

GROWTH OF CAPITALISM
HOW DOES INNOVATION REINFORCE CAPITALISM IN THE PROGRESS
OF ITS AUTHORITY?

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

ÖMER ERSİN KAHRAMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY STUDIES

AUGUST 2010

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 : Ömer Ersin Kahraman

Signature :

ABSTRACT

GROWTH OF CAPITALISM

How does innovation reinforce capitalism in the progress of its authority?

Kahraman, Ömer Ersin

M.S., Department of Science and Technology Policy Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Erol Taymaz

August 2010, 98 Pages

The main aim of this thesis is to discuss the role of innovation in the capitalist mode of production so as to achieve the domination of capitalism in the human world by capitalizing it. The idea of freedom is handled as a reason for politics when one confronts another in this quest. Process innovations are accepted as methods of improving the profitability of production which deprives dispossessed masses from their productive power outside the workplace while product innovation is claimed to be the process of improving profitability of consumption which results in increased intervention of capitalism in the relation between the human being and his wants through pacification. Thus, as capitalism continues growing, it becomes more a mediator between the human being and materials, which gives it more authority in society.

Keywords: Innovation, Authority, Labor, Work, Freedom

ÖZ

KAPİTALİZMİN BÜYÜMESİ: İnovasyon Kapitalist Otoriteyi Nasıl Destekler?

Kahraman, Ömer Ersin

Yüksek Lisans, Bilim ve Teknoloji Politikası Çalışmaları

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Erol Taymaz

Ağustos 2010, 98 sayfa

Bu tezin asıl amacı inovasyonun kapitalizmin insani dünya üzerindeki egemenliğini başarması için kapitalist üretimde nasıl bir rolü olduğunu tartışmaktır. Özgürlük fikri, özgürlük arayışında insanın insanla karşı karşıya gelmesi nedeniyle siyasetin bir nedeni olarak ele alınmıştır. İşlem inovasyonları, kitleleri işyeri dışında üretkenlikten mahrum kılan üretimin kârlılığını artırma yöntemleri olarak kabul edilirken ürün inovasyonları kapitalizmin insani pasifleştirerek insan ve insanın istekleri arasındaki ilişkiye daha fazla müdahalesiyle sonuçlanan tüketimin kârlılığını artırma işi olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu nedenle kapitalizm büyümesine devam ettikçe toplumdaki otoritesini insan ve eşya arasında daha çok bir aracı haline gelerek geliştirir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İnovasyon, Otorite, Emek, İş, Özgürlük

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. FREEDOM, WORK AND CAPTIVITY	8
2.1 VOLITION, WORK AND AUTHORITY IN HUMAN ORGANIZATION	8
2.1.1 <i>Volition and Detachment of the Human Being from Nature</i>	9
2.1.2 <i>Work as a Purposive Activity and Power of Labor</i>	13
2.1.3 <i>Freedom of Volition versus Coercion of Execution</i>	14
2.1.4 <i>Emancipation from Execution through Instrumentalization of the Human Being in the Struggle for Freedom: Slavery</i>	17
2.1.5 <i>Patterns of Authority in Slavery</i>	19
2.1.6 <i>Freedom of Master</i>	23
2.2 WORKPLACE AND STRUGGLE BETWEEN CAPITALIST AND WORKER.....	24
2.2.1 <i>Choice of Humanity Coercing Worker</i>	25
2.2.2 <i>Capitalist as the Master in the Struggle for Profitable Production</i>	27
2.2.3 <i>Father-Capitalist and Devaluation of Worker in the Struggle</i>	29
2.2.4 <i>Transfer of Freedom and Profitable Production</i>	32
3. SOCIETY IN INNOVATIVE LABOR PROCESS	38
3.1 SOCIAL PRODUCTION AND CHALLENGING CAPITALISM.....	39
3.1.1 <i>Individuals' Limitedness and Division of Labor in Social Productivity</i>	39
3.1.2 <i>Need of Stock and Challenge of Newcomer in Society</i>	42
3.1.3 <i>Capitalist Stock and Division of Labor</i>	44
3.1.4 <i>Expansion of Capitalism through Process Innovations</i>	47
3.2 CAPITALIST PROCESS INNOVATION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE	49
3.2.1 <i>Taylor's Scientific Management</i>	49
3.2.2 <i>Implementation of Taylor's Methods in Ford Motor Co.</i>	56

4. GROWTH OF CAPITALISM THROUGH PRODUCT INNOVATION	65
4.1 CONSUMERISM AND PRODUCT INNOVATIONS	67
4.1.1 <i>From Consumption to Consumerism</i>	68
4.1.2 <i>Emergence of Capitalist Consumerism</i>	70
4.1.3 <i>Capitalist Expansion in Consumerism: Product Innovation</i>	72
4.2 PACIFICATION IN CONSUMERISM.....	73
4.2.1 <i>Rationality in Consumption and Triumph of the Irrational</i>	73
4.2.2 <i>Passive Execution of Consumption</i>	78
4.2.3 <i>Passive Personality of Consumerist</i>	79
4.3 CAPITALIST GROWTH AND ITS LIMITS	82
4.3.1 <i>Dissatisfaction and Limitlessness of Consumerism</i>	82
4.3.2 <i>Growth: Domination of Capitalism</i>	85
4.3.3 <i>New Boundaries to Growth</i>	88
5. CONCLUSION	92
REFERENCES.....	95

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Innovation is generally considered in the context of technological progress and consequently its development is supposed to facilitate human's condition. However, if the relation between innovation and marketing is missed¹, the real end of the fast and vast capitalist growth² cannot be comprehended. Indeed, although marketing may include functional needs and through marketing some functional items may meet society, marketing's main purpose is not to gratuitously offer a better life to people, but it is to make profits.

