

ALIENATION IN MARX AND BAUDRILLIARD

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
THE MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

SİREL YELMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

FEBRUARY 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Prof. Dr. Yasin Ceylan

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof Dr. David Grunberg (METU,PHIL) _____

Prof Dr. Yasin Ceylan (METU,PHIL) _____

Doç.Dr. Ertuğrul Turan (DTCF,PHIL) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct. I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name:

Signature:

ABSTRACT

ALIENATION IN MARX AND BAUDRILLIARD

YELMAN, Sirel

M.A., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yasin Ceylan

February 2012, 83 pages

Alienation is a one of the central concepts in Marx's philosophy. It has positive and negative implications regarding man's self realization in nature. It is also about discussion on ontology of work. Moreover, it has led Marx to design new society models for human beings. Alienation in Marx is analyzed together with political economy and its concepts. Baudrillard's alienation discourses in contemporary age include arguments in terms of consumerism and technology in today's developed world. While Marx's theory of alienation considers the relation of subject and object in political economic conditions, Baudrillard's discourses discuss it in social and cultural bases. Baudrillard rather argues that reality and meaning in contemporary world is lost, we live in a "hyperreal" and "simulacrum" world.

Keywords: alienation, reality, postmodernity ,simulacrum

ÖZ

MARX VE BAUDRILLIARD'A GÖRE YABANCILAŞMA KAVRAMI

YELMAN, Sirel

Master, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Yasin Ceylan

Şubat 2012, 83 sayfa

Yabancılaşma Marx'ın felsefesinin temel kavramlarından biridir. İnsanın doğada kendini gerçekleştirmesine ilişkin pozitif ve negatif yönler içerir. Aynı zamanda insanın çalışma ontolojisine ilişkin tartışmalar da içerir. Yabancılaşma teorisinin analizi aynı zamanda Marx'ı yeni toplum modelleri aramaya yöneltmiştir. Marx yabancılaşmayı politik ekonomi kavramlarıyla birlikte incelemiştir. Diğer yanda Baudrillard'ın yabancılaşma söylemleri çağdaş dünyanın tüketim ve teknoloji ağırlıklı yapısına göre şekillenmiştir. Marx'ın teorisi özne ve obje ilişkisini politik ekonomiye göre açıklarken, Baudrillard daha çok sosyal ve kültürel olgulara göre açıklamaktadır. Baudrillard çağdaş dünyanın realite ve anlamdan uzaklaştığını, hipergerçekliğin egemen olduğu simulacrum dünyası olduğunu savunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yabancılaşma,realite,postmodernite,simulacrum

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank numerous people for their support and contribution to my thesis.

I am deeply indebted to Yasin Ceylan for the supervision and guidance he gave me during the thesis period of my master's program which I began some years ago; to David Grunberg, the first instructor I met in the Department of Philosophy, who encouraged me to start a master's program and meticulously read and gave constructive feedback on my thesis; to Ertuğrul Turan who contributed by taking part in my jury. I would also thank to Tülin Yılmaz for her moral support and patience as well as the proofreading of this thesis.

I have furthermore to thank myself for the desire to learn about the history of thought which in turn led me to a curiosity about philosophy; and all the instructors in the Department of Philosophy at METU for the distinct perspective and knowledge this discipline has given me.

To my son

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
DEDICATION.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 THE ALIENATION THEORY OF MARX	7
2.1 Human Existence	8
2.2 History and Dialectic Method.....	9
2.3 The Nature of Alienation	12
2.4 Results of Alienation.....	18
2.4.1 Private Property	18
2.4.2 Division of Labor and Exchange	19
2.5 Labor as a Commodity (use and exchange value).....	21
2.6 Social Consciousness	23
3 DISCOURSES OF BAUDRILLIARD	26
3.1 Poststructuralism and Postmodernism.....	28
3.2. Introduction to Baudrilliard	35
3.3 Sign Value and Symbolic Exchange.....	38
3.4 Simulation and Simulacra.....	42

3.5 Alienation and Consumer Society	48
3.6 Social vs. Masses	52
3.7 Alienation in Technology World	55
4 HOW ALIENATION RELATES OR DIFFERS IN MARX and BAUDRILLIARD	58
5 CONCLUSION	70
REFERENCES.....	77
APPENDIX	83

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this study, firstly, I shall examine the relationship between man and nature by alienation ontologically. This topic has been deeply analyzed by Marx in his works, *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts 1844* and *Capital* and, as well as being contemplated philosophically in part of the *Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic and Philosophy as a Whole* referring to Feuerbach and Hegel. For Marx, alienation is not negative at all; it has positive aspects that provide man's socialization and exposing his real power in the production arena. Therefore, I shall define the meaning of Marx's theory of alienation, discuss it and infer some results. Jean Baudrillard is one of the contemporary thinkers who have been highly influenced by Marx; he has acknowledged this in *Selected Interviews* (Gane, 1993). His theory of "Simulation and Simulacra" examined in *Simulation and Simulacra and Symbolic Exchange and Death*, is a social theory, which criticizes the reality and truth in nature. I will examine the meaning of these theories. I will also trace the concept of "alienation" and examine Baudrillard's arguments to investigate its formation in contemporary thought and how it differentiates from that of Marx.

Karl Marx, renowned philosopher and critical thinker of political economy left behind a vast legacy and a rich literature to elaborate upon the historical development of human being in nature and society. From

the beginning of the capitalist period, humans have been portrayed as a labor power at work. In essence, work became a vital issue and appeared as a product of man in different formats, for example, in primitive age, work could be defined as hunting or building a house, nowadays work is regarded more as a labor power, such as in designing and producing smart phones, performing surrealist art, training on a subject. It has thus become sophisticated. But on the other hand, the relationship of human being to nature has changed dramatically and transformed since Marx's time.

Marx's purpose in analyzing "alienation" could not have aimed at a specific goal but has finalized a new framework in terms of political economy. In fact, his early works imply a philosophical background mainly influenced by his philosophical attitude. As it has been declared by Marx, his main drive was to make philosophy for man and his material life. Accordingly, philosophy could not have been carried out in abstract categories and remained at theory. In this sense, Marx says in his thesis on Feuerbach that the philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it. That is to say, it should serve to further improve man's life. We may say that this is the reason why Marx is so creative within an interdisciplinary realm.

Baudrillard employs the concepts of linguistics to develop his critique. This linguistic method breaks down the linguistic sign into a signifier, a signified and a referent and "merely theorizes the signifier, in search of its systematic quality, relegating the signified and the referent to an obscure horizon of their science" (Baudrillard 1975, p.6). Baudrillard stated in *Selected Interviews* that he has been influenced by his teacher, Barthes who developed linguistic theories (Gane 1993).

Baudrillard's work is a discourse of alienation in linguistic format. What happens in political economy is that "the signified and the referent are now abolished to the sole profit of the play of signifiers, of a generalized formalization where the code no longer refers back to any subjective or objective reality, but to its own logic" (Baudrillard 1975, p.20). The sign no longer designates anything at all. It approaches in its truth, its structural limit which is to refer back only to other signs. Reality then becomes the place of semiological manipulation of a structural simulation. From this point, Baudrillard criticizes capitalism and its results. He argues against political power, political economy, consumption and problems of real life which have become a code and derives his critique from this argument.

Baudrillard has been using the deconstruction method in some of his critiques, which is an approach applied by French philosophers. Due to this method, his writings are evaluated as being difficult to understand. Deconstruction, which is a series of techniques developed by Jacques Derrida and others for reading texts, is based on linguistics philosophy. However, as a "result of the popularity of these techniques and theories, the verb 'deconstruct' is also used more broadly as a synonym for criticizing or demonstrating the incoherence of a position" (Balkin 1996, p.27). Many deconstructive arguments are mostly held around the analysis of conceptual oppositions. Texts that use the deconstructive method, "privilege" a term in the opposition over the others in a particular text, argument, historical tradition or social practice. The reason for this may be because the privileged word is considered the general, normal, central case, while the other is considered special, exceptional or derivative. Another reason why a word might be

privileged is because it is considered more true, more valuable, more important, or more universal than its opposite. Moreover, multiple opposites could result in many different types of privileging at the same time (ibid.).

Balkin emphasizes that texts written in deconstructive format have relationships between different parts of a text that are not foreseen. The multiple meanings of the key words in the text cause it to speak in different and often conflicting voices. This does not mean that all texts are meaningless. On the contrary, this means that they are filled with multiple and often conflicting meanings.

For Marx, “alienation” is a necessary and humanized process that includes positive implications, while Baudrillard argues that it is negative and mostly explained with concepts like “devil” and “silence”. Baudrillard’s opinions related to today’s technologically developed world are highly pessimistic and nihilistic. His interpretation of subject, object and reality has been associated with postmodernity. I will also investigate the characteristics of postmodernity, in particular its meaning in philosophy. I will examine the connection between postmodern philosophical approaches and Marx. By articulating Baudrillard after Marx, I will elaborate on how their theories relate or differentiate.

Before exploring Marx’s theory of alienation, it is worth looking at the historical roots of the concept. In Judeo Christian mythology, man is considered as alienated from God. It is the story of “the fall of man”. Adam and Eve were expelled from paradise for having eaten the forbidden fruit that gave them the knowledge of good and evil and so destroyed their innocence. With the emergence of capitalism, the ideological forms have become more and more secular as well. In the development of modern thought, the concept of alienation maintained an

increasing importance parallel to the rise of philosophical anthropology (Mezsaros 1972, p.40).

According to Marx, alienation is a necessity inherent in the ontological foundations of human life. Before Marx, it was first Diderot that drew attention to the problematic of the “distinction of yours and mine”, the opposition between one’s own particular utility and the general good. Also Rousseau mentioned man’s alienation from nature. Critical points of his theme can be summarized in the following way. Everything degenerates in the hands of man while everything is good in the hands of the Creator. Civilization distorts man and causes the destruction of the goodness of man. In the process of development and growth of civilization, contradiction arises between society and human species. Civilized man has been born into slavery, he is surrounded by institutions. Contradiction between town and country is a conclusion of capitalistic alienation. Individuals and states have artificial needs and useless desires that cause artificial beings instead of original human beings. According to Rousseau, the origin of alienation is to give or sell and law is made for the protection of private property. But Rousseau cannot go beyond putting forward the problematic of alienation, nor could he suggest any systematic solution (ibid., pp.54-59). Rousseau rather uses the concept to explain the original state of man that was free from war and exploitation. He recognized a relation between the rise of civilization and corruption of the original innocence of man.

Man made a social contract, as a result of which he suffered a part of his freedom in return for his civilized life. Inequality, hierarchy, property and exploitation have been the results of this civilization (Skempton 2010, p.38). Rousseau also argued that “writing is a primary corruption

of human nature, alienating humanity from the immediacy and self-presence of the voice” (ibid., p.37).

Skempton (2010) examines the alienation concept in philosophical history, comparing it to Derrida’s views. He argues that Derrida’s interpretation of alienation rejects its mythical sense that is the loss of original state of harmony and unity. Early philosophical approaches, such as the one by Empedocles develop alienation theories influenced by a religious standpoint. According to Skempton, the early model of alienation and reconciliation involves rejection of the material world. This is a proof that the true nature of humanity is indeed connected to a spiritual world for Skempton.

CHAPTER 2

THE ALIENATION THEORY OF MARX

Karl Marx (1818-1883), a philosopher, wrote on a wide variety of topics covering philosophical critiques, political economy and sociology. *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* was written in 1844, when he was just twenty five, but this remained unpublished until after his death. It is the first work in which Marx tried to elaborate on the problems of political economy from the standpoint of his “maturing dialectical-materialist and communist views and also to synthesize the results of his critical review of prevailing philosophic and economic theories” (Marx 1844, p.76). There were three major influences on Marx’s thinking and intellectual development right from his youth to his later years. These were German philosophy, French Revolutionary politics and English political economy (Ebenstein 2000, p.643).

Manuscripts begins with the premise that political economy, such as wages, capital, profit and labor, mostly referring to Adam Smith, further covers such topics as “estranged labor”, “anti-thesis of capital and labor”, “private property and labor” as well as the *Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic and Philosophy as a Whole*. Alienation of labor appears throughout this text and is examined from a philosophical point of view. Therefore, I shall refer to these texts mainly to understand Marx’s alienation concept and its analyses.

The concept of alienation in Marx's work is important since it provides ontological discussions of human activity, i.e.work. Arising

from capitalism, work has been a necessity for an individual since the industrialized age. It is still an issue to think about man's existence in the technology age and its problems from different perspectives. Man represents himself as a form of labor in the alienation process. This process is one in which consciousness, history, creativity, need for socialization, passion, and necessity are determiners in man's endeavour to produce and reproduce his relationship to nature. While analyzing this and its conclusions in life, Marx has posited man in the material world and this forms the central theme of his philosophy. That is why his philosophy is also referred to as humanism or materialism. Human is composed of a "sensuous being" and must have "praxis". Besides, man is also a natural living being that possesses natural abilities.

