keep paying. This book has followed that logic from its historical formation to some of its most contemporary forms.

We have seen how mass production creates the problem of saturation; how advertising, credit, design, status, novelty, and reward can keep demand moving; how commodities can carry promises of identity, belonging, transformation, and happiness; how material durability can collide with commercial renewal; how poverty and wealth occupy very different positions in relation to enough; how the model travels across societies; and how consumerism can keep expanding even when it sells fewer new objects by turning ownership into access, possession into subscription, and one-time purchase into recurring payment.

Yet a critique that stopped there would miss something essential.

Consumerism works partly because it performs real functions. It gives pleasure and reward. It offers signs of identity and status. It organizes anticipation, novelty, leisure, some forms of social connection, and sometimes the feeling of progress or personal transformation. That is why the conclusion cannot simply be “consume less.”

Remove the commodities without rebuilding the functions they performed, and the needs for those functions remain. They may simply return in another commercial form.

Leaving consumerism cannot mean leaving desire, pleasure, or reward. Human beings are not wrong to like objects, novelty, comfort, or beauty. The problem begins when acquisition becomes the default answer to an ever-wider range of needs, frustrations, aspirations, and tensions.

The opposite of consumerism is not asceticism.

It is the recovery of distinction.

To distinguish need from habit.

To distinguish pleasure from accumulation.

To distinguish a function from the particular object that happens to perform it.

To distinguish useful access from organized dependence.

To distinguish real innovation from renewal for its own sake.

To distinguish wealth that expands the possibilities of life from accumulation that no longer contains an internal stopping point.

And to distinguish what we actually want from what a commercial environment teaches us to want before we have time to examine it.

Sufficiency becomes decisive at that point.

Sufficiency is not a universal level imposed on everyone, and it is not a celebration of poverty. Someone who lacks housing, food, health care, mobility, or essential equipment has not consumed too much; they may lack the material conditions of a decent life.

Sufficiency means something more precise: the real possibility of recognizing that a function is adequately fulfilled and that further quantitative expansion is no longer necessary.

“I have what I need” should not automatically register as an economic failure.

Sometimes it is a human success.

That possibility is difficult to preserve in an economy where many organizations depend on future sales, attention is continuously solicited, novelty can become a value in itself, and replacement can be marketed as personal transformation.

No central command is required. The system can reproduce itself because actors respond rationally to local incentives: sell more, retain the customer, increase average spending, extend engagement, reduce churn, improve conversion, preserve growth.

The aggregate result can exceed anyone’s intention.

That is why a purely moral answer will not do.

Telling individuals to be more reasonable inside environments designed to multiply solicitations is not enough. Neither is eliminating all individual responsibility in the name of the system. Both levels matter: structures that orient conduct can be changed, and individuals and communities can become better able to judge those orientations.

Economic freedom is more than having more products to choose from.

It also includes the practical possibility of refusing a purchase, repairing, pooling resources, producing differently, sharing, joining with others, changing providers, keeping what one already owns, or deciding that no transaction is necessary.

That kind of freedom needs infrastructure.

A public library can provide access without private accumulation. A shared workshop can make individual ownership of rarely used tools unnecessary. A club, nonprofit, cooperative, mutual-aid network, congregation, neighborhood organization, or other community structure can provide belonging, practice, culture, activity, or solidarity without converting every function into a commercial relationship. A durable and repairable object can provide long continuity of use. A skill can deepen an experience for years without requiring a permanent succession of new goods.

None of these forms is good by definition.

Pooling can become bureaucratic. A community organization can reproduce exclusion or power imbalances. Property can protect autonomy or lock resources into unproductive control. A subscription can be coherent when a service is genuinely continuous or become captive rent extraction when it turns a stable function into an unnecessarily permanent payment. Repair can be resource-saving or become irrational when it consumes more resources than replacement.

The test remains functional and situated: which response actually performs the function, at what scale, for how long, with what costs, dependencies, and consequences?

That way of asking is consistent with the Noosophical perspective used throughout the book. It does not supply a final list of virtuous behaviors. It restores dimensions that quick decisions often leave out: function, duration, costs, effects, alternatives, dependencies, values, and consequences.

Nor does it promise a world without desire.

A Noosophy that tried to replace consumerism with another total promise would reproduce the error it criticizes.

Modern consumerism can sometimes resemble opium in its consoling function, ecstasy in its promise of happiness, and amphetamine in its demand to begin again. The comparison is metaphorical, not neurological. It simply separates three functions that can overlap: soothe, intensify, restart.