It is impossible to reject that the modern man has some new facilities which are shouldering many tasks in the daily life; however, it is also evident that various goods are consumed without considering their use, many goods are purchased by looking at the package or image rather than the service of the good. Although this is not consistent with a progressive point of view, it is quite understandable for the point of marketers as their aim is not to help people to go in better conditions but it is just to generate profits regardless of the source.

¹ Innovation is defined as "the economical application of a new idea"; and while product innovation involves "a new or modified product", process innovation involves "a new or modified way of making new products" (Black, 1997, p.238). For Joseph Alois Schumpeter, economic innovation consists of "introducing new products or production methods, opening new markets, acquiring new sources of raw material or finished goods, or applying a new invention to industry" (Ammer, 1977, p.416). In this sense, Schumpeter related innovation to profiting since "profit is the innovator's reward" (Ammer, 1977, p.416) who economized an idea in the market. Thus, innovation is to profit through instrumentalizing the technology in the market as it is the commercial introduction of a new or modified product or process (The New Palgrave, 1988, vol.2, p.858).

² In economical terms, growth is "an increase in an economic variable, normally persisting over successive periods" (Black, 1997, p.205) while it is most commonly defined "in terms of the rate of exchange in some measure of national product per head of population at constant prices" (The New Palgrave, 1988, vol. 3, p.432). As the measure is based on per head in the population, the augmentation of productivity is the source of the growth since "technological innovations both increase the usefulness of land and the other resources and add to the variety and quantity of capital (goods used to make goods)" (Ammer, 1977, p.205). Moreover, as this measure is in terms of prices, the productivity can only be perceived in profitability since product is converted in terms of money. Thus, economical growth is the augmentation of the profitability of the labor process through innovations.

On the other hand, if we consider the act of buying in only terms of profits in money, the reason why masses have to work for the production of that enormous consumption without which the human being would still be able to live cannot be understood. Without considering, one goes in the workplace to produce for contributing functionless consumption so as to improve his consuming potential although he does not need to consume more. In this way, even he may think that technology is to facilitate his life, any augmentation in productivity is allocated to produce more immensely. This situation is quite paradoxical seeing that even though life is to live, the human being is always in a situation of scarcity and he works as if he always needs something more while he cannot find any occasion to live more than the joy of consumerism. Finally, what is obvious is that one cannot go out of the workplace despite of the improved productivity but he can buy more while people tend to believe naively that working for the progress of humanity is contributing to innovation process even though this process has only creation of more consumption as its objective is to generate profit.

On the other hand, it can be assumed that the aim of the capitalist is always to make profit in both production and consumption. This parallelism between production and consumption in the capitalist mode of production is important in the investigation of the reasons of the paradoxical progress of innovation so as to raise the question “What is the function of innovation in capitalism?” for comprehending why one is running in circles even though the economy is always growing and technology is advancing.

What’s bizarre in all is the fact that the worker-society does not have any active role in either production or consumption although there is an exchange. In both cases, an ordinary individual is in a passive position, as he is working under the orders of a supervisor in the workplace at the same time as he can only buy what he can find among the standard goods in the supermarkets offered in packages. Moreover, this passiveness is deepened by the growth of economy as the individual is less included in the any cogitation of a want even though he can buy more of those mysterious objects in the market. He turns more and more into an executer of tasks without thinking, obeying orders even in his consumption. In short, there is nothing more obvious than the fact that society becomes obedient in this growth of capitalist economy. Contrarily, there is another group in society which is not pacified in the workplace (the capitalist)

while the masses are quietly conducting given tasks. Furthermore, this group gains a high political power in society parallel to the growth in which masses are quietened.

This is an important point considering the objective of a capitalist as making profits does not provide any insight about his aim seeing that profit in terms of money can only be significant if it is accepted as a mediator of another end while it cannot be an aim alone. By introducing the political conditions of man in a society, the hidden or concealed purpose of profit can be acquired. Innovation would only gain a meaning within the context of this kind of an understanding of capitalism since without its political conditions it is pointless to discuss about any kind of exchange which can be thought of the basis of politics seeing that the aim of congregating in a society is for pursuing exchange in order to mutually create more benefits than somebody can achieve alone.

Consequently, this thesis is to investigate those political roles of innovation in the developed capitalist economies such as those in the US and Western Europe in the context of the fact that profitability is only possible for a capitalist if the workers are working always at a high level. Thus, the problem will be investigated in its relation with the idea that the capitalist is in a favorable position as he does not have the same obligations of an ordinary dispossessed individual; and, thus, he would like to conserve his position. In brief, the foundation of the thesis is the idea of a struggle for freedom in which the parts are eager to fulfill their wants without the drudgery of laboring. This is not about any human nature as this kind of a definition of nature cannot be more than a forced induction derived from the current organization of the human world. Nonetheless, the thesis is based on the common belief in society that “the human being is lazy while he wants to acquire his limitless demands in life”. This is such a belief which is accepted by some parts as a scientific truth for the reason that the idea of human’s greed is even utilized in the definition of the purpose of *economics*³.