2.1 Human Existence

Before examining the occurrence of alienation, alienated labor and its results, we need to examine Marx's understanding of human existence. Marx defines man as a "species being". Man is a "species being" who possesses universal essence inherent to all his species. Freedom is also inherent in this essence. Man as a species being is a universal being: every being can for him become objective in its "species character"; his existence is a universal relationship to objectivity. Man has to include these theoretically objective things in his praxis; he must make them the object of his life activity and work on them. The whole of nature is the medium of his human life; it is man's means of life; it is his "inorganic body", which he must take up and reintroduce into his praxis (Marx 1844, p. 31, Marcuse 1972, p.6).

Moreover, human being is also sensuous which is the appropriation and confirmation of human reality that manifests itself in a plural way: "seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thinking, contemplating, sensing, wanting, acting, loving". Man as an objective, sensuous being is therefore a suffering being and because he feels that he suffers, he is a passionate being. Passion is the essential power of man energetically bent on its object (Marx 1844, p.69).

If we make a framework of Marx's understanding of man's existence, man inherently and historically has knowledge of nature and sensuously has a passion to change and shape it and therefore to objectify himself externally in nature. In other words, this is a journey of man within history from his essence to the outside world dialectically and with necessity. Man is "universal" and a "free being".

2.2 History and Dialectic Method

For Marx, the discovery of the matter from the material world has been done historically and with a dialectic inquiry. He defines man as a historical being. Therefore, the concept of historical materialism is used to refer to Marx's thinking, though he did not use the term directly in his works. Marx uses the concept of history and the concept of dialectic in his works separately.

What is the meaning of history according to Marx? He argues that antagonisms related to man, for example spiritualism and materialism, can be solved only in real life with practical energy of man, not in a theoretical study which is what philosophy has been doing. Man is a product of history within a process of a solution of antagonisms and this solution is only possible in material life. "Human history" and the

"genesis of human society" can only occur as a result of this process and in dialectic with nature and industry. This is "true anthropological nature" (Marx 1844, p.47). History is comprised of representations of man's doings in relation to his social needs.

All history is the history of preparing and developing "man" to become the object of sensuous consciousness, and turning the requirements of "man as man" into his needs. History itself is a real part of natural history of nature developing into man (ibid.).

Since it is evident that the entire history of man is created through human labor, this is the "proof of his birth through himself" (ibid., p.49). The development of human being throughout history is a collective work of all humans. With only this possibility, the human is able to continue through mankind. This includes all science as man's activity. In due time history and natural science will influence and come to include each other. Man changes over the course of history and he develops and transforms himself; "history is the history of man's self realization" (Fromm 2004, p.24).

Marx divides prehistory and world history of human society as Asiatic, ancient, feudal, modern and socialist (Axelos 1976, pp.62-64). Marx's main drive was philosophical in *1844 Manuscripts*, economic in *the Contribution to the Political Economy*, political in the *Communist Manifesto*. But his thought always starts from productive labor which in its development conditions the whole of historical movement.

What was the method of dialectic of Marx? To clarify this, Marx (1859, p.10) refers to a commentary in the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. He states that after the application of the dialectic method "can the actual movement be adequately described. If this is done successfully, if the life of the subject-matter is ideally reflected as in a mirror, then it may appear as if we had before us a mere

a priori construction” (ibid., p.14). He further emphasizes that his dialectic method is different from the Hegelian;

According to Hegel, the life process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of the Idea, he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurges of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of the Idea. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought, but Hegel used the dialectic method “mystically”(Marx 1859, pp.14-15).

After thirty years, Marx explained again as in 1844 Manuscripts that all matter has been happening first as motion in a material world and then it occurred in the mind or consciousness. Marx’s dialectic method is related to his understanding of consciousness and being. How did he define it thirty years before Capital was written?

Marx conceptualizes man as a sensuous human being with feelings, having passion which enables him to realize his potential in external world, but he also suffers due to his being. He states that a being, which is not indicated in nature as objectively, is a non-being. How this being is determined in terms of consciousness according to Marx can be answered in part by *Hegelian Dialectic and Philosophy as a Whole* that is attached to the end of *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*. In terms of Feuerbach’s expostulating alienation from a secular standpoint is in contrast to his predecessors, Marx makes a comparison between Feuerbach and Hegel and proves that Hegelian alienation occurs in consciousness, i.e. abstract, idealist and not in the physical reality. He also states that Feuerbach’s great achievements were the proofs that philosophy is “nothing else but religion rendered into thought” and the “establishment of true materialism and of real science”, by making the social relationship of “man to man” the basic principle of the theory

(Marx 1844, p.64). While Feuerbach is in this position, Hegel stands on absolute thought within consciousness for designing his philosophy. Hegel thought in Marx's words:

The appropriation of man's essential powers, which have become objects –indeed, alien objects – is thus in the first place only an appropriation occurring in consciousness, in pure thought, i.e. in abstraction: it is the appropriation of these objects as thoughts and as movements of thought (ibid., p.66).

Marx has stated that in German Philosophy, it is above all Hegel who greatly influenced him. The detailed comparison of Hegelian alienation and Marx's is beyond this study. This theme is included here to clarify Marx's thought in setting up his alienation concept and philosophy. Marx distinguishes himself from Hegel in terms of the dialectic method. Marx was interested in the economic and social life of man under industrialization and aimed to improve his quality of life through developing a new political system. Eric Fromm (2004, p.40) argues that Marx's first drive was not suggesting to establish a system for equal income distribution, but rather the emancipation of the worker.

2.3 The Nature of Alienation

After putting forward the nature of human existence and the method of inquiry of Marx, we need to look at what the theory of alienation consists of , what makes man alienated, what part of man is alienated, what labor is, how and in what condition alienated labor occurs. Herbert Marcuse (1972) extracts three formulations of labor as referring to Marx: "Labor is man's coming to be for himself within alienation, or as alienated man", it is "man's act of self-creation or self-objectification", "life activity, productive life itself". Man can only realize his essence if

he realizes it as something objective, by using his essential powers to produce an external, material, objective world. The basic definition of alienation appears to be;

The product of labor is labor which has been embodied in an object, which has become material: it is the objectification of labor. Labor's realization is its objectification. Under these economic conditions this realization of labor appears as loss of realization for the workers; objectification as loss of the object and bondage to it; appropriation as estrangement, as alienation (Marx 1844, p.29).

Here, Marx initiates his logic of alienation. Labor is a necessary realization of man, as a worker and of producing commodities. Commodity is used in the meaning of political economy, that is commercial object. But while the worker produces commodities as objects that have become accumulated in the history of mankind, he becomes less himself, and he falls away from his essence. His labor is depicted in a commodity and becomes an object of himself. As it is stated earlier, the concept of alienation is also understood as a separation from God. But Marx's concept of alienation is not intended in that sense. Marx emphasizes that the worker has become a "sway of his product, capital" and "all these consequences are implied in the statement that the worker is related to the product of his labor as to an alien object" (ibid.)

If a product of man, let's say language and words, are spoken once from the mouth, they belong to the objective world. For example, if one says "I love you", it becomes its own and goes to realize its own story. The owner of the words only remembers the thought of love. Because of this, one sometimes prefers not to speak or avoid using some words all together. It is like an aphorism in Turkish culture which is "think twice before saying". That is to say, once the product is gone away from the

owner, it loses its originality and starts to live its own realization (Fromm 2004, p.10).

Marx states that industry is an accumulation of human knowledge and also it is in “movement” and this movement has been created by alienated labor. With industrialization, human started to realize himself in the production process as a worker and producing commodities. Within this process, Marx argues that labor becomes a part of commodities and a part of capital. This taking part is losing control and losing humanity at the same time. The power and control is directed by the owner of the capital. This means objectification of labor to the human who is producing it and is becoming something strange and artificial to him. It is treated as a commodity; it is bought and sold like a commodity, since it is measured with time and exchange value like all other commodities. Therefore, the objectification of labor that is transforming it into a product is a main source of alienation.

The objective world is part of man himself. It becomes a part of him by appropriation and suppression because it is his nature. This is his “self-objectification”. The real objectivity of this world can be interpreted as a prerequisite of his being, and appear as beyond his control and “overpowering”. This forms a conflict in his essence which leads to reification and alienation as a result of which man can “lose the object of his essence” which becomes independent and overpowering (Marcuse 1972).

Marx questions objectification in detail and his philosophy claims that man realizes and materializes himself by working and producing. Labor is materialized in an external world and becomes the object of nature. Furthermore, Marx argues that political economy does not take into account the relationship between the worker and production and

hence the alienation of labor. Labor is alienated since it becomes external in the production process; something is not inherent in human anymore and also he satisfies the needs of others, not just himself. So, Marx defines it as a loss of one's unity and a limitation of one's freedom and thus, man is only freely active when eating, drinking or dressing that is, when he is performing non working activities. Therefore, work for man is an activity that limits his freedom.

Marx(1887 p.124) defines labor as a modifying process between nature, a sensuous external world and man. Man changes nature when he has participated in the production process; he produces commodities that are extracted from nature for satisfying his needs. This in turn affects his human nature. This causes a discrepancy and it becomes greater when labor products increase and his inner world becomes less belonging to him. Man and nature have a dialectical relationship via mediation of industry.

The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien (Marx 1844, p.29).

Marx continues to define alienation as a power that is built as a reciprocal of one's life and acting like an enemy. He also asks and elaborates upon the question of what is the difference of man from other species in nature and finds the answer as consciousness. Man makes his life activity itself the object of his will and of his consciousness (ibid., p.31). Because of this consciousness, man makes his life the object of himself. Here, Marx distinguishes producing man as a life activity from animals. Animals work or produce only for their own needs, for example

sheltering or feeding. But man produces universally. Man's activity is a universal activity; he reproduces all nature while animals produce only their own kind.

After much deliberation, arguing and confirming an alien power to man in *1844 Manuscripts*, Marx begins to question the owner of this alien power and concludes that it is the capitalist, as elaborated in *Capital*. Also, he often mentions the lack of analyses on alienation and its components in classical political economy which had been considered before him. Marx does not regard alienation as negative. He elaborates alienation and the ontology of man in the historical progress within nature. Marx investigates the human characteristics of a working activity. For example, political economy considers labor as a commodity, alienated labor, which is used as an object or a material by the other; hence it is treated like another production element. In this sense, labor is expected to work without human disadvantages such as sickness or fatigue.

On the other hand, we observe a tension within the process of alienation. On the one hand, man realizes himself as a worker within necessity and in free activity; on the other he loses his freedom. Marx argues that man feels as human while performing inhuman activities for example eating and sleeping. While man's ability to establish himself in the process of production could be understood as freedom, the lack of total control on this freedom and the rule of capital over him, limit it at the same time. In political economy, man is regarded as a substance in the pot together with other production elements that have inhuman characteristics. This suggests a disregard of how his complex properties

are influenced in the production process. Thus, man only feels completely free when he is not working.

Four aspects of alienation are put forward by Marx that involve many meanings and even define the working society of today. First, “the relation of worker to the product of labor”; working activity means losing control of his labor power; second, “the relation of worker to the act of production”; it is a limitation of a worker’s non-work life activity and limitation of freedom. From the first two, Marx deduces third and fourth aspects; third, becoming dehumanized due to falling away from humanity, essence and spirituality; and finally man is alienated from other man, and lives somehow in a hostile environment (Marx 1844, pp. 31-32).

Barry L. Padgett (2007, pp. 2-6) argues that since the first two means alienation of labor from the product of labor and from the production activity itself and the last two means alienation from humanity and other human species, the first two and the last two can be merged. Also the last two are effects of the first two, as Marx also stated. On the other hand, Padgett challenges the objection made to Marx by Antony Flew and some others that “alienation does not apply to any facts in real world”. He also challenges another objection to Marx that claims he did not examine the concept of alienation in his later works, such as *Grundrisse* and *Capital*. Marx inferred capital as an alien power to man in the conclusion of the analyses of alienation, and in later works he completely focused on the critique of capitalist political economy and proposal of alternative political/economic systems to overcome his objections. In other words, after his answer to the inquiry of the alienation process, he moves on to further investigations in his later

works. Padgett claims that alienation of labor is constituted by the fact that human relations are determined by the conditions of the capital, which is also maintained in *Grundrisse* of Marx (ibid., p.17).

