

does not rule out the point, which is, that the form “formed” a separate reality of the works of art. With a gradual transformation of the original (and even revolutionary in their age) aesthetic theories into the ideology of art, ideology of an “elite” public, the form “as such” became an object of obsession on both sides: the public and the artists. However, when this point was reached, it was already obvious that all around emerged all sorts of “entertainment,” and that “unworthy” forms of decoration invaded the streets in the metropolitan areas.

### *Orchid in the Land of Technology*

Benjamin, using the terms of political economy in defining the superstructure, saw the decisive transformation, crucial in attaining a new form of society. It is not as important as it may seem that he understood this movement as a way to communism, which had been a lively idea of emancipation at the time. His conceptualization of the consequences of the perceived properties of what had been going on is much more significant. “The equipment-free aspect of reality here has become the height of artifice; the sight of immediate reality has become an orchid in the land of technology” (Benjamin, 1969: p. 233). The results of such an assumption may be taken as sociological, but no less, they are significant for the idea of the subjectivity as well. What we may say today is that Benjamin was on the verge of discovering not only the disappearance of the *aura*, but the disappearance of the Subject itself, too. Again, in Benjamin’s “sociological” observation the change concerns the art as much as the masses:

*To pry an object from its shell, to destroy its aura, is the mark of a perception whose ‘sense of the universal equality of things’ has increased to such a degree that it extracts it even from a unique object by means of reproduction. This is nowadays noticeable in the increasing importance of statistics. The adjustment of reality to the masses and of the masses to reality is a process of unlimited scope, as much for thinking as for perception (Ibid.: p. 223).*

What is seen here from the side of object is at the same time reflected by a change in the structure of subjectivity, whose reality must become split in a way as a contradiction of form against form (replacing the old contradiction between the form and the content). The instrument representing the new structure of reality – the cinematographic camera – functions on the level of a new “science,” which ruins the idea of the Subject, born to be