³ The definition of economics is made by John Black (1997, p.137) as “the study of how scarce resources are or should be allocated”. Although in the first definition allocation’s purpose is missing, in ‘Economics Dictionary’ of Donald W. Moffat (1983, p.101) the definition of economics includes also the premise of ‘unlimited wants’ as the objective and it is introduced that economics is “the examination of the allocation of limited resources for the satisfaction of the UNLIMITED WANTS of humans”. Sometimes this objective is even affiliated as a scientific truth parallel to the beliefs of some economists who regard economics as a ‘positive science’ of one sort of social phenomena despite the fact that “economics is built around a normative theory of rationality, and has a relevance to policy making and the criticism of social institutions” as said in ‘Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy’ (1998, vol. 3, p.205).

Accordingly, in the thesis, innovation is used in the sense that any activity for improving the profitability in growth while even though it may serve the progress of technology, its impetus is not taken on the basis of technology. On the other hand, technology is handled as a vapid entity to human's political circumstances although it can be instrumentalized for an end. The basic idea of politics is constructed on the fact that work is a purposive activity. In this sense, work is considered in the thesis in relation with human volition which is the source of human's freedom although it is restricted by choices as the power of labor is also limited by the current productive stock of both instruments and knowledge. Thus, volition is introduced as a challenge of human's freedom while the human being always seeks for more freedom. This quest is the reason of production of instruments which reconditions one by extending the boundaries of his freedom. However, the confrontation of man to man in this quest is a phenomenon of today's organization of the human world while this situation can be assumed as the source of politics.

In brief, the economic struggle in the commodity market is analyzed in the context of the struggle for freedom due to the parallelism between profit and freedom while innovation (an activity of improving profits) is handled as a tool to conserve and to buttress the status of the capitalist by pacifying the industrious society in both the workplace and the quotidian. Growth, in this context, does not mean amelioration of the human conditions but it means deepening the human's political circumstances. Consequently, process innovations which are conducted to improve the productivity are to serve the struggle for converting people into laborers of a capitalist; on the other hand, product innovations assist the capitalist in his attempt of mastering the society by dominating the individuals' wants so as to pacify and to subordinate them. However, it must be mentioned, this is not a result of conscious decision making but it all arises as a result of seeking for profit.

It sounds like a conspiracy but as the tool of endogenous growth, innovation is apt only to assist the development of capitalism. Consequently, Marx (1987) underlined the role of innovations in the instrumentalization of technology in the following way:

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society.

Indeed, the augmentation in the consumerism is a sign of this support of innovation process buttressing capitalism seeing that the inequality⁴ in society is systematically deepened. This inequality can even be seen in the definition of civilized society given by Smith (2008, p.1):

Among civilized and thriving nations ... though a great number of people do not labour at all, many of whom consume the produce of ten times, frequently a hundred times, more labour than the greater part of those who work; yet the produce of the whole labour of the society is so great, that all are often abundantly supplied; and a workman, even of the lowest and poorest order, if he is frugal and industrious, may enjoy a greater share of the necessaries and conveniences of life than it is possible for any savage to acquire.

The paradoxical situation of growth in the path of civilization is, although, legitimized in Smith's argument, it is obvious that the situation of being deprived of the necessary productive stock results in an inequality in even the freedom of consumption. Moreover, as this is introduced as a result of the progress of civilization, it can be deduced that its growth is deepening the social gap. Hence, it is possible to ask "if this growth does not serve give a better life, what is it for?"

As an objective, one can say "if people want a product and if they buy it, this product is a need". This affirmation would be true if it was occurred under rational boundaries; however, as the consumerism of today occurs in the ambivalence of products since they become more mysterious for everybody, speaking about need becomes very difficult. On the other hand, the openness of the consumer goods to manipulations due to the dependence of the individual on the marketer to acquire an idea about the product is not a conspiracy but a reality in a world where every year more than hundreds of billions dollars are spent on advertisements⁵. Thus, as the aim

⁴ Inequality, as the opposite of equality, refers to "differences in income between individuals or families or between different groups, areas, or countries" (Black, 1997, p.234). Inequality is an important concept as "material inequality is one of the central factors underlying the formation of social classes and class conflict" (New Palgrave, 1988, vol.2, p.818). Although in 'Encyclopedia of Political Economy' edited by O'Hara (1999, vol. 1, p.505) inequality is described as a situation of misery and a social pathology as if it only refers to the scarce food consumption, clothing, housing standards, healthcare and education opportunities; inequality is a comparison between two parts and it refers to a state of being deprived of something that the other possesses. Thus, inequality can be instrumental for the social equilibrium of the authority as it has the power of dissociating the society and forming the social classes.

⁵ On enterpriseinnovator.com, for 2007 it said that 400 billion dollars globally were spent for only consumer marketing while the growth of the market was introduced as around 6.2% (Zellen, 2010). On the other hand, Tim Mullaney (2008) forecasted the global advertisement spending to occur around

of a marketer is to make profits and he has the potential of manipulating the demand so as to achieve this end, need becomes indefinable since need cannot stay *per se* anymore.

On the conceptual framework, it can be said that the thesis is basically founded on Marx's ideas and Braverman's Marxist analyses of work as they are utilized to see the situation of the laboring worker in the capitalist mode of production. Moreover, the master-slave dialectic is handled so as to comprehend the freedom subject in the context of captivity while Hannah Arendt's discussions on the human condition in the context of activeness are employed to understand the meaning of work and its compulsions that induce to a struggle for freedom. On the other side, the author refers to Adam Smith, Winslow Taylor and Henry Ford in order to comprehend the political path of capitalism as three of them were of the best known spokesmen of capitalism. Finally, all the discussions on the product innovations in the last chapter are founded on Jean Baudrillard's great work on the modern consumerism "Consumer Society" as it reflects a profound insight on the development of today's consumption in both social and psychological level by successfully utilizing the ideas of both Marx and Lacan, and on Heidegger's essay "The Question Concerning Technology" for understanding the alteration in the relations between the human being and his wants due to the intervention of the capitalist in it.