2.4 Results of Alienation

2.4.1 Private Property

Marx's theory of alienation arose from and revolved around the reason of holding private property. Private property refers to a system “that allocates particular objects like pieces of land to particular individual's use and to manage as they please, to the exclusion of others and to the exclusion also of any detailed control by society” (Waldron 2010). Classical political economies not including this subject have been missing the point according to Marx and he inquired the relationship between “private property”, “greed”, “separation of labor”, “capital” and “landed property”, “value” and “devaluation of man”, and the connection of “this whole estrangement and the money system” (Marx 1844, p.28). Private property thus results by analysis from the concept of alienated labor that is of alienated man, of estranged labor, of estranged life and/or of estranged man (ibid., p.33).

Marx considers private property not only to be a reason for alienation, but also a state of being social. Private property has been a means for man to interact with other people and the world. On the other hand, Marx points out that this process made humans foolish since humans want to possess the objects. “The sense of having” in an external world is realized in the sense of conversion of inner to external wealth. That is to say, the inner world of man has become poorer in parallel to an

increase in human productions in the material world. Marx depicts modern society in an analysis of private property being what man has come to identify himself by what he has or possesses (ibid., p.47).

As I have argued earlier, Marx's theory of alienation is not purely negative; there are also positive aspects to his thinking. Man's general abilities and potential have been proved through industrialization and productive activity. He also socializes and forms a relationship of man to man. He advocates socialism and emphasizes the power of man and rejects an alien being or God in this sense. In contrast, Eric Fromm interprets Marx in that as long as man is productive, he is alive and proving his powers in the external world, he returns to his essence, to God (Fromm 2004, p.26).

2.4.2 Division of Labor and Exchange

The concepts of political economy, division of labor and exchange are two other conclusions of alienation which constitutes a social character of it. While man realizes himself through social life, he sells his labor power in return for something else. Therefore, becoming social is a positive effect of this alienation while exchange is considered negative since the control of labor power is lost, and in losing, humanity restores man in the form of money and wealth instead of a way of life. "...the divine power of money lies in its character as men's estranged, alienating and self-disposing species nature. Money is the alienated ability of mankind." (Marx 1844, p.61)

This is exchange for something and money is so alienating that it can convert inability to ability. It has distortive character converting one quality of man into something else. Money has a character of lying and changing reality. It makes contradictions and impossibilities possible, “the world upside down” (ibid.).

Assume man to be man and his relationship to the world to be a human one: then you can exchange love only for love, trust for trust, etc. If you want to enjoy art, you must be an artistically cultivated person; if you want to exercise influence over other people, you must be a person with a stimulating and encouraging effect on other people. Every one of your relations to man and to nature must be a specific expression, corresponding to the object of your will, of your real individual life. If you love without evoking love in return – that is, if your loving as loving does not produce reciprocal love; if through a living expression of yourself as a loving person you do not make yourself a beloved one, then your love is impotent – a misfortune (Marx 1844, p.62).

Here, Marx points out that the exchange between people is settled in a common base after the invention of money but, indeed, this base is not equal. If money had not been invented, one would have to give a real attitude for accepting a real feeling. Marx affirms the need for a society in which man is related to his fellow men as an individual human being, in which love cannot be bought, but can only be exchanged for love (Ebenstein 2000, p.644).

2.5 Labor as a Commodity (use and exchange value)

As explored in the previous section, labor is alienated within the production process and generating products or commodities that satisfy a need. In parallel to the increase in production, that is growth of a capitalist economy, an accumulation has occurred in terms of capital and commodities. This accumulation has, in part, been created by alienated labor. Participating labor as a commodity component like any other material creates a value. Marx defines two aspects of this created value; use and exchange. Use value is defined as a practical or physical usage of a commodity and measured by time spent for the production of a specific commodity. After measurement it is then defined as exchange value.

To begin with, a commodity, in the language of the English economists, is 'anything necessary, useful or pleasant in life', an object of human wants, a means of existence in the widest sense of the term. Use value as an aspect of the commodity coincides with the physical palpable existence of the commodity (Marx 1859, p.6).

If commodities are considered as an objectification of labor, exchange value is materialized or comes into existence when it is used. Looking from another point, it is the socialization of human with intermediation of commodities. Marx calls this social labor. Labor before equalizing within such a system is called abstract universal labor that may be understood as a uniform totality of all labor in the world and attributes equal quality from one labor to another. The labor of different persons is equated and treated as universal labor only by bringing one use value into relation with another one in the form of exchange value. It

is thus correct to say that exchange value is a relationship between persons (ibid., p.10).

Exchange value is economically equivalent to a commodity to be used. Therefore, exchange value is only possible if it has a use value. In other words, the products of man, has value if it satisfies a need. If this need is valued as an exchange with another product or money then exchange value arises.

So far therefore as labor is a creator of use value, is useful labor, it is a necessary condition, independent of all forms of society, for the existence of the human race; it is an eternal nature imposed necessity, without which there can be no material exchanges between man and Nature, and therefore no life (Marx 1887, p.30).

It can be inferred that one must work, produce and realize his labor power as a necessity. It is an essential aim of one's life, a “nature imposed necessity”. Therefore, labor is a mediator between nature and men and becomes a necessary value. But value can be disadvantageous for men in the base of measurement of labor power. From an economic point of view there are some disputes on the value concept proposed by Marx. However, it will not be covered here as it is outside the scope of this thesis.

Moreover, the alienation theory of Marx can be considered as a reason behind why Marx argued a surplus value theory of capitalism and proposed a new society model aiming to distribute this surplus more equally. On the other hand, because of its economic, philosophical and social implications it still is of vital importance today.

2.6 Social Consciousness

For Marx, men “inevitably enter into definite relations” in social life and “independent of their will”, and “the totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness” (Marx 1859, p.4).

Preventing the conflicting meanings on the term of consciousness, it seems that Marx uses “social consciousness” for exploring his standpoint. The existence of social, political and intellectual life is not determined by consciousness. On the contrary, their existence determines consciousness and the development arises from the interaction between the two. Whenever a conflict arises between the two sides, there begins the “era of social revolution” (ibid.). He argues that all the contradictions maintained in social life cannot be explained by only consciousness, but social forms of production and relationships of production. Therefore, economic forces and dynamics are primary factors in determining social consciousness.

Fromm (2004) examines Marx’s views and the arguments on man, alienation and consciousness. He distinguishes between materialism and idealism. Materialism refers to and takes the view which holds that matter in motion is the fundamental constituent of the universe. On the contrary idealism, beginning with Plato, is understood in which it is not the everchanging world of the senses that constitutes reality, but incorporeal senses or ideas. In this sense, pre-Socratic Greek philosophers were materialist. Fromm does this in order to put forward the difference between Hegel’s and Marx’s approaches as was outlined

in the previous section. Marx's materialist method involves the study of the real and economic social life of man and of the influence of man's actual way of life on his thinking and feeling. "The evolution of man in all history is characterized by man's struggle with nature" (ibid., p.14).

Marx has interpreted consciousness as being directed from a material world. While analyzing Marx's work, some researchers, including Fromm, regarded his idea of consciousness as "false consciousness" in comparison to idealism. In other words, some commentators of Marx's works use "false consciousness" for referring to his logic of consciousness. On the other hand, Marx has not been against ideas surely, but against ideas which were not rooted in human and social reality (ibid., p.19).

Contrary to Fromm, Georg Lukacs (1975, pp. 22-57), has viewed that it is wrong to evaluate materialism of Marx in regard to early Greek materialists. Marx regarded human consciousness as a late product of material ontological development. It is misconception to evaluate it in the framework of religious conception or Platonic idealism.

Man performs work. Therefore, the animal has become human through work as a responsive being. Every work activity is a response and solution to an underlying need. Work is the ontological model of a completely new mode of existence. Every societal praxis which has work as its model contains this duality; teleological propositions or causality in one hand, material existence into motion on the other hand. But earlier philosophical systems disregarded this duality; teleological propositions were not recognized as a particular characteristic of society's being.

Man must decide every moment for his actions; this is continuous and it is a risk taking process. Every action has its alternatives according to future teleological propositions. This was Marx's point according to Lucaks. A basic property of work is that its every moment as man is performing it must be directed by defined goals. Thus, each movement belongs to an ought. But in work process although man carries out the teleological proposal consciously he is unable to control the consequences of his activity.

The entire phenomenon is a tension between realm of necessity and realm of freedom. Freedom is the result of man's self actualization in the process of economic development which increases the number of choices and alternative decisions and also tasks and capabilities. Marx defines the realm of freedom as "development of human energies which is a goal in and of itself" (Lukacs 1975, p.35). Work is a necessity of life and Marxism must be read with a dualistic view according to Lukacs.

CHAPTER 3

DISCOURSES OF BAUDRILLIARD

In spite of the fact that about 120 years have passed since Marx's death, his theories have not only been criticized by but have also inspired thousands of thinkers over the years. Marx appears in thirty of Baudrillard's forty-five books published between 1968 and 2007 (Coutler 2009, p.133). Baudrillard's *Mirror of Production* included a critique of Marx's political economy. In this work, Baudrillard uses the deconstruction method to analyze the concept of political economy. First, he defines the components of political economy as including labor, wages and money and contemplates their relationship to production as a reference.

In spite of the influence of Marx on him, he is known as being against the theories of Marx. For a critique of the political economy of the sign, Toni Negri and Paulo Virno never forgive him for reducing use value into exchange value in his theories and to imply that they are equal because this makes it impossible to advocate any revolutionary project (Baudrillard 2007, p.27).

Baudrillard accepts the influence of Marx on his studies, though for the time being, he has been distancing himself from Marx's thoughts in political economy and began to question it (Gane 1993, pp. 20-21). Besides Marx, Sartre and Barthes have also had an influence on him. He studied with Barthes. He also confirmed that he was influenced by

Nietzsche, Heidegger and Schopenhauer. Baudrillard is often associated with postmodern thinking. But he has not associated himself with postmodernity and has described the term postmodernist as “empty”, “explaining nothing” and “collage”. On the other hand, Baudrillard stated that his simulation theory also refers to “emptiness” and a sort of “bricolage”.

Douglas Kellner (1989) states that Baudrillard’s early works, *System of Objects*, *Consumer Society*, *Critique of Political Economy as a Sign* provide the sort of critical theory and analyses of social world produced by Barthes, Lefebvre and others. They also cover critiques of some central concepts of Marx. Cultural theories are considered to be neglected in the development of Marxian economic and political theories. The neglect of culture had been challenged by German Marxists like Walter Benjamin, Bertolt Brecht and the Frankfurt School as well as Barthes, Sartre and others. Baudrillard states in *Mirror of Production* that Marx has not covered the areas of communication and culture in his theories.

In late capitalist social formations, consumerism had become privileged, so society is fulfilled with messages and signs. “On this view, the cultural sphere, mass culture, advertising, information and communication technologies had a direct role in production and economic management”(Kellner 1989, p.8). *System of Objects* of Baudrillard explores the world of objects and subject-object dialectic and it suggests the theory of commodification of everyday life under capitalism. Baudrillard separates objects as functional objects, non functional objects and meta functional objects. Baudrillard combines structuralist analyses of systems of objects with Freudian analyses and

Marxist ideology and critiques. He describes consumer society under the sign of modernity. Baudrillard's system of objects is related to the theories of the technological society which were circulating in France at the time. He carries out a study through cultural analyses of the mythologies surrounding such objects as mirror, clocks, glass, automobiles and robots.

Baudrillard's writings (1993,1994a,1994b,2005,2007) include many clues that he can be assumed as being postmodernist, in a sense poststructuralist. His discourses draw a picture of what postmodern world is. Moreover, his writing style itself includes approaches of post structuralism and deconstruction.

Let's look at what poststructuralism is and its relationship to Marx.

3.1 Poststructuralism and Postmodernism

Poststructuralism is known as an approach after structuralism and commonly used to differentiate French philosophers of the 20th century, such as Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze, Lyotard, Barthes and Baudrillard. Some common characteristics are observed in the style of these philosophers. Structuralism is a study of symbolic order, obsessed with language and neglects material elements and factors. The works of Saussure were a dominant influence on structuralism. Poststructuralism both inherits and combats with structuralism. Poststructuralists set themselves against human idealism. "Poststructuralists analyzed differential relations not as systems of general law but in terms of more fluid connections" (Choat 2010, pp.12-13).

Simon Choat (2010) develops a detailed study to examine the relationship of Marx's thoughts to the philosophies of Lyotard, Derrida, Foucault and Deleuze. Choat examines each philosopher in terms of Marx's philosophy. He concludes that "the poststructuralists proceed in the spirit of Nietzsche's claim that the apparent world is the only one; the real world has been lying and like him they mistrust all systematizers" and "Hegel" is a common "enemy" for them. (Coat 2010, p.15). The suspicion of poststructuralists about Hegel and Nietzsche's systems and teleology could have had a strong influence on the way they approach Marx. In poststructuralism, there is a tendency to explain things with "signifier", "signified" and to concern extra discursive factors and forces (ibid., p.16). Furthermore, it falls into "indeterminacy" and searches for "differences and disorders". Poststructuralism is also affiliated with postmodernism. Hence the question, what is postmodernism? Alex Callinicos (as cited in Coat 2010, p.28) defines "three distinct cultural trends" which operate under postmodernism; postmodern art, poststructuralist philosophy and theories of postindustrial society.