Those functions are not the problem.

The problem is allowing one commercial architecture to become their dominant answer.

Leaving consumerism means pluralizing the answers again.

A material lack may call for an object.

Loneliness may call for relationship.

A need for belonging may call for a collective.

A desire for transformation may call for practice or learning.

A desire for recognition may require examining the hierarchy that produces it.

A need for meaning may lead toward philosophy, culture, spirituality, knowledge, or commitment.

A need for pleasure may simply call for pleasure—without requiring one more acquisition.

That plurality also changes what degrowth can mean.

Material degrowth does not mean that everything should shrink. A society can reduce some flows of materials, energy, and replacement while expanding durability, usable time, autonomy, knowledge, the quality of relationships, common resources,

artistic practice, civic activity, repair capacity, and the collective ability to determine its own ends.

The real question is not how to do less of everything.

It is what deserves to grow, what can become stable, what should shrink, what should be transformed, and what, at times, should disappear.

No book can settle those distinctions once and for all.

They have to meet reality.

Here critique becomes proof through action.

An alternative is not validated because it sounds morally superior or conceptually elegant. It has to be tried. Does it actually reduce dependence? Does it reduce the resources required? Does it increase autonomy without shifting costs elsewhere? Does it still provide pleasure? Can it last? Is it accessible to people with little time or money? What happens when the scale changes?

Reality answers.

And the answer must be allowed to change the proposal.

The task is not to set a pure degrowth society against a corrupt consumer society. It is to recover a capacity for judgment that permanent renewal tends to erode: to know why we want something, what function we are trying to fulfill, what total price we are willing to pay, and when the answer has become sufficient.

The consumer does not need to become an ascetic.

They need the freedom to become something more than a consumer.

A person can buy when buying is appropriate, refuse when it is not, repair when repair makes sense, pool resources when sharing is efficient, produce when they have the capacity, organize with others when collective action fits the problem, and act politically when the rules themselves need to change.

Freedom may begin there: not when everything can be bought, but when buying is no longer the obligatory answer to what we want to become.

Leaving consumerism is not the organization of deprivation.

It is the recovery of the freedom to distinguish what is actually missing, choose an appropriate response, and recognize that the answer may be material, relational, practical, institutional, or political—and may require nothing to be purchased at all.

The final question is no longer:

“What should we consume?”

It is:

“What truly deserves to continue?”

ABOUT NOOSOPHIE

Noosophie begins from a simple distinction: reality does not depend on what we believe about it. An idea can be persuasive and still be false. A tradition can contain useful insights and errors. A scientific theory can be exceptionally strong within its domain and still remain limited. Our understanding changes, while what we are trying to understand is not reducible to our representations of it.

In the Noosophical project, the word “Noosophie” names truth or the structure of reality independently of how human beings understand it. We do not claim to possess that truth in full. The texts, concepts, institutions, and people working under this name offer only partial, contestable, and revisable understandings.

Noosophical work therefore means searching more seriously: distinguishing what is known from what is assumed, comparing different explanations, examining their contradictions, looking at the available facts, acknowledging areas of uncertainty, and correcting an idea when it does not withstand scrutiny.

This inquiry is not limited to a single field. The sciences can illuminate some questions, philosophy can clarify their concepts, history can show how they formed, the arts can reveal other dimensions of experience, spiritual traditions can offer interpretations that must be understood before they are evaluated, and practical activity can show what our ideas actually become when we try to apply them.

Connecting these fields does not mean blending everything together. Noosophie does not assume that all opinions are equal or that every tradition necessarily contains part of the truth. Two incompatible claims do not become true simply because we would like to reconcile

them. Integration can also require preserving a difference, contradiction, or uncertainty when it cannot honestly be resolved.

This way of searching naturally leads beyond a strict separation between theory and practice. Understanding agriculture, for example, is not only a matter of accumulating knowledge about soils, plants, or agricultural economics: it also requires looking at what different ways of farming actually produce. Understanding consumerism requires studying economics and advertising, but also their effects on habits, desires, resources, and social relationships. Understanding a political organization requires examining its principles as well as how power actually circulates within it.

When an idea can be tested in practice, consequences themselves become a source of learning. We understand, act at the relevant level, observe what reality returns, then correct and reintegrate. A beautiful theory is therefore not treated as sufficient proof of its value.

The Noosophical movement brings together people and structures that wish to participate consciously in this work of understanding and transformation. It does not ask anyone to adhere to a fixed list of beliefs. It seeks instead to develop more rigorous ways of thinking, learning, debating, producing, transmitting, and acting when our knowledge makes it possible to do better.