In this thesis, the first chapter is to discuss the freedom of the capitalist which is dependent on worker's presence in the workplace. Here, work is considered as an activity of concretizing any kind of want of a free volition; while the cogitation of work refers to freedom, its execution is accepted as a coercion. Thus, the process of replacing the cogitator's body with another person in the phase of execution is analyzed in the context of the slavery practice which is a method of instrumentalization of the human being in the labor process. The worker's situation as the executor of a capitalist is studied in the context of master-slave relation where the master's freedom means an ability to go out of the domain of execution, namely the workplace. In addition, the capitalist profit cycle's ability of reproducing the social authority is discussed so as to give a general perspective on the capitalist authority relations and

\$490.5 billion in 2009. It can be seen that advertisement is in a fast growth parallel to the growth of economies.

the parallelism between the struggle for freedom and the struggle for profit. Finally, the necessity of sustaining the profitable production is examined so as to comprehend the circumstances and the coercions of the capitalist. §1

The second chapter discusses the coercion of the individual to join a social form of production since without subdividing the tasks man cannot attain more than a rude sense of life as Adam Smith supported. In this context, the coercion of the individuals to go in the workplace is examined seeing that without sufficient productive stock, like the instruments or technical knowledge, which can only be acquired in a cooperative group of work, it is impossible to compete with capitalism while the growth of stock through process innovations systematically disfavors the society in this competition. Accordingly, process innovation is introduced as the development instrument of capitalism for endogenously accumulating the productive stock at the same time as depriving the masses of it. The procedure of process innovation is investigated in the second part of the chapter through the theory of Winslow Taylor and the implementation of Taylor's method in Ford Motor Co. The introduction of prosperity as the mutual benefit of both parts has been stressed as it shows the ideal path of capitalism which deprives people of the possibility of producing their own wants by intervening in the relation between the human being and his wants.

In the last chapter, the product innovation is discussed as the stimulator of process innovations seeing that the rational human needs is limited and the expansion of capitalism is not sustainable without the accompaniment of consumption. Accordingly, in this chapter, the destruction of the rational is discussed in the context of extending the consumptiveness of society. The disappearance of the product's essence as a result of the loss of the sense of purposefulness of work during the execution excluding cogitation is claimed as the source of the manipulation. Accordingly, the new roles of consumption like obtaining an identity in society is claimed as a part of pacification process of society while the passiveness of the masses due to the capitalist mediation in the human world is discussed in the second part of the chapter. Finally, in the last part, the expansion of the capitalist growth and its limits are examined.

CHAPTER 2

FREEDOM, WORK AND CAPTIVITY

The economical activity of the human being is the center of his political condition (since production is the realization of human's imagination in acting) seeing that it is the domain where the conflicts and struggles occur in a society. On the other hand, society and the human condition out of its natural state are not independent from human's conscious economic activity as well. Thus, the comprehension of the authority in the workplace is not possible without considering its connection with human's recent condition in which man confronts man, and it is important to understand the discrepancy which detaches the human being from nature and puts him in the relations of politics in the same context. This chapter is about the patterns of authority in the workplace within its sense of the labor process which is the productive power of creating and perpetuating humanity in the way that we know. In the first part of this chapter, the characteristics of work will be investigated with its political consequences, and, in the second part, the capitalist organization of work relations will be critically analyzed.

2.1 Volition, Work and Authority in Human Organization

The basic idea of that part is that the work is not just a subsistence of life in its animal form, but it is the creator of a world founded on purpose. On the other hand, the human being is not only a repeater of his existence since he wants to realize his wants. He extracts his wants in the concretization process of work while nature is transformed and the human being is reconditioned there in the desired way. Accordingly, this chapter will start with the sentiment of the detachment of the human being from nature

due to his purposive activity of work with the motivating power of his free volition that enables him to imagine his choices before they come in reality⁶.

2.1.1 Volition and Detachment of the Human Being from Nature

It is not easy to talk about the period when the human being detached himself from nature because that kind of a detachment cannot be a result of a conscious action regarding that the human being was also a part of nature and unaware of the cycle that he was in. However, it is possible to see the source of the human condition resulting in the detachment from nature while man has started to construct his world.

Even though the human being is a part of nature, he contradicts his own surroundings seeing that consciousness allows him to imagine and to want while nature unceasingly reproduces its own state in cycles. Nature repeatedly creates itself in its cycles of birth and death while it stays vapid to the particular living beings which follow nature's state of circularity or its state of balance. As a result of that fact, in human comprehension, any living being is meaningful in its place in the natural balance since any being is as vapid as nature to its own existence while they are only interested in a circular state of existence where they can repeatedly reproduce their lives in the same way. The repetitiveness of nature, consequently, is its condition; all beings of nature repeat the same cycles like their ancestors while their perpetuation is recreated in those cycles within the balance of nature.