Postmodernity is understood as an era after modernity. Modernity is formulated by the 18th century's enlightenment philosophers including their efforts to develop objective science, universal morality and law (Habermas and Ben Habib 1981, p.9). The concepts of modernism and postmodernism are abstract ideas that have been used to try to articulate the experiences of people living in the age of technology and capitalism. Both are referent to particular eras of technological innovation and wealth gain. David Harvey (1990) tries to figure out the two concepts in order to understand their role in social experience. Harvey lays out the criticisms and basis for the change called postmodernism and argues that

the postmodern situation is just an extension of modernism through a more pluralistic view, and it can be understood through a unifying concept of capitalism. Postmodernism is so closely linked to capitalism that Harvey believes they are inseparable, because just as capitalism is a quest for having, postmodernism is a quest for being. In this world of complex social structure that is dominated by the influence of capitalism, being and having are one and the same and there is a tendency to live in the here and now. Harvey also describes postmodernity with the “accumulation” concept that Marx used to describe as the accumulation of capital. Therefore, in parallel to accumulation and flow of capital what is happening in social and cultural life can be referred to as postmodernity.

There is strong evidence that post-modernity is nothing more than the cultural clothing of flexible accumulation. Flexible accumulation, in short, is associated with a highly fragile patterning of urban investment as well as with increasing social and spatial polarization of urban class antagonisms (Harvey, 1990).

The term postmodern first became popularized in relation to architecture, where it was used to refer to a populist, commercial architecture (ibid., p.30). For example, postmodern architecture takes a different part of the past ones and makes a fusion. Ihab Hassan (1985) depicts some common characteristics of postmodernism comparing to modernism as in Table 1.

Table 1. Modernism vs. Postmodernism

Modernism	Postmodernism
Romanticism/Symbolism	Pataphysics/Dadaism
Form	Antiform
Purpose	Play
Design	Chance
Mastery/Logos	Exhaustion/Silence
Hierarchy	Anarchy
Art Object/Finished Work	Process/Performance/Happening
Metaphysics	Irony
Creation/Totalization/Synthesis	Deconstruction/Antithesis
Genre/Boundary	Text/Intertext
Signified	Signifier
Presence	Absence
Determinacy	Indeterminacy
Symptom	Desire
Semantics	Rhetoric

The concepts in Table 1 can be observed in the works of Baudrillard (1988,1993,1994a,1994b,1998,2005,2007). Deconstruction, pataphysics, indeterminacy, signifier, silence and play are often used terms in his works. According to the Oxford Dictionary, pataphysics is defined as “the branch of philosophy that deals with an imaginary realm additional to metaphysics”. It is often called imaginary science.

Indeterminism for some philosophers is an event without a cause. Determinism implies complete predictability of events and only one possible future.

Reification/alienation of social relations within literary theory is the concept of “intertextuality”. In the twentieth century, this concept is in alliance with Russian Formalism, New Criticism, Eliot’s “tradition” and classical structuralism. For the “intertextualist” the social relations in literary terms are between texts themselves. This corresponds to a progressive alienation and reification of the social relation of writing and reading. It is the reification of the symbolic act of displacement of the concept of “work” by the concept of “text”. Where “work” was historically grounded as labor of production, the concept of “text” has the power to suspend both historical and generic definitions. This concept erases the heterogeneity of objects and dissolves the differences between the “literary” and non-literary”, the “high” and the “low”, the “aesthetic”, the “cultural” and the “social”, even the written and the non-written. The identity of the text lies in its destiny not its origin and in the moment of its consumption not its production. When it is reified and so freed from its production the text is dematerialized, becoming no more than an image of itself, an object of the consuming subject (Bennett 1990, pp.15-37). Baudrillard believes postmodern society to be

dominated by linguistic and textual spheres which are more important than economic realm. Thus, he follows literary turn in social sciences (Macintosh, N.B., Shearer, T., Thornton, D.B. and Welker, M 2000, p.15).

Frederic Jameson (1983) identified postmodernism as “the cultural dominant of the logic of late capitalism”. For him, the work of Foucault cannot be classified only as philosophy, history, social theory or political science. Therefore, such a theoretical discourse that is unclassified is also to be numbered among the manifestations of postmodernism. Instead of seeking one theory or one answer to the problems and questions of human life, there can now be multiple realities that are equally important and should be investigated.

Privileging consumption over production or otherwise reading over writing only unmasks one as a convert from the other, such theories can be read as instances both resistance to, and complicity with what Jameson terms the “cultural logic” of the postmodernist period (Bennet, 1990). Baudrillard’s discourses arising after his critiques of Marx focus on privileging consumption over production, therefore it was consumption, as opposed to production, which was the main drive in early capitalist society.

The French poststructuralist philosopher, Jean Francois Lyotard, who is known for his work on postmodernism, the postmodern condition is a study of the status of knowledge in computerized societies. It is Lyotard’s view that certain technical and technological advancements have taken place since the Second World War which have had and are still having a radical effect on the status of knowledge in the world’s

most advanced countries. As a defining element with which to characterize these technical and technological advancements, Lyotard chooses computerization. (Woodward 2005). For Lyotard, postmodernism represents the collapse of what he calls “the ground narratives of legitimation like the discourses of enlightenment, those of Hegel’s accomplishment of the spirit and the Marxist emancipation of the workers” (Guattari 1996).

Moreover, Harvey set out a relation between time and space experiences and post modernity. The feature of this experience includes the increase of turnover in production sector and application of online systems in finance and service sector. Another feature is immediate solutions like usage of disposable goods. The marketing of images expands quickly in wholesale logic of this new age. Therefore, fleeting and immediate transfer of information are favored results for the capitalist. Global world is an open market for the capitalist. There is no time and space difference. Harvey calls this “time and space compression” and depicts it as multicultural development of capital. One product of a city can be found in another city of another foreign country. Products are accessible from everywhere (Yelman 2003).

Now, we can better understand the post structuralism approaches to the social and philosophical problems. Returning to our inquiry of what is the relationship between poststructuralism and Marx, the poststructuralists do not reject in their referring to Marx. “...they came to Marx in a different context and with different aims, but especially for political purposes” (Choat 2010, p.157). Marx is approached as an open resource. This also stems from poststructuralist attitude; Marx is read in this way because this is the way that poststructuralism reads all texts;

“filtering and using a text rather than simply repeating it or trying to reconstruct its internal coherence”. “Freed from the duty to present the correct Marx, they are attentive to irresolvable problems of his work” (ibid., pp.158-159).

3.2. Introduction to Baudrillard

Baudrillard's early works *Mirror of Production and For a Critique of the Political Economy of Sign* include critiques of Marx's *Capital* and *Grundrisse*. His later works are *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, *Consumer Society and Simulacra* and *Simulation*. The term of Simulacra is almost associated with Baudrillard and most replicated theory of him in other fields, such as critique of architecture and art. “Simulacra” indicates disappearance of the reality into objectified world. Contrary to the ultimate human power realizing in historical perspective proposed by Marx, Baudrillard proposes in technologically postmodern society that the subject has almost disappeared.

Social theorists and historians of differing persuasions agreed that in 1960's France Guy Debord was developing theories of the “society of the spectacle” which focused on image production and new forms of domination and “alienation” in consumer society (Kellner 1989, p.5). At that time, Baudrillard was teaching sociology and engaged in Marx. On the other hand, after industrialization and capitalism, a new field started to question areas such as mass culture, advertising, information and communication technologies. Baudrillard's work covers the insight in

these themes and its relationship with the subject and reality in contemporary age.

Kellner states that Baudrillard's first published book, *The System of Objects* covers the theory of commodification of everyday life under capitalism, in which objects are interpreted as signs organized into systems of signification. This suggests that Baudrillard could have been inspired from Marx's theory of Commodity Fetishism. What Marx called the fetishism of commodities is the process by which products of labor came to appear as an independent and uncontrolled reality apart from the people who create them. Commodity production creates the social division of labor and constitutes a social relationship between producers. This confusion of relations between people with relations to things is the fundamental contradiction of commodity production. The logic of commodification has come to structure every aspect of contemporary life. This commodification of the world is said to have drained things of their independent being. The ultimate form of commodity fetishism in the modern consumer society is the image, the spectacle itself. That is to say, we consume the abstract idea of a thing, rather than the thing itself like designer clothes, latest model cars, the photographs we take of our holiday destinations. These all become images for others to have of us and they seem to represent universal commodification which reduces cultural and natural objects to reified images for consumption (Bennet 1990, p.17)

Baudrillard (1994a) proposes that since the industrial age, the world has lost its reference to nature or reality. Serial industrial production and society with classes led to imaginary, simulacra and no referential world. He resembles this to a map without territory and defines it as

system of signs. This is simulation process, that resembles something, and how it simulates is “simulacra” which will be elaborated upon in the next section.

Baudrillard advocates that Marx has lived in a different period than us and therefore his theories are insufficient to explain today’s technological world. This new system could be rather explained with “binary oppositions”. For example capital moved from oligopoly to monopoly, democracy has passed from multiparty to two parties. Any unitary system must find a binary regulation. In a global world, it is suggested that two opposite superpowers exist (Baudrillard 1993, p.69).

Baudrillard (1975, pp.121-122) argues that the production and proliferation of signs has replaced production of objects in the center of social life in this new era. Therefore, the whole of Marx’s work is no longer adequate for contemporary age. He claims that control of the “code” and “sign” values are more important than control of labor and sphere of production. Baudrillard’s view is quite controversial. As long as human produces, it could not be claimed that Marxian theories will be obsolete. On the other hand, Baudrillard does not specify the economic forces or social groups behind the simulation process, rather he defines a system whereby models and codes become the primary determinants of social reality. In his later works, political economy is erased from his social theory. In postmodern era, the model or code structures social reality. In later works, Baudrillard moves away from Marxian theories. Although he uses the category of capital, it functions simply as a sign among the system of simulations rather than master category which constitutes social relations as for Marx (Kellner 1989, pp. 52-62).

Butler (1999, pp.119-160) argues that Baudrillard uses doubling in his writings, i.e opposite categories for remarking the other category. One category cannot exist without the other. Baudrillard develops his discourses with the opposite, as double strategy. Since the other or what is excluded from one category must be known, in other words, the limit of one category must be known, e.g. the limit of social is masses, the limit of good is evil.

On the other hand, Baudrillard has been using deconstruction in his writings. It is a characteristic of deconstructive method that nihilism has been viewed as the unavoidable consequence of deconstruction (Balkin, 1996). According to Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, nihilism is the belief that all values are baseless and that nothing can be known or communicated. A nihilist believes in nothing, has no loyalties and no purposes other than an impulse to destroy. Nihilism is most often associated with Friedrich Nietzsche who argued that its corrosive effects would eventually destroy all moral, religious, and metaphysical convictions and trigger the greatest crisis in human history.

3.3 Sign Value and Symbolic Exchange

As it has been elaborated in the previous chapter, Marx defines two different values related to object; use and exchange value. Baudrillard (1975) defines four values operating in the objectified world; use value, exchange value, symbolic exchange and sign.

Use value and exchange value are used in a Marxian sense, that is, use value is the practical needed value of an object and exchange value is

economic equality of it. But Baudrillard thinks that neither exchange nor use value protect its reference to the reality. “The concept thus takes all strategic power from its irruption, by which it dispossesses political economy of its imaginary universality” (Baudrillard 1975, p.47). Baudrillard has been criticizing political economy and the system with another approach. “We must move to a radically different level that, beyond its critique, permits the definitive resolution of political economy. This level is that of symbolic exchange” (ibid., p.51).

It is evident that Baudrillard’s concept of symbolic exchange has been inspired by Marx’s exchange and value theories. He calls this “critique of the political economy of sign” and interprets the industrialization and enlightenment in the 18th century;

Nature is entry into the era of its technical domination. This is definitive split between subject and nature-object and their simultaneous submission to an operational finality. Nature appeared truly as an essence in all its glory but under the sign of principle of production (ibid.,p.52).

In this paragraph, the influence of Marx’s theory of alienation can be observed in emphasizing split “subject” and “nature object”, that is labor and the product of labor, and concept of production as a sign. Baudrillard thinks that nature is imposed into production, science and technology under the principles of signification. Nature becomes “signifying”, “referent” and then “reality”. Every commodity as a product of labor refers a sign of nature and its operation. Production is the “mirror” and “expression the form of a code”.