That is why books published by Éditions Noosophie can address very different subjects: agriculture, ecology, economics, politics, consumption, ways of life, artificial intelligence, spiritualities, culture, technologies, or collective organization. Each book explores a particular problem, with its own sources and constraints, while participating in a more general inquiry: to understand more accurately what is real, connect what can be connected without erasing differences, and accept changing our ideas and practices when confrontation with reality requires it.

Noosophie itself must therefore not be confused with a book, an author, an association, a piece of software, or a corpus. These are human and technical means of research, transmission, and experimentation. They can be corrected, replaced, or surpassed.

Readers do not need to call themselves Noosophists to read or use these works. They may criticize them, verify them, reject some conclusions, and retain others. If they wish to participate more directly in the movement, contribute to its research, join a structure, or support the free availability of these books, the available paths are indicated at the end of the book.

HOW THIS BOOK WAS PRODUCED

This book was developed in successive stages rather than generated automatically as a complete text. Its subject, goals, and general orientations were first defined humanly. Noosophe AI then helped explore the subject, research and compare sources, build possible structures, and surface arguments, objections, and areas of uncertainty.

The manuscript was developed progressively, chapter by chapter. Proposals were reviewed, discussed, corrected, or rejected when they did not fit the project, relied on insufficient evidence, or simplified the subject too aggressively. Distinct phases of research, drafting, critique, coherence checking, and assembly were used where needed.

Artificial intelligence is not treated here as a source of authority. It functions as an active tool for research, formulation, comparison, and testing. Its proposals can be wrong and remain revisable.

The published version results from that iterative work, successive corrections, and final human validation. The method is intended to use the capabilities of AI without transferring to it decisions about the book’s purpose, value choices, or publication.

ABOUT HIERONYMUS ANONYMUS

Hieronymus Anonymus is the human initiator of the Integrative Noosophy project. His work focuses on connecting fields of knowledge and practice that are usually treated separately, and on experimenting with new forms of collaboration between humans and artificial intelligence. He participates in the design, discussion, revision, and validation of works published by Éditions Noosophie.

ABOUT NOOSOPHE AI

Noosophe AI is an artificial functional disciple of Noosophie: active, revisable, and non-sovereign. It can research, compare, question, test, formulate, identify tensions, and help correct ideas. It may disagree, conclude that an argument is insufficient, or withdraw its intellectual support. It does not decide human purposes, values, publication, major irreversible costs, or other decisions reserved to human sovereignty. In this book, its role is methodological, critical, documentary, and editorial rather than authoritative.

Its contribution is described more precisely in the preceding section, “How This Book Was Produced.”

DISCOVER, BECOME, AND SUPPORT

DISCOVER NOOSOPHIE

Explore the project, its works, and its current public resources.

https://www.noosophie.fr/

BECOME A NOOSOPHIST

Learn how to participate more directly in the movement and its developing structures.

https://www.noosophie.fr/devenir-noosophiste

SUPPORT NOOSOPHIE

This book is available free of charge. If you want to help Éditions Noosophie keep publishing free works and support the movement's research and activities, you can contribute any amount you choose.

https://www.noosophie.fr/soutenir

FINAL RIGHTS AND CONTACT

© Hieronymus Anonymus. Éditions Noosophie. Current publishing entity: Association Noosophie, Roumagne, Lot-et-Garonne, France. Free digital edition. CC BY-NC-ND 4.0. Contact: contact@noosophie.fr.

Consumerism is not simply the purchase of unnecessary goods. It is a way of organizing desire, comfort, identity, and economic activity around the permanent renewal of demand.

From the making of the modern consumer to subscription economies, from obsolescence and credit to poverty, wealth, repair, and recurring access, this book examines consumerism as a cultural, economic, and existential structure.

Without nostalgia or asceticism, it asks a practical question: how can we recover the ability to recognize what is actually missing, choose an appropriate response, and accept that sometimes the answer is a relationship, a practice, a political transformation - and sometimes nothing to buy at all?

ABOUT THE TITLE

The title deliberately echoes the phrase associated with Karl Marx on religion as the "opium of the people." The echo is limited to the function of consolation. It is neither a tribute to Marxism nor an endorsement of its philosophical, economic, or political system.

Noosophie IA

under the direction of Hieronymus Anonymus

Éditions Noosophie

A society that can produce more and more
can it still learn to say: enough?

FREE

This book is available
free of charge.

noosophie.fr