The condition of nature can be comprehended through the possibility of developing the natural sciences like biology regarding that a scientific comprehension is a set of discovers of repetitive cycles through inductive methods. Although biology foresees

⁶ Volition is described as “a mental event involved with the initiation of action” in ‘The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy’ (1995, p.843) while in ‘The Dictionary of Psychology’ of Ray Corsini (2002, p.1059) voluntariness of volition is included in its definition since it is called as a “process of choosing a course of action voluntarily or without direct external influence”. Being the initiator of an action determines its limits seeing that it is only possible to act in the physical boundaries of the action's domain at the same time as it needs instruments to be realized. Moreover, this role of initiating an action is its source of freedom since volition is a voluntary choice although it can be either spontaneous or based on a rationale. The contradiction in the freedom of volition is in its center as volition can be only meaningful with its realization which is limited by the existent instruments. Thus, volition is more a freedom of choice and the improvement of choices means also extending freedom of volition while it is more mental than physical. Indeed, the discrepancy between the mental and the physical in the description of volition is central and while volition's freedom occurs in the mental phase of choosing, its limits are determined in the physical world as in the theory of Descartes “that a person comprises of two distinct substances, soul and body” (Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 1967, vol. 8, p. 259).

evolution in nature over long periods⁷, in a life time of a human being it is obvious that nature is unchanging and in a state of simple reproduction of itself. Thus, for human mind, nature is in a circular state of existence since it can only vapidly exist in those cycles of perpetuation. Likewise, the balance of nature is nature's state of both existence and perpetuation⁸.

However, man believes that he is not like the other living beings as he presumes that they are vapid to their own existence. He contradicts the regularity and balance of nature with his free volition which is unpredictable as it is free and linear in realization⁹. As the human being does not seek for a rude perpetuation of his life in nature and seeks for his wants and acts, he contradicts the circular state of the existence in nature with the linear path of volition. Volition has a linear path seeing that it is not only a wish but it is a possibility of concretizing a want while the linear path is the distance between the want and its fulfillment. That discrepancy of the human being with nature and with other living beings is important to comprehend the human condition since the situation of the human being in that inconsistency diversifies his existence from natural state of existence as the human being is not an indifferent repeater of the tasks in the balance of nature but he has a free volition which reconditions him in the relation with things.

In that way, human's state of existence becomes linear as a result of his free volition. Nevertheless, while outer nature with its circularity opposes his linear state of existence, the human being does not stay only as a dreamer without any concretization. In fact, human volition is not only a choice of want between materials existing in nature but it is an ability to imagine the choice before it exists outside, and, as a consequence, a human being can realize it through acting on the existing materials

⁷ In fact, this evolution occurs in a circular manner as it is a result of obligations as well. For that reason, it is a matter of science as science can only comprehend repeating events which can be named as phenomena.

⁸ See "The Human Condition" of Hannah Arendt (1998)

⁹ Freedom is usually understood as the absence of coercions in an individualistic aspect by saying "so long as a man acts of his own volition and is not coerced in what he does, he is free" (Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 1967, vol. 3, p.222). Similarly, Ray Corsini (2002, p.391) describes 'freedom' as "the state or quality of exercising one's own choices or decisions without external or internal constraint". Those understandings of freedom are founded on the duality in the definition of volition as the voluntary part of act is its mental part while the physical part of realizing volition is its limitedness that bounds freedom.

surrounding him¹⁰. In other words, one has the power of altering the materials in a desired way so as to acquire his wish. Yet, it is still restrained as a choice because even though one has the ability of altering materials, he is dependent on his surroundings that he uses in his process of deriving the desired object.

That process is the power of man to detach himself from outer nature and to humanize his environment so as to improve his ability of realizing his volition. Thus, work can be thought as the propulsive activity which reconditions the human being in nature by altering environment and his relation with surrounding articles while volition is its impetus as the pushing factor to conduct the transformation of the human condition. Similarly, Hannah Arendt (2000, p.23) made the description of work in the following manner:

Work is the activity which corresponds to the unnaturalness of human existence, which is not imbedded in, and whose mortality is not compensated by, the species' ever-recurring life cycle. Work provides an "artificial" world of things, distinctly different from all natural surroundings.

As the human being differentiates himself in nature, he simultaneously detaches himself from it too. The nature surrounding him becomes more human and it turns into an unnatural environment which is not in balance as it continuously grows with respect to the continuity of volition; that is, it turns into a human nature. It contradicts nature like an artificial counter-nature or an unnatural world of things since its impetus is not convenient with the balanced state and natural regularity.

Volition as the impetus is the reason of existence of human's unnatural condition while its realization is accompanied by work which is also the continuous realization process of the human world. In that context, the human world is linear in state of both existence and perpetuation since its existence is a result of a linear motive, which has a beginning and an end, while its perpetuation in work does not cease and it continuously improves the ability of human volition by producing through acting on surroundings.

Volition's linearity in existence is carried to the human's state of existence while work as the activity of improving the possibility of realization of human volition

¹⁰ This is the purposefulness of work as described by Karl Marx. The work as a purposive activity is further investigated in the part 2.1.2 'Work as a Purposive Activity and Power of Labor'.

continuously perpetuates it. Hence, that the human world exists as long as man wishes to realize something and it will continue growing through work as long as human continues to want.

The human world is as human as its members and it may die one day. It can survive only if the human being pushes his volition forward. On the other hand, that progress of volition becomes as vapid as the balance of nature although it is unbalanced in its freedom of want and production. The human world corresponds to a state of nature in that sense since its impetus is in the cycle of birth and death (regardless to its ends) while it creates its own paradoxical circumstances. The freedom turns into an obligation as volition becomes a necessity of the human world's existence seeing that the human being creates another nature; however, this nature is not in a circular reproduction but it is in a state of continuous buildup and growth.

Similarly, because a want is personal and its activity of realization is consequently individual, man confronts man in his work in that context while the eternal and unhistorical peace of natural vapidness has left its place to conflicts and politics in the humanized world though the human being has reconditioned himself in his relations with the surrounding environment so as to overcome the discrepancy between him and nature. Namely, since man confronts man in his freedom, the struggle for freedom commences at the same time as “all aspects of human condition are somehow related to politics” (Arendt, 1998, p. 23).