He defines this production age as simulation, but after the production age symbolic is inevitable; whole system is swapped by

“indeterminacy”, every reality is absorbed by “hyperreality”. “You can’t fight with the “code” with political economy” (Baudrillard 1993, pp.2-3). Baudrillard radically challenges political economy which Marx claimed cannot lead to solving problems since it does not represent reality. Therefore, it cannot be a method of approach, and thus new discourses must be developed. For Baudrillard, Marx was in the age of the dialectic of the sign and real, classic period, but we are in “hyper capitalist” mode (ibid., p.10). Today, labor can be produced and consumed like other commodities ordinarily, so labor is not a historical praxis. The system of signs possessed labor and made it passive and it is no longer productive. Moreover, it is not possible for any revolutionary progress in the Marxian sense that production is gifted with consumption so only the “code” lives. Baudrillard tries to deconstruct Marxian production categories such as factories, labor time, product, money, surplus value in order to discover a “code” and “signifiers” of production. Political economy is a model of simulation and “simulacra” involving social relations and social power. Baudrillard has been claiming that production itself has no meaning and its social finality is lost in series.

In direction of such premises examined until now, Baudrillard develops “simulation and simulacra” arguments. He believes that referential value of a sign is lost since Marx’s time. The systems of reference for production, substance and history, all this equivalent to the real content; is over. From now on, signs are exchanged against each other rather than against real. The same operation takes place at the level of labor power and production process; the flotation of money and signs, the flotation of needs and disappearance of political economy.

Baudrillard defines communication, language and signs as new power and productive forces. It is the level of reproduction at the same time (art, information, communication networks) and the sphere of “code”. “all governed by the code” and the unity of the whole process of capital is formed (Baudrillard 1993, pp. 56-60). The meaning of code is very ambiguous and at some parts of Baudrillard’s discourses, it comes to imaginary level that does not form sound arguments and logic.

As today is the reproduction age, art also entered into reproduction. “Aesthetic” is a sign; “city is first and foremost the site of signs execution”. The code is observed in city and the monopoly of code is a genuine form of social relations (Baudrillard 1993, pp.77-78). Graffitiists express themselves with the codes written on walls to fight this code in the city, it is a political response, answering the code.

The social and political system that has been directing the world is a “code” with power. The code changes according to area, for example it is solved as a code in political economy, and it also exists in cities as a capital. The code may be capital or power. The notion of code could have been invented since the critical social theory is trapped within the framework of economic thought (Granter 2009, p.153).

Baudrillard adds a sign value dimension to Marx’s use and exchange value theories. Commodity was primarily analyzed by Marx in terms of use and exchange value. Use value was defined by the usefulness of a commodity whereas exchange value was defined by its worth in the market place. In Baudrillard’s theory, a capitalist mode of production produces a system of sign values that are characterized by differences and hierarchy. He suggests that sign value is governed and organized by

a code of political economy. It seems that the code is referring to the semiological structure of political economy. The code of political economy determines the needs, uses and values possessed by commodities and consumption. The code rationalizes and regulates exchange and makes things communicate (Kellner 1989, p.23).

Although Baudrillard generally claims sign values are determined by a code, it is not clearly defined which determines what. There is no institutional analysis in any of Baudrillard's works; he does not assign determination or control of the code to any specific class or individuals. The term is simply used to refer to the code of commodity or social life as a new model of social organization and thus it refers to simply what Marx calls commodification (ibid., p.29).

3.4 Simulation and Simulacra

Before exploring Baudrillard's theories in detail, we need to ask what the meaning of simulacra is in the history of philosophy. Paul Hegarty explains it in *The Literary Encyclopedia* as such;

Simulacrum has thus never been far from judgements about good and evil: it is the product of deception. Such is the sense we get from Plato in *The Sophist* and in *The Republic* where he reflects on the relation of the real to representation, notably in the allegory of the cave, where, despite its difficulties, he never abandons the desirability of truth, and reflection on how we share truth or thoughts about it.

Simulacrum is also an appendix of "Simulacrum and Ancient Philosophy" in Gilles Deleuze's *Sense of Logic* (1990). It begins with a "reversal" of Platonism. The main focus of this is Plato's treatment of

epistemology, which sets up a difference between appearances and essences, or phenomenal objects in the world and the pure ideal entities from which all corporeal objects derive their properties. Objects correspond to the ideal entities, and this is known as Plato's theory of ideas. The reversal of Platonism is the annulment of this distinction between objects and their representations. Deleuze identifies the analyses of this reversal in Hegel, Kant and Nietzsche, too. Deleuze, however, says that there are no essences at all but only appearances. He develops the argument by demonstrating how Plato leads the way for his own deconstruction within the theory of forms.

Deleuze argues that the “the motive of the theory of ideas must be sought in a will to select and choose” and Platonic dialectic is a “dialectic of rivals and suitors” (ibid., p.253). This means that this is a dialectic of rivalry not a dialectic in which appropriate distinctions are drawn out and conclusions arrived at. It is to screen the claims or pretensions and to distinguish the true pretender from the false one. The image used to represent this is one of the foundation and pretenders; father, daughter and fiancé to make his point. “The suitor must satisfy the requirements and must ‘pass the test of the foundation’ in order to make good on his bid to ‘possess’ the inspired object” (ibid., p.255).

The aim is to distinguish the false pretender from the true one. Deleuze gives an example from *Statesman*; there is a hierarchy as true statesman, well-founded aspirer, relatives, slaves, simulacra and counterfeits. This is the method of division. The resemblance is a measure of pretention. Pretenders can never possess what they aspire to but can only take part in it. They can only appear to resemble it in a

primary way. This means that there are varying degrees of proper participation. The simulacrum produces an appearance that seems to participate in a form which is internally corrupted and decidedly not "true" to that form. The problem here is that if all "false" pretenders of any sort are simulacrum, what do they correspond to? Because their falsehood corresponds to something, we can say that they cannot correspond to anything. They are actually all being produced by the same thing: the simulacrum itself. As Deleuze depicts;

...as a consequence of searching in the direction of the simulacrum and of leaning over its abyss, Plato discovers, in a flash of an instant, that the simulacrum is not simply a false copy, but that it places in question the very notations of copy and model (ibid., p.256).

This means that if the simulacrum is something which these simulacra can correspond to, then there must be truth to these false pretenders. If it is not representation, what then? The only thing left is the "simulacra-phantasm", which is produced by the simulacrum itself. This phantasm is difference, otherness or dissimilarity. As Deleuze puts it, it is "an image without resemblance". As an example of this, Deleuze gives man. He says "God made man in his image and resemblance. Through sin, however, man lost the resemblance while retaining the image. We have become simulacra" (ibid., p.257). Here we arrive at the productive rather than deconstructive side of Deleuze's argument in which he refers to the simulacrum as what "becoming unlimited". Rather than ideal categories from which all corresponding objects descend in order of their being "true to form", there is the simulacrum, a "latent content" for which all images and effects are a possibility. "The simulacrum is not a degraded copy" (ibid, p.262).

The simulacrum does not have a specific content. Simply, it is a nothing for which all effects are possible and for which all productions are to be affirmed rather than judged (ibid., p.265). So, it can be claimed that all identity is a result of simulacrum, but at the same time, all differences and distinctions are also produced by simulacrum. Artificial and simulacrum are not the same according to Deleuze. In modernity, they are opponents and pop art is an example of simulacrum. But at the same time they are two nihilisms.

In Baudrillard's theory, "simulacra and simulation" include an epistemological drive, as in Deleuze, in describing life world. It searches the true knowledge or reality. All dichotomies between appearance and reality, life and art, subject and object collapse into universe of simulacra, controlled by simulation of models and codes (Kellner 1989, p.77). Baudrillard (1993,1994a) defines different phases of simulation in society; first, a reflection of "profound reality"; second, "denaturing" reality and; third, the "absence of reality" and no relation to reality, i.e. simulacrum. He attributes different meanings to each level. In the first level there is truth, but in the last level there is no longer truth or "last judgment" to separate the false from the true, everything is dead. Real is no longer as it was; this is an age of "hyperreal", the world of simulation. Simulation means that it is simulating a process, display or imitating something real, simulacra means the representation of an object. Money exemplifies a simulacrum.

Baudrillard(1994a) tries to support the hyperreality argument with Disneyland example. It is built as a phantasm world to show that the out of Disneyland world is real whereas it is not real, it only simulates a reality, neither true nor false. Disneyland is built in a childish style so it

is believed that adults have been living outside, in the real world. Baudrillard draws a picture that all nature is not living as pure as once it had been. Nature has been transforming through simulacra. “Hyperreality and simulation are deterrents of every principle and every objective”; “capital was the first to play at that deterrence”. Baudrillard uses these meanings to explain that today we are living in a hyperreal world; the simulation of something that really never existed. Power produces signs and its resemblance. Baudrillard predicts that the social itself as a power will be reborn after the rising and death of socialism and like after the death of God, a birth of religion. One event will lead to a return back to the logic of reason (ibid., p.26).

Since Marx’s time, the world has been producing, but there became a need for the object of a social demand like leisure. But work has also left its reference and become unreal, it is the scenario of work. Thus Baudrillard argues that it is simulacrum.

Baudrillard defines Feudal era as an era in which relationship between signs and their referents were fixed, clear and transparent, e.g. social position and status were obvious from appearances. But by the development of western society he argues that reality collapses phase by phase. That is to say, it is explained by the phases of image into historical phases of western civilization. It is assumed three orders of simulacra; first; the counterfeit, from Renaissance to Industrial Revolution, second; production in industrial age and third; simulation in the current code governed phase. Each of these phases means that “Western society’s defining sphere (order, mode) has experienced a series of grand eruptions and reformulations of its social, economic and political realms (Macintosh et.al 2000, p.16).

In the order of counterfeit, the sign becomes counterfeit of the referent. The advent of stucco, for example, led to the imitations of nature, artificial signs and images to real referent (Baudrillard 1993, p.88). The second order, dominated with the arising of serial production, witnesses the appearance of the new social class, bourgeois. The bourgeois also has an appetite for simulacra type of goods that signified their station in society. In this serial production age, objects are simply images of other objects; they are “sign objects”. Just as material goods were produced, both workers and bourgeois owners were serially produced and commodified. Subject was merely an image of other workers or bourgeois persons, serial production simultaneously generated the producing consuming subject as commodity.

A specific analogy that Baudrillard (1994a) uses is a fable derived from the book of Borges. In it, a great Empire created a map that was so detailed it was as large as the Empire itself. The actual map grew and decayed as the Empire itself conquered or lost territory. When the Empire crumbled, all that was left was the map. It is the map that people live in, the simulation of reality (ibid). It is no longer a matter of either a map or territory, there is no relation at all between them. This is third order of simulacra and collapse of representation. The sign precedes the reality.

As it is said, a third order simulacrum is the collapse of representation. “Disneyland is there to conceal the fact that it is the real country” (Baudrillard 1994a, pp.25-28). “Watergate is not a scandal; but this is what must be said at all costs, for this is what everyone is concerned to conceal”. All this exaggerated pretensions demonstrate that “the opening of system itself up to the other; another that is possible by

means of system” (Butler 1999, p.45). The world can be explained with these other/counter examples.

He argues that Disneyland is an imaginary place. However, he also claims that the real in America, in fact is more imaginary than Disneyland. Disneyland, scandal, war only exists to exclude the real; to prove the other is real. While Baudrillard is using simulation and simulacra hypothesis for defining system what is excluded from the system is not clarified. There is “double strategy” in his works.

On the one hand he tries to keep something ‘outside’ to actually exclude it. But on the other hand, he cannot keep it outside since any outside is only an effect of the system itself. He has to think, therefore, not so much what is outside or other to the system of simulation as what is excluded by the fact that it has no outside. He has to think what is excluded by the very conformity of the world to the system, the fact that from now on it can only be seen in its image. Therefore, “double strategy” is a necessity (Butler 1999, p.46).

3.5 Alienation and Consumer Society

Marx basically examines the relation between production and consumption in *A Contribution to The Critique of Political Economy*. Consumption creates a motive for production and creates a new need for further production. He also states that production creates the consumer. Marx states that needs are socially constructed.

Baudrillard (1998, pp. 60-68) on the other hand, defines a class society which is determined by consumption as a sign. People are not assumed to consume an object, its use value, but only its “sign value”

which further depicts status. Consumption produces signs like a language. On the other hand consumption provides freedom experience for the individual. In the consumer society, the object lost its use value and its exchange value and reappeared as a function or a sign value. The interest is not in the objects but in the system of signs which reflects them. The sign or syntax is disassociated from the product and attaches itself to its own meaning. To understand the contemporary world is to understand the message contained in its underlying system of signs.

With work and commodification of the object Baudrillard argues that society lost its shadow and this is social alienation. Our acts, our work, our labor and power, as soon as they are performed as an image of us in the objective world, they possess an image of the hand of the “devil”. Life has lost its meaning since human beings invented the political economy and replaced gold as an exchange value, this is source of alienation. So alienation cannot be overcome, it is bargaining with the devil, it is the very structure of a market society or capitalism (Baudrillard 1998, p.189). The most distressing part is that within alienated labor that is in circulation freely and objectively in the world, there exists a part from our inner worlds. This is turning against itself, hostility to itself. Therefore, Baudrillard agrees with Marx. He also approves the capital or capitalism as a system as an alien power to man.