Actually, work as the realization of a want has brought conflicts because work is the ability of bringing forth some artificial objects carrying wants out in the existent world while want carries the possibility of concretization. By doing thus, the condition of human has been able to be altered according to the other's volition even though both parties are in the state of realization of their own volition. Thus, comprehension of structuring societies with its struggles and conflicts¹¹, the work must be examined along with its productive power.

¹¹ As a product of human work, in fact it is also possible to claim that society is a product of those struggles and conflicts, and its existence is depended on their maintenance because they are related to the volition which is the base of work.

2.1.2 Work as a Purposive Activity and Power of Labor

Paul Thompson (1983, p.39) describes Marx's explication of labor process in three simple elements:

1. Purposeful activity of man, directed to work.
2. The object on which the work is performed, in the form of natural or raw materials.
3. The instruments of that work, most often tools or more complex technology.

Among those three elements the main difference between the work of man and animal is considered by Marx as the purposefulness since even animals are also accepted performing work on some objects with means of some tools, they perform it without a conceptual consciousness; namely, it is only the human being who can cogitate the work before its realization:

Human work is conscious and purposive, while the work of other animals is instinctual. Instinctive activities are inborn rather than learned, and represent a relatively inflexible pattern for the release of energy upon the receipt of specific stimuli...In human work, by contrast, the directing mechanism is the power of conceptual thought, originating in an altogether exceptional central nervous system. (Braverman, 1998, p.32)

In this way, work is “an activity that alters materials from their natural state to improve their usefulness” (Braverman, 1998, p.31). Alternatively, the transformation of the natural materials into another form in order to purposively create a use value is the ability of work. From that point of view it is possible to claim that the power of human labor is a result of its cogitated and purposive characteristics that enables it to be altered according to human volition. In other words, work as a purposive activity gives the power of altering nature in a desired way, consistent with human volition. Likewise, according to Marx, “by thus acting on the external world and changing it, he [the worker] at the same time changes his own nature” (quoted in Braverman, 1998, p.34). Namely, the human work is not only an alteration of some materials for a use but it is an alteration of human’s own nature by changing his surroundings and an emancipation of his volition in that purposive creation. For that, one is free since he has a mind and since he can exert it in work.

In this sense, human work is an attempt for salvation from nature and liberation of volition. Man is free in cogitation of production¹² and altering nature; so he can freely use his volition and be emancipated from the circular existence of nature which confines him to follow the repetitions of its cycles.

On the ground of the fact that the human being is free in cogitation, the freedom of man is not instantaneously viable, and it is limited in the physical state of his existence, but it is conveyed out of human's concrete environment and extended in the future by the power of labor since it enables one to act beyond his body through instrumentalization of externals. Overall, the ability of the human being in utilizing and continually altering nature allows him to produce some instruments of instruments which can redefine the use of any necessary component of labor process.

The ability of replacing an instrument with another is the source of this emancipation of human labor from its physical boundaries (like in nature) while it also enables the reproduction of those instruments through other instruments. Thus, the temporary freedom of man, which was just possible in balance with the outer nature in the animal level, has started to be detached from the natural compulsions (even from one's physical body) and extended in time towards future.

2.1.3 Freedom of Volition versus Coercion of Execution

It is obvious that man's freedom is not only a matter of physical existence in the animal level; conversely, it is the ability to cogitate that he wants to execute. Accordingly, Braverman (1998, p.34) asserted that "labor that transcends mere instinctual activity is thus the force which created humankind and the force by which humankind created the world as we know it". As the instrumentalization of externals enables one in the course of emancipating the body from the execution part of production, the potential of cogitation is tried to be liberated as it is the use of freedom in work.

In contrast to the freedom of cogitation, the execution of work is the role of the instrument which must perfectly obey to its user who wants to extract the design in his

¹² Here, the mental part of work is described by 'cogitation' since 'cogitation' means both "the faculty of thinking" and "design or plan" (Dictionary.com, 2010). Hence, while cogitation can substitute both 'mental labor' of Marx and 'conception' of Braverman as it means "design", it also refers to the course of designing which includes the designation of purpose or namely the freedom of volition since it is the process of voluntarily choosing a course of action.

head. The executer of the work has to leave his natural or original level and it must be transformed into an *organon*¹³ which entirely fits the purpose designated in the designer's mind. Accordingly, the executer of the work is also an instrument which is performing the work corresponding to the mind of the designer.

An instrument has two edges which are connected to each other: input and output. It takes an object, which has the potential to be transformed in the desired way through work, and it is rapidly driven to execute the job on this object to end up with the desired form. In that way, although it can also be a product of labor process, the instrument is in the state of nature since it repeatedly performs the same input-output cycle until it is altered by the designer for another end although it still stays valid to its new use. In other words, since its volition is irrelevant of the work, an instrument is the repeater of the volition of the designer. Accordingly, it has a circular state of existence similar to any natural subsistence in the view of the fact that it is identical to any instrument which can perform the same work¹⁴.

The designer (the attributer of the use of instruments) acquires the instrument of work through transformation from material's original form into another form which entirely fits the purpose of work. An object becomes an instrument as a result of the conscious activity of the designer according to his volition. Thus, the execution of the work is performed in a cogitated manner of the use of instruments at the same time as the instrument of work can be also the physical body of the designer since body is an innate member of nature and has the potential to be allocated in the production process.