Baudrillard (1998, pp.126-133) gives *The Student of Prague*, a movie from 1930's as an example to illustrate his understanding of alienation. The story is about a poor student who is ambitious to have a well-off life. With the devil's intervention the student meets a rich woman and falls in love with her. However, the wealth of the woman makes her unreachable for the student. The student is sad and broods

over his dissatisfaction. Then, in his room, the devil appears and makes an offer to the student – in exchange for the student’s image in the mirror he offers the student a pile of gold. The student accepts the offer and the devil, taking the mirror image of the boy, leaves. With his newly found money the student enjoys social success. He is not bothered by not seeing his own image in mirrors. But one day he notices that his own image (the devil) is following him around. If the two are seen together it would cause trouble. But if he were to isolate himself from society the image would take his own place. However, the dominance of the image increases and the student is no longer able to freely go around in society. One day the image follows him to his room. When he sees the image in the mirror he fires at it. The image vanishes but he soon realizes that by killing the image he is killing himself. Just before he dies he picks up one of the fragments of the broken mirror and realizes that he can see himself again. His image is given back to him but he pays the price by his life.

According to Baudrillard, the mirror image here is the symbolism for the meaning of our acts. These images collect around us to form our world. Symbolically, when this image is missing, our world is losing its transparency, we cannot control our acts and we have no perspective of ourselves; I become another to myself; I am alienated. This is the first element the film represents. The second element is the symbolism of the image. The image is not lost or destroyed. It is sold like a commodity.

Further Baudrillard exemplifies his view with Chamisso’s Peter Schlemil, the shadow of the person is separated and becomes a different entity. In both stories the plot is similar. Whether it is the image or the shadow, it is the transparency of our relation to ourselves and to the

world that is shattered. This leads to the loss of meaning of life. In both stories the deal is done in exchange of gold. Gold here symbolizes commodity and exchange value. Gold is placed at the centre of alienation.

Different to the story of the student of Prague, Schlemil is condemned to solitude. By selling his shadow to the devil he only loses his life in society. The second bargain the devil tries with him is his soul for his shadow. Schlemil does not accept the deal thus, loses his shadow but saves his soul.

From the first story we can say that the sold object (soul, image, shadow) takes revenge from us. In the Student of Prague there is no second bargain. The student dies of the consequences of the first bargain. He has no solution to overcome alienation. Alienation is the very structure of the bargain with the devil and cannot be solved. The same structure is evident in market society.

Baudrillard regards the film as a good representation of social life ruled by commodity. The age of consumption is also the age of alienation. Everything in this age is orchestrated into images, signs and consumable models. The reception of signs is all that there is and the individual vanishes in these signs. The consumer man never meets his own needs or his own image. What characterizes this society is the absence of reflection, perspective on itself. The society as a whole has struck a deal with the devil and has exchanged transcendence and finality for affluence.

The devil making us believe that affluence exists is the effectiveness of the myth. Consumption, too, is a myth. The only objective reality of

consumption is the idea of consumption. Our society consumes itself as a consumer. Consumption has existed only since the term “consumption” has become generally used. It is becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy of its own. Baudrillard believes that all myths have their own discourse and anti-discourse. So does consumerism. The discourse and the anti-discourse together constitute the myth. The moralizing protests and the critical discourse are also responsible for the existence of the myth. Like the medieval society that was based on God and the devil, the society today is based on consumption and its denunciation.

3.6 Social vs. Masses

Baudrillard (2007) sets out masses opposite of social and arises as if representing a reality in hyperreal society. He argues that in social life, the system is represented by signs, but there is no longer any social referent of a classical kind, a class or a proletariat to empower effective political signs. There is no longer a social significance, only a silent majority. He attributes alternative meanings to masses while avoiding giving a certain definition of it:

- Everything flows through them and they absorb state, history, culture and meaning
- The strength of inertia
- The strength of neutrality
- Characteristics of our modernity
- A potential social energy

Due to the emptiness of discourses and the impossibility of circulation of meaning, the masses are not alienated any more (Baudrillard 2007, p.38). It is simulation of every lost referential. It means their representation is not possible. The subject in the masses does not have a chance to exist, even in a social class. There is only silence. “No longer being subject, they can no longer be alienated, neither in their own language not in any other which would pretend to speak for them, marking the end of revolutionary convictions.”(ibid., p.49). Baudrillard argues that Marx’s revolution thesis is not valid anymore on the foundation of the silence; we live in an imaginary and illusionary world, thus meaning is lost.

Baudrillard uses a supply-demand theory of goods as a metaphor to articulate his view where “meaning” is the desire for reality. Meaning as a product is no longer in short supply as it is produced everywhere, but demand is limited. Here, the meaning is used in the sense of information, texts, and messages appearing in the media. Baudrillard argues that the bounty of signs and information in the media distort meaning and reality. Meaning implode into meaningless, it has pure effect without content or meaning.

While emphasizing the loss of meaning and silence of the subject he actually criticizes capitalism. He claims there is no longer a crisis with regard to capital; “the hyper-real” has nothing to do with either “capital” or “social” (Baudrillard 2007, p.50). Baudrillard often uses interchangeably, “code”, “simulacrum” and “hyperreality” to refer to a reason, which is powerful but unrecognizable in the political and social life. He mentions also the impossibility to manipulate masses which

bears a potential energy; nobody knows where it will go. Meaning and simulation are produced every day, and the one is subject and object of it at the same time, but no object knowledge and subject knowledge is possible. Statistics, surveys and studies to measure the view of masses does not make any sense, because they only represent signs not reality.

Terrorism is an example of hyperreality and a simulacrum according to Baudrillard. It is an act that does not represent masses or anything like an attack upon silence; neither does it represent reality.

Since Marx's time, the world has been producing, but it became a need of a social demand like leisure. But work has also left its reference and become unreal, it is a scenario of work. Baudrillard encourages thinking that it is the end of social and there is no hope for socialism. The transparency of social relations is lost and consumed everywhere.

Baudrillard's system of concepts is dualistic and not dialectical. It includes categorical oppositions like social vs. masses, subject vs. object, good vs. evil, reversibility vs. irreversibility. In this categorical comparison Baudrillard puts object over subject. He declares the sovereign power of the objectified world (Kellner, p.157). The products of man such as information, media, commodities, fashion dominate the subject.

As Kellner states (1989), in *Fatal Strategies*, Baudrillard examines this thesis mainly that in new era, subject has disappeared under the world of objects. The objects of both natural and physical sciences cannot be controlled by subject. The aim of the object is not good, it is

characterized by evil. Catastrophic scenario is valid in Baudrillard's discourse and it is man's destiny.

How it is possible to envisage a world of objects without human subjectivity is problematic. It is impossible to gain access to objects or perceive of them apart from our subjective modes of perception and cognition. Baudrillard separates subject and object and supposes a struggle between them instead of reconciliation.

3.7 Alienation in Technology World

Baudrillard (1988, pp.126-133) states that we live in an age of communication networks. The screen is a nonreflecting surface, a smooth operational surface of communication. With the television screen, which represents the perfect image of our time, our body and the surrounding universe have become a control screen.

Each person sees himself as the controls of an imaginary machine, at an infinite distance from his original universe like an astronaut in a space capsule. The terrestrial habitat of the subject means the end of metaphysics and the beginning of the era of hyper reality. That is to say, what used to be lived out on earth as metaphor, mental or metaphorical scene becomes projected into reality without any metaphor. We are here at the controls of a micro satellite living no longer as an actor but as a terminal of multiple networks. Television is still the most direct representation of this.

The simple presence of the television changes the rest of the habitat into a kind of archaic envelope that strips everything off fantasies and behaviors on a miniaturized screen. What remains are concentrated effects, miniaturized and immediately available.

Thus the body, landscape, time all disappear as scenes. And so does public space and advertising. Advertising is no longer limited to its traditional language. It organizes the architecture and realization of culture, commodities, mass movement and social flux. It is our only architecture today.

It is the same for public space. The loss of public space occurs with the loss of private space. Public space is no longer a spectacle and private space is no longer a secret. There is a sort of obscenity in all this where our lives become the playground of the media and inversely the entire universe comes to unfold on the other's domestic screen, like a microscopic pornography of the universe.

After describing such a technology oriented postmodern life of man Baudrillard believes that this private universe man had was alienating in that it separated man from others and the world. Thus, consumer society lived under the sign of alienation. But men are no longer a part of the drama of alienation. We live in the "ecstasy of communication". This ecstasy is obscene. It is not sexual obscenity. Today, there is pornography of information and communication. Therefore, it is not the traditional obscenity of what is hidden, repressed, forbidden or obscure. It is the obscenity of the visible, of what no longer has any secret.

According to Baudrillard, Marx denounced the obscenity of the commodity and this was linked to the principle of free circulation,

beyond all use of the object. The obscenity of the object stems from the fact that it is abstract. Commodity is the place objects communicate. Commodity form is the first great medium of the modern world.

Baudrillard claims that we live in communicational, contractual and motivational obscenity of today. It is the end of interiority and intimacy, the overexposure and transparency of the world. The subject can no longer produce the limits of his own being, can no longer play or stage himself, can no longer produce himself as mirror. He is now pure screen, a switching centre for all the networks of influence. Baudrillard states that the media, its instruments and advanced technology networks removed privacy of individual; this is the era of “obscenity” that overcomes the alienation.

CHAPTER 4

HOW ALIENATION RELATES OR DIFFERS IN MARX and BAUDRILLIARD

Marx (1844) distinguishes his understanding of alienation from Hegel and claims that Hegel has set his phenomenologist philosophy in abstract thinking. Hegel was wrong since he designed his system only in consciousness that human alienation in history represented as an abstract phenomenon and “thought entities”. So the oppositions between subject and object are also realized in thought, alien objects also have been in the thought. Hegel is criticized in that “religion, state power, etc., are spiritual entities; for only mind is the true essence of man, and the true form of mind is thinking mind, theological, speculative mind” (ibid)

Marx puts his philosophy on the absolute subject, producers of material goods as objective subjects against Hegel’s total absolute knowledge (Axelos, 1976, p.32). Marx begins with the natural history of man, the first origin; the appearance and development of labor and technique. Contemporary civilization makes the division of labor unbearable. Products of individuals fall into different individuals and different classes. So labor is alienated to his nature.

Marx’s philosophy is based on historical dialectic. That is to say that changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the immense superstructure (Marx 1844, p.2). The whole humanity has been developing within production process by

reason of alienation. In material life, man enters into relation with the means of production. The relation of production is conditioned by man's needs and by the mode of production. The life of man is the combination of what man has and what man is and man enters into relationship with nature by senses. Man is realized in work by alienation, he becomes worker. In that, he ceases to be man in order to become worker, especially in a world where labor is divided, the act of making is alienated (Axelos, 1976, 125). Man is the subject constituted by object, yet becomes alien to himself and to the world in taking himself for a simple object and wishing to possess objects.

Marx defines human essence and human as a natural being. Thus alienation can be evaluated as inhuman process, falling away from essence. "Marxian humanism wishes to dealienate man, abolishing everything that prevents man from satisfying his vital social and spiritual needs" (ibid, p.132).

According to Axelos, Marx does not question the whole metaphysical conception of "subjectivity" and "objectivity". If manifestation is alienation, where then is their being and what then can true objectivity and reality be and what is the meaning of sense experience are unanswered questions by Marx. On the other hand, the notion of true, real species man that he uses as the measure of alienation is a highly metaphysical idea. It is this metaphysical idea that Marx attacks in Hegel. Axelos criticizes Marx in that alienation itself is a metaphysical concept, so Marx cannot escape from being Hegelian (ibid., 135).

Alienation for Baudrillard is a rupture from reality and nature. His discourses emphasize the question of reality and loss of meaning in postmodernity. We live in such a postmodern world that instead of reality there is emptiness and nothingness. The reference to the reality has been lost and cannot be found once again. Baudrillard also understands alienation as separation from God. He believes God created the world as good but man acted in evil, so was alienated from God and became simulacrum. The concept of simulacrum is used as synonymous with alienation. Baudrillard (2001, pp.13-15) also defines the world we live in as “impossible exchange”. This means that the world has become detached from nature itself and has nothing to give back in exchange of the world. Baudrillard claims that the technologically advanced world has become so artificial that it cannot be exchanged with anything. But within the world, everything is exchangeable. Through impossible exchange, Baudrillard regards the world with a highly pessimistic view in which the world is a computer screen and artificial networking.

Baudrillard advocates that all systems such as religious and metaphysical, have failed and only “virtual reality” exists.