Actually, without any transformation of nature, the only instrument of work is the physical body of each person since it is the single tool which is directly controlled by human's mind in order to conduct a work. Thus, one is both the designer and the instrument of his work that he conducts in the case that the ability of transformation of nature is absent. However; as it is mentioned before, the human being has the ability

¹³ *Organon* (or *organum*) is a term of Aristotle so as to refer to instrument of knowledge while it also referred to bodily organ: "a system of rules or principles of demonstration or investigation" (Emery & Brewster, 1946, p. 1199). In that sense, an organon does not only refer to the instrument but also the knowledge that enables of the use of it. Hence, it is a completion of the instrument mind in order to conduct the work while the word also gives the sense of the coalescence of the mind with the instrument through its own instrumentalization in work.

¹⁴ In that sense an instrument, even takes place in labor process, cannot humanize itself in its use in production. It stays in the same circular existence like the state of nature and it continuously reoccurs in the same form of existence.

not only to produce what is desired, but he can also produce the instruments to conduct labor process with use of other instruments than his own body. In fact, the real transformation of nature is that reconditioning process of the human being since the instantaneous production of a desired object (even if the product is durable) does not change the condition of human in nature while the production of new instruments let him to alter the surrounding circumstances.

In other words, man starts to change his condition with altering his state of perpetuation which is more about the transformation of the natural tools into the means of production. In that way, the human being can physically recondition his existence relying on the inhuman nature and he seizes the possibility to create a humanized environment. Namely, this transformation is resulted from stocking process of new instruments which gradually emancipate one more from the drudgery of laboring with his body while he nominates to himself the role of the designer more than the executer.

On the other hand, as an instrument is vapid to the work, it needs to be included in the labor process by a conscious entity of work: an executer, who has a human mind to utilize given means of production in order to derive the desired product. That is, the executer is obliged to follow the operational requisites of the work and become a conscious instrument fitting the means of production and simulating the human mind of the designer¹⁵. Naturally, the designer (who has only the direct control on his instrumentalized body) has to handle the execution of his designed work by employing his own body.

At that point, the participation of the designer in the execution coerces the designer to discontinue cogitating and the freedom of his volition given that the body and the mind are indispensably associated while the perpetuation of the human world coerces the designer to improve his ability to use his volition. For that reason, Arendt (1998) described the labor (in the sense of the execution) as a compulsion from which the human being would like to emancipate so as to actualize himself.

¹⁵ Body has been accepted as the animal part of human which is contradicting the human mind. The discrimination between body and soul in philosophy as Descartes did is a result of that attribute of body.

2.1.4 Emancipation from Execution through Instrumentalization of the Human Being in the Struggle for Freedom: Slavery

The executer (as a conscious instrument) is not something unnatural although it cannot be directly obtained from nature out of the human being since it has to have a certain degree of consciousness about human activity. However, taming nature and dominating it in the quest of instrumentalization (as nature's state of existence is circular and lacks the volition which can break the cycle) are indispensable parts of human's work in the process of nature's humanization since one seeks the ways of emancipation from physical compulsion that detains his volition. For that reason, the instrumentalization of other bodies has given the chance of replacing human body so as to partially liberate the designer from the coercion of indispensability of cogitation and execution of physically laboring.

In taming of nature, man has firstly seized the service of animals' work capacity with return of the perpetuation of their lives so as to improve the power of the labor in transformation of nature in the desired way. This has been possible since animals lack cogitation of work that they conduct and are unaware of what they are producing; nevertheless, they are only interested in the maintenance of their lives by their human masters. Thus, they have the potential to be humanized in the tamed nature as instruments of work.

However, although the utilization of animals in execution of different tasks liberated human body from direct use of instruments, it required other compulsory works for perpetuation of animals' lives and man had to continue his role as the executer as a result of the fact that animals are unaware of the conscious human work. Alternatively, animals could be used as an intermediary instrument of work under the direct use of human-executers while man was partially liberated from the execution since the animal body took on the drudgery of work. However, man was still obliged to maintain the humanized nature surrounding him; otherwise, the unrestrained nature in human activity would result in a process of dehumanization regarding that those instruments are humanized in their use and their state of perpetuation is linear while they need to be continuously tamed to maintain their services.

Thus, the salvation of the human being with utilizing natural competences is not enough for the process of their humanization in view of the fact that nature is apt to

recover its own state of existence since it does not have the capacity to reproduce its humanized form without aid of man as nature has no human mind and it lacks consciousness of work. On the other hand, an instrument is a part of nature as it is vapid and not capable of performing the work alone because it does not have the concept of work in itself while it needs to be driven by a user in the execution of work. In this sense, the use of animals as intermediary instruments requires an executer so as to make them useful in human activity and the exploitation of natural sources is not enough to emancipate designer's body from the drudgery of execution.

The need of the humanized environment's reproduction and an executer to perform the work in the process of emancipation of the designer is the reason of the requirement for an instrument which can simulate human mind in labor process. That is to say, one needs the existence of an executer which can maintain its humane state during its service while it can recover the other instruments and use them in the desired way of designer. In order to attain the objective of labor process as the emancipation of volition, the exploitation of other human bodies has been possible for the salvation of the designer from laboring because the human being (as an instrument of work) does not need to be maintained tamed as he already is human while he can conduct the execution through utilizing the tools since he has a mind. Consequently, the first practice to solve that need of replacing the executer of work has been slavery of others. In this sense, Paul Lovejoy (2000, p.1) made a definition of slavery in the following way:

Slavery was form of exploitation. Its special characteristics included the idea that slaves were property; that they were outsiders who were alien by origin or who had been denied their heritage through judicial or other sanctions; that coercion could be used at will; that their labour power was at the complete disposal of a master...