But this time we seem to have final solution, the definitive equivalent: Virtual reality in all its forms- the digital, information, universal computation, cloning. In short, the putting in place of a perfect virtual, technological artifact, so that the world can be exchanged for its artificial double (Baudrillard 2001,p.14).

Baudrillard believes that God has disappeared, we are in the age of simulation, and the highest function of the sign is real. We have to ask why there is nothing rather than something. There is no point to identify the world. The world exists because it is imperfect and accidental. If it

had been perfect, it could not have been lived. There is no meaning in the world, only illusion of meaning. “The simulacrum is not what conceals the truth; it is the truth which conceals that there is none. The simulacrum is true” (Baudrillard 2008, p.22).

Marx never mentions alienation as separation from God. On the contrary, he takes care of not representing a religious mind. The origin of the manifestations of man’s activity lies in movement. The relationship of man to nature and the relationship of man to other beings are essential to material life. This relationship is the truth of reality. This is the main point of Marx, everything starts and ends in human and human history.

It is compromised by many commentators that Marx’s philosophy is dualistic. It seems that Marx is not interested in dealing with ideal forms, but interested in materialist philosophy and doings of man. There are criticisms that Marx does not go away from being dualistic though he attempted to do this. Marx’s view is not unity of totality. Marxian dialectic intends to express logos of human history and the meaning of human activity. “Marxian dialectic fights against any intervention by mediation; for mediation is that through which the being in becoming totality is achieved in self knowledge as universal and absolute spirit” (Axelos 1976, p.208). “Spirit” here depicts Hegelian view.

Marx’s aim was to set dialectic between proletarians and the capitalists who feed alienation. Critical philosophy after Marx is no longer inspired by love of knowledge, attempting to distinguish truth from error; it now aims to relate the genesis, the development of ideas to material social conditions. (Choat 2010, p.166). Baudrillard’s theories can be an example of this. Baudrillard believes in the irreversibility of

systems and the mode of disappearance. He does not believe in the mode of production, which approves his nihilism without energy and without hope for a better future (Kellner 1989, p.118).

Marx does not distinguish between thought and consciousness. Since he does not clarify this and does not define fully what he calls reality and truth, true thought must be a practice of dealienation (Axelos, p.148). Marx sets his materialist philosophy starting from real life into consciousness. First comes reality, then consciousness. (Marx, 1846, p.9). In this sense Marx positions himself against idealists. He always departs from real life as a conclusion of satisfying needs. For satisfying needs man enters into social relations and consciousness is a product of this social relations. It arises from necessity. Language also arises as a necessity for communicating with others. Therefore, language and consciousness are the same in respect to their occurrence. Marx does not attribute abstract meanings to consciousness.

If materialism is considered critical, historical and focusing on social relations, then poststructuralist movement can be assumed to be materialist. (Choat, 2010, p.172). Materialism is formed in the light of past experiences or history within the necessity of present moment. In this sense, Baudrillard and Marx have parallel approaches about interpreting man's social life in the objectified world.

Exchange/money is an alienating factor according to Marx because it reverses natural properties of things. Money for Baudrillard also depicts alienation. It is an evil force and a distorting factor that is the cause of every alienated nature of man.

For Marx, alienation is associated with the concept of exchange. Exchange in the sense of value and the lack of equal base cause alienation. Since a basis for exchange between objects has been created through money and gold as if equal, real exchange has been lost. Private property, exchange and division of labor are elements of alienation that separates man from his labor when he works. Marx's critique of alienation is thus formulated as a "rejection of this mediation" (Meszaros 1971, p.79). Marx defines dialectical relationship between nature, man and industry. Man is not only the creator of industry but also the product of it. Marx calls this a genesis of human society. Man's own nature necessarily implies ontological self mediation of man with nature through his own productive activity (ibid., p.104).

Marx by the analyses of alienation concept arrives at the decision that hostile power is acting against man. So Marx criticizes capitalism and proposes a new system; communism, that is based in political, economic and social fundamentals. In this sense the concept of alienation is related to the issues of political economy, like labor time, accumulated capital, surplus value etc. It is parallel with the development of political economy from monetary system to liberal political economy, also from feudal landed property to industrial capital. Marx criticizes political economy in that it does not consider the worker as a human being, but regards him like a machine. In his theory, "the complex manifestations of human life are explained in a reference to a dynamic principle, activity itself" (Mezsaros, 1971, p.148). I argue that alienation concept has led Marx to become aware of alien power to man that is defined as capitalist in many ways. This has resulted in him suggesting a new society system; communism.

Communism differs from all previous movements in that it overturns the basis of all earlier relations of production and intercourse, and for the first time consciously treats all natural premises as the creatures of hitherto existing men, strips them of their natural character and subjugates them to the power of the united individuals. Its organization is, therefore, essentially economic, the material production of the conditions of this unity; it turns existing conditions into conditions of unity (Marx 1846).

On the other hand, the main theme of Marx's theory is how to realize human freedom which must be maintained in real life. Man is a specific part of nature and he cannot be identified with something spiritual. Marx designed his theories in materialistic base since freedom is an attribute of man. Freedom is not ideal or abstract category, it belongs to human realm. By this, human freedom is limitless and more powerful (Mezsaros 1971, pp.165-167).

Baudrillard (2007, pp.79-94) investigates social vs. masses, which necessarily and oppositely exist. However, he could not decide what the social is and proposes multiple hypotheses. Social develops in the same manner that institution like media and information develop. "...social is both destroyed by what produced it (media, information) and reabsorbed by what it produces (masses)". It follows that its definition is empty and that social serves as universal alibi for every discourse, it no longer analyses anything, no longer designates anything. "Wherever it appears it conceals something else; it conceals that it is simply an effect of the social, a simulation, an illusion". This is typical working way of Baudrillard with concepts. To empty the concepts, to fill them with nothingness and strip them of meaning, then bearing the concept with illusion or simulation.

For social concept, Baudrillard suggests three different hypotheses. First, social basically never existed, second, the social has really existed, and thirdly, it exists even more and more. According to second hypothesis, social has been dying. When everything including social becomes use value, the reverse of what Marx dreamed occurs. Social is reabsorbed into political economy, its administration pure and simple. Socialism can do nothing to prevent it. In the third hypothesis, social existed but it does not exist anymore. The social only exists in a perspective space; it disappears in the space of simulation which confuses the real with the model. Social has existed in the second order simulacra but has no opportunity to be produced in the third order. In the third order, signs of hyperralization of the social are everywhere. “Social will never have time to realize socialism and the concept of class will have dissolved well before into an extended double or simply into a retrospective simulation of the proletariat” (Baudrillard 2007, p.93). Baudrillard attacks Marx that he has dreamed to propose socialism because there is no social to realize it. But the opposite arguments do not take into account every premise and argument of Marx and try to falsify it systematically.

The three hypotheses to define social do not differ mainly. Nonetheless, they show that social has nothing to do with developments in the society. Social is assumed as powerless and is absorbed by unknown powers into unreasonable passivity. Reasons of this passive characteristic cannot be found in works of Baudrillard. It is understood that a hidden but unquestionable factor manages human life mystically.

Baudrillard suggests that life is determined more by the manipulation of commodities and interaction with objects than

interaction with other people. His point is that commodities are part of a system of objects correlated with system of needs. He adds cultural dimension to Marx's critique of political economy that consumption of commodities signifies happiness, well-being, affluence, success, prestige, etc. He also argues that consumption is a mode of social activity signifying that one is a member of this society (Kellner 1989, pp.14-15).

While production is a factor which alienates man for Marx, due to consumption man is alienated for Baudrillard. Yet production and consumption are overlapping. Alienation cannot be overcome; it is the very structure of consumer society. It is the essence of real life, as everything is bought and sold. Individuals neither see their own true needs nor another way of life (Baudrillard 1988, p.307). In Baudrillard's view, objects dominate subjects and semiological theory of signs can be used to describe the world of commodities and consumer society. In this active using of sign system or manipulation in consumer society, subject is not included actively as producing, redefining and resisting. Baudrillard fails to develop a genuine theory of agency (Kellner 1989, p.9).

Baudrillard argues that without a theory of sign value, political economy cannot explain why commodities become such objects of desire and why consumption can take on such an important function in contemporary capitalist societies. But his theory of sign value provides a one sided, limited theory of consumption. Baudrillard denies all human agency and creativity and does not analyze any of the ways in which commodities can be integrated into our own life. He believes that consumer society is a reflection of the capitalist world and consumption

is managed and controlled by capital. Baudrillard's analysis focuses on the consumption only from the standpoint of the capitalist class by describing how consumption serves to integrate individuals into society (ibid., p.15).

Moreover there is no analysis in contradictions, conflicts and shifts in sign value. It is ambiguous who establishes the code or how it functions in specific cases. In Barthes's language theory, there is interplay of a multiplicity of readings and constant change, on the contrary to Baudrillard's monolithic code. Baudrillard does not elaborate some aspects of political economy such as profit, savings, and surplus value while he criticizes Marx. Whereas he has been opposite of Marxian logic of production and proposing the production of sign value, it is assumed to be independent of the logic of capital accumulation or even what determines it. In some points Marx's whole theory of capitalist realization disappears from the view (ibid., p.31).

Baudrillard does not accept that pure use value and exchange value are different as in Marx's theory. He argues both needs and uses are socially constructed. Baudrillard attacks the strategy of Marx who appeals to the primacy of use value over exchange value. In *Mirror of Production*, Baudrillard also rejects many concepts of Marx including labor for which Marx claimed overcoming its alienation would involve constructing another mode of labor and another system of production. According to Kellner, Baudrillard underestimates Marx in many ways ignoring his goal of achieving a new form of society.

I have argued that Marx's theory of alienation inspired him to develop a new economic and political system for a better living and

equal sharing society. This equality principle of new society will provide unity to human being (Marx 1859).

Barry L. Padgett (2007, pp. 23-29) challenges the objections made to Marx's theory of alienation. There were criticisms that current political economy has reached saturation and that workers have greater share of profits. Therefore individuals have been less alienated compared to early capitalist age in which Marx developed his theories. Padgett gives the credit card example in today's society that excess expenditure limits have been used against man as a false power. Marx has declared money as an alienating power; since credit cards are used instead of money in contemporary society it can be a factor for alienation. Today, we live in a cashless society in which credit card usage has reached extreme amounts. One can have a purchasing power beyond his exchange value of labor power. This situation causes economic alienation in contemporary age.

Furthermore, Padgett draws attention to the objections made in the field of social theory, too. A survey was conducted by Charles B. Saunders, Hugh M.O'Neill and Oscar W.Jensen (as cited in Padgett 2007, p.51) to measure alienation in the workplace. But among the 21 questions of the survey, only three are related to the alienation concept in Marxian sense. Although the survey proved to provide valuable insights into the working conditions and satisfaction of man in contemporary age, the survey is irrelevant to measure whether Marx's theories are still applicable or not (ibid., p.51). Padgett gives American economy as an example of people spending over personal incomes and income inequality is still a vital issue. Therefore it can be claimed that economic alienation still exists.

World Bank compares income inequality with Gini index which measures the extent to which the distribution of income (or consumption expenditure) among individuals or households within an economy deviates from a perfectly equal distribution. According to World Bank Development Indicators in 2007, this index shows that, for example, in Turkey the richest %30 of the population receives % 83.8 of gross national income. In 153 countries included in Gini Index in 2007, a similar situation is evident for most of the countries including United States. The lowest Gini Index means there is less income inequality. In 2007, Czech Republic with 25.4 and Norway with 25.8 rates, were recorded as countries having the lowest income inequality.

Padgett (2007) enumerates alienation in contemporary age as credit cards, commodification of self and inter urban competition. These have been indicators of alienation. Padgett strongly criticizes consumerist American society in that it has become similar to third world countries with excess debt amounts per person. To consume with excess debt over one's earnings is regarded as a third world culture.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In putting forward his philosophy, Marx uses the historical dialectic method. According to Marx, man, in the process of history and in interaction with nature, is within a process of self realization. The duality (materialism vs. spiritualism) in man's nature can only be solved with his practical energy and in material life. "Human history" and "genesis of human society" come about as a result of the dialectic relationship between industry and nature that result from human creation. Marx defines this as the "true anthropological nature". Man's social needs also serve to determine his practical activities. Thus, man exists for man as a collective being and actualizes himself, throughout the history of humanity. When the dialectic method is used to explore the real anthropological nature of man, the relationship of subject and matter can be observed clearly. For distinguishing his own dialectic method from that of Hegel's, Marx claims that the ideal is nothing but the real world. Thus, he criticizes Hegel for being "mystical". He states that matter emerges in the material world as a motion. He reiterates this argument in both Manuscripts of 1844 and in Capital. On the contrary to his definition, Marx claims matter in Hegel is a "movement of thoughts".

Alienation is an inevitable nature of ontology of work. Marx defines this alienation as objectification of labor. Since man is a sensuous being and perceives external objects with senses, objectification of labor is compulsory to the existence of man. Through this objectification other

man becomes his object; hence this is a medium for socialization. Labor is a depiction of freedom through work. By producing in real world, man realizes his own power and creates and recreates. These are mentioned by Marx in positive manner. On the other hand, man sells his labor power for exchange value but he loses his freedom and this exchange is not in equal base. These are objections of Marx to the capitalist system. Social relations between persons are influenced by the conditions of capital. Moreover, individuals are alienated from characteristics of free human beings.

Marx puts alienation as a loss of unity in humanity and analyses it in economic and social foundations. I have argued that Marx's theory of alienation caused him to develop a new societal system; communism promising emancipation of workers. Therefore, he develops communism which aims to provide the unity of humanity again, according to his assumptions. His essential philosophy has been based on improving man's humanity and the power of subject.

Movement is also an outcome of alienated labor which in itself leads to the formation of industry, as accumulation of knowledge. With the concept of alienation, Marx emphasizes that man passes on his own control to the control of another power and thus loses his freedom. Human labor has become an object that can be bought and sold like an exchange product. Marx's concept of alienation explains the tensions and contradictions of man's actions in the world. It is between realm of necessity and realm of freedom.

Marx also claims that "private property", "division of labor" and "exchange" is results of alienation. With the emergence of private

property man became familiar with ownership which has gradually led man away from intellect. Human beings thus began to identify themselves with what they own. It could be said that Marx was able to foresee one of the results of capitalism.

Marx's theory of alienation has both positive and negative aspects. It is positive in that man has created industry through his own talent, that is, by using his own potential. It has also led him to become a social being as a result of the interaction he has had with others during work and production. Marx emphasizes man's power and his freedom while stripping the concept of alienation off God and religious approaches.

While showing us the fact that "exchange", which is another result of political economy, is not based on equal ground and those unequal things may also be exchanged, Marx demonstrates that there is no exchange in which love is changed for love and trust is changed for trust.

He has justified that man began production as a result of his relationships in social life and his actions and that this production determined that economic, social and political superstructure which led to the emergence of the social conscious. Social revolutions are thus the result of the interaction and the contradiction between the two. The most important factor determining the social conscious is production conditions and economy.

Baudrillard who initially based his social and political theories on Marx, later deviated from Marx and rejected his socialism claims. Baudrillard claims that during the time Marx developed his theories we had been living in a different age. Today, Marx's theories are inadequate and that is the reason why we need new theories to talk about the new

age . In our day, it is associated with postmodernity, and communication, culture and language have become more important than economy. Baudrillard claims that Marx's theories are insufficient in that they do not analyze these areas.

In his works, Baudrillard heavily focuses on the concepts such as "reality", "hyperreality", "virtual reality", "integral reality", "sign", "image", "simulacra" and "code". He inquires the reality consistently by asking the existence of reality and whether or not we are living in the real or illusionary world. He argues that in today's technology oriented world, only appearances are true, images are dominated; the natural world has become artificial. This artificiality is called simulacrum in Baudrillard's philosophy. Reality is absorbed into the virtual. What if the world is freed from appearances? It becomes the real universe, the universe of integral reality. Indeed, Baudrillard believes that the world has acquired such a degree of reality that it is bearable only by a perpetual denial with "this is not a world"; operating as the surrealist denial of self evidence (Baudrillard 2005, p.26). While developing this argument he appeals to his personal beliefs. If we negate the entire world, it is impossible to talk about philosophy, politics, economy and social sciences any more. This seems ontologically problematic. Foundation is lost to separate true ones from copies. Indeed, Baudrillard claims metaphysically that world has been drifting away from truth and goodness. Its foundation for true judgments has been lost. Therefore the world resembles nothing, but "simulacrum".

Baudrillard also claims the loss of meaning in postmodern world since advanced communication tools, culture, industry and media distorted the meaning. Political economy does not refer to anything real.

It continues to be represented with the code. Code refers to a reason or system that it is applied as implication of sign values. This analogy which is used in theory of language produces meaning through differences, rules interplay of signifier, relating signifiers to the signified, yet it is not clear that this linguistic analogy is appropriate on explaining life world.

Baudrillard does not believe that there are different use and exchange values related to object. He does not prove his arguments systematically against Marx. Therefore, he is criticized that he has been rejecting central concepts of Marxian philosophy without falsifying them (Kellner 1989).

Commodification and signification of everyday life is one of the central themes of Baudrillard who elaborates alienation under the influence of contemporary age. Baudrillard further argues that in technology focused postmodern world, subject has become a pure screen. Private space and public space have imploded. He calls this the ecstasy of communication. Therefore man is no longer a part of alienation.

Baudrillard's understanding of alienation is ambivalent. In consumer society, alienation is commodification of everyday life and loss of innocence; it is defined as a social alienation. When man realizes himself in the objective world, man's products and acts can belong to the one who does not have good intentions, i.e. the devil. Thus it refers to the alienation from spiritual world. Although just like Marx, Baudrillard regards political economy as the source of alienation in the consumerist production society in his early works, we come across different

interpretations in his later works. Baudrillard's understanding of alienation in the age of communication is based on man's free ability to communicate with others and being freed of isolation. The social cannot be a part of alienation in "ecstasy of communication".

In his alienation arguments, Baudrillard draws a definite line between the subject and the object. Subject is passive and has no power over the objectified world. Subject in masses does not have a chance to be represented so it could not have been alienated anymore. This creates the problematic of how the knowledge of the object can be attained without the subject.

The subject that exists in the consumerist society has lost his essence, his humanity and thus has become a part of the devil. Under the constant information flow of the media and other communication means, the subject has gradually become passive due to the temporariness of technology. In the postmodern world in which meaning and reality are lost, it can only be interpreted by codes. The subject who lives in the world of simulacrum, dominated by hiperreality, has found himself in a totally objectified world. Thus, Baudrillard stands at a point where even alienation is out of question. Whereas subject in Marx's philosophy is constituted with power to create his own history in work, Baudrillard's subject is constituted without power against object. This also leads to the problem of freedom for the subject.

Whereas Marx is in favor of developing a solution for human being in order to overcome alienation, Baudrillard rather focuses on the nature of alienation. His theories that have come to equate with nihilism, have a pessimistic idea of the future. He points out that the virtual world,

dominated by technology, distances man from reality and nature for which he has no means of irreversibility. However, we must not believe that we live in simulacrum world and that our existence is the copy of the natural world. Also, we must hold on to our hopes that good can have a strong position against evil and it can be possible to justify what is truth.

REFERENCES

Axelos, K.(c1976).*Alienation, Praxis and Techne in the Thought of Karl Marx*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balkin,J.M.(1996). *Deconstruction*. In D. Patterson. *A Companion to the Philosophy of Law and Legal Theory*, Basil Blackwell.

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/jbalkin/articles/deconessay.pdf>

Baudrilliard, J.(c2008).*The Perfect Crime*. London; Newyork: Verso.

Baudrilliard, J.(c2007),*In the Shadow of Silent Majorities or The End of Social introduction By Sylvaere Lotringer,Chris Kraus and Heidi el Kholti* .Los Angeles : Semiotext(e) ; Cambridge, Mass. : Distributed by MIT Press.

Baudrilliard, J.(c2005).*The Intelligence of Evil or The Lucidity Pact*.Oxford; Newyork: Berg.

Baudrilliard, J.(2001).*Impossible Exchange*.London: Verso.

Baudrilliard, J. (1998), *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London: Sage Publications.

Baudrilliard, J. (1994a), *Simulacra and Simulation* .Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Baudrilliard, J.(1994b).*The Illusion of End* .Cambridge: Polity Press.

Baudrillard, J.(1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death* .London ; Thousand Oaks : Sage Publications.

Baudrillard, J. (1988). The Ecstasy of Communication. In H. Foster, *The ant-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (126-135). Seattle; Washington, Bay Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1975).*The Mirror of Production*.St. Louis : Telos Press.

Bennet, D. (1990). Wrapping up Postmodernism: The subject of consumption versus the subject of cognition. In A. Milner, P. Thomson and C. Worth, *Postmodern Conditions* (15-37). Newyork; Oxford; Munich: St.Martin's Press.

Butler R.(1999). *Jean Baudrillard: The Defense of Real*. London: Sage Publications.

Choat, S. (2010).*Marx through Post Structuralism*.London; New York: Continuum.

Cootler, G. (2009). Маркс Бодрийяра [The Place of Marx in Contemporary Thought: The Case of Jean Baudrillard]. *Foreign Philosophy*, 2,133-141.

Deleuze, G.(1990).*The Logic of Sense*. Newyork: Colombia University Press.

Ebenstein, W.(2000). *Great Political Thinkers*. Newyork, London; Sydney; Tokyo: Harcourt College Publishers.

Fromm, E. (2004). *The Concept of Man*. London: Continuum Publishing Company.

Gane, M. (1993). *Baudrillard Live: selected interviews*. London; Newyork: Routledge.

Granter, E.(2009),*Critical Social Theory and The End of Work*. England: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Guattari,P.F.(1996).The Postmodern Impasse. In G.Genesko,The Guattari Reader (pp. 109-113).

Habermas, J & Ben-Habib, S. (1981, Winter). Modernity versus Postmodernity. *New German Critique: Special Issue on Modernism*, 22, 3-14.Retrieved November 5,2011, from http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/sociology/pg/current/programmes/ma/modules/sociologyofmodernityii/habermas_modernity.

Harvey, D.(1996). *Postmodernliğin Durumu*. İstanbul:Metis Yayınları.

Harvey, D.(1990).Flexible Accumulation Through Urbanization, *The Yale Architectural Journal: Theater, Theatrically and Architecture*, 26.

Hassan, I.(1985), The Culture of Postmodernism, *Theory Culture and Society: Explorations in Critical Social Science* ,2,119-131.

Hegarty, P. (2006). Simulacrum. *The Literary Encyclopedia*. Retrieved on 07 December, 2011,from [\http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1016

Hegel, Friedrich Georg Wilhelm (2006), *Lectures on the History of Philosophy 1825-6, Volume II Greek Philosophy*, Edited by Robert F. Brown .Newyork: Oxford Universty Press.

Jameson, F.(1983),Postmodernism and Consumer Society, In H.Foster, *The Anti-Aesthetic Essays On Postmodern Culture* (pp. 11-125).Seattle; Washington: Bay Press.

Kellner, D. (1989). *Jean Baudrilliard from Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lukacs, G. (1975), “The Ontological Basis of human Thought and Action”, *The Philosophical Forum*, VII/2,22-57

Macintosh,N.B., Shearer, T., Thornton, D.B. and Welker, M. (2000,25). Accounting as simulacrum and hyperreality: perspectives on income and capital. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 13-50 ,Retrieved on 22 October,2011, from <http://directory.umm.ac.id/Data%20Elmu/jurnal/A/Accounting,%20Organizations%20and%20Society/Vol25.Issue1.Jan2000/267.pdf>

Marcuse, H.(1972). *The Foundation of Historical Materialism*. Boston: *Studies* Beacon Press
URL=<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/historical-materialism/index.htm>

Marx, K. (1887). *Capital Volume I : The Process of Production of Capital*. Moscow :Progress Publishers.
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/>

Marx, K.(1844).*Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow :Progress Publishers
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Economic-Philosophic-Manuscripts-1844.pdf>

Marx, K.(1859).A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.
Moscow: Progress Publishers
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Contribution_to_the_Critique_of_Political_Economy.pdf

Mezсарos, I. (1972). *Marx's Theory of Alienation*.New York:Harper & Row.

Padgett, B.(2007).*Marx and Alienation in Contemporary Society* .New York : Continuum International Pub. Group.

Pratt,A.(2005).Nihilism.*Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved 18 November,2010 from
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/nihilism/>

Skempton, S. (2010). *Alienation after Derrida*. London :GBR: Continuum International Publishing.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/metu/>

Waldron, J. (2010 Winter).Property. "Property and Ownership", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* , Edward N. Zalta (ed.).
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2010/entries/property>

Wilson, D.,*What Gives work its value?The Human worth as a physical product;a modern Reinterpretation of The Theory of Karl Marx*.USA: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006.

Woodward,A. (2005), A.Jean François Lyotard. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrived December 10,2011 from
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/lyotard/>

World Bank Development Indicators (2007). Retrieved from 20 December,2011, from [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/table 2_7.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/table2_7.pdf)

Yelman, S.(2003).Person in Postmodernity. In Z. Davran (ed).*XXIst World Congress of Philosophy Facing World Problems*. Abstracts. Ankara:Meteksan Yayınevi.

APPENDIX:TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı :

.....

Adı :

.....

Bölümü :

.....

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınmaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:

.....