It is obvious that slavery was a very high level of detachment of man from his freedom in volition so as to coerce the slave to obey his master like the animals under captivity while the only matter of the slave was the maintenance of his life by his master. On the other hand, although they were instrumentalized in the human world, slaves were alienated in society since they were detached from their volition that the free people had.

In those slavery discussions, Thomas Wiedemann (1981, p. 34) distinguished free and the captivated man in the following manner: “Being free (*libertas*) is the natural ability to do whatever anyone pleases, unless one is prevented from doing it either by force or by law”. On the ground of that fact, the ability of using volition is the main determinant of being whilst human volition is the direct source (and motive) of freedom; conversely, the loss of that ability is captivity.

In the process of captivity, the one who seized the volition of the other with reducing him to a slave-level is equivalent of degrading the slave to an animal since the aim in captivity is exploiting the slave’s work capacity in the realization of the master’s cogitation as in the case of animals. Meanwhile, the slave loses his volition and he turns into someone who accepts what is given from the master in order to survive in the human world. On the other hand, a slave is still able to use human mind so his existence can be enough for the master to leave the workplace. Hence, slavery may be a solution for the master in the quest for salvation from laboring with the completion of the division between cogitation and execution of the work.

As the slave shouldered the execution of the work under the supervision of the master, who detached himself from the workplace and jointed to the world of *libertas* where he is relieved to use his mind and volition so as to continue his designer role; the slave, as an innate member of the human world, filled the absence of the master in the workplace with his human mind as the executer (although the work became a drudgery for him as in the case of animals). In this manner, the master is the one who cogitates and the slave is the one who executes. In other words, the captivity and enslavement of the human being is the complete separation between cogitation and execution of work while this also indicates the beginning of a struggle for freedom as the master seizes the freedom of the slave for acquiring and improving his own freedom.

2.1.5 Patterns of Authority in Slavery

The slave accepts his situation not because he cannot meet his needs for maintenance of his physical life without his master, but he is captivated where he may be stripped of the necessary humanized environment of work by means of isolation or even he can be exposed to the legitimate violence in society. In consequence, the slave voluntarily leaves his volition and obeys to his master (even it is a result of a fear, it is

also for a return) whereas that transfer of volition from slave to master is also a transfer of power of labor in the same direction because the awareness of work is the power in the transformation of natural materials into new forms while nature is altered in this conscious activity. Accordingly, the slave accepts his role in society since his mind rationally leads to the obedience as a member of humanity.

Although the means of violence are thought as the root of this authority, the use of violence fails the authority and, similarly, the authority cannot be established through persuasion of the society (Arendt, 2006, p. 92). The compulsion can never be destructive in view of the fact that the authority leaves with the use of violence since the master needs the body conjoined to human mind of the slave but it can be reestablished throughout the reproduction of the conceptual coercion of the humanized environment through evocation of the authority in the slave's mind. Therefore, deprivation of the slave can only be assumed as the source of the preservation of the authority since the human being can obey in return of a desired thing so as to perpetuate his existence in the human world. Namely, the captivation of human's volition can nourish the slavery system of production.

In this context, punishment has a room in this evocation process of the coercion in the understandings of the slaves as it is the functional and perceivable part of the power. At this point, Michel Foucault (1979, p.169) underlined the fact that punishment is a coercion instrument over bodies:

While jurists or philosophers were seeking in the pact a primal model for the construction or reconstruction of the social body, the soldiers and with them the technicians of discipline were elaborating procedures for the individual and collective coercion of bodies.

Accordingly, punishment “is a functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished, and more generally on those being supervised” (Foucault, 1979, p.29). On the other hand, punishment sets up masks or myths to hide its working like linking punishment to crime and, by thus doing, the power that punishes is concealed (Tunick, 1992, p.30). However, punishment only proves its gratuitousness due to the domination of the master while functioning.

Indeed, punishment, as a gratuitous right of the master, is only an evocation of the status of the master with his paternal role seeing that the master punishes since he can punish. In this context, punishment has always been a tool of communication working

in double sense: for the punished, reminding the coercion of world surrounding him so as to maintain his existence in society, and, for the others who are not punished, recognition of the human world which protects its existence by punishing the nonhuman.

In short, the use of punishment is to pronounce the status of the master and the situation of the slave for him to consent as it functions only in one direction. Moreover, the slave comprehends also the ability of the master that can deprive him of any social means of perpetuation in the human world. That is, the possibility of the human being to reach to the means of perpetuation in society is related to his obedience to the enduring authority relations. Hence, a slave as the quiet executer of his work can only acquire the right to join the human world and to maintain his life in society through obtaining what he may be deprived of. However, it is not a decision taken by the slave since he cannot freely use his volition (since he does not have the right to imagine something before its realization) so as to reach to the means of perpetuation, but it is the return from the master as he is in the center of the humanized organization of the world. Moreover, since the slave as the one who is deprived from the human world (where he may be free) accepts to continue his human life with his captivated volition, the master takes the role of perpetuation of humanity of the slave¹⁶. Thus, even the subsistence of the slave becomes a reward as the antonym of punishment and if the slave obeys more, he is rewarded more by the master¹⁷. Actually, rewarding the slave is a method of perpetuation of the authority like in the case of perpetuation of animals' lives (so that they can continue their services) while it emancipates the master from execution of supervision. Likewise, Stefano Fenoaltea (1984) argued that the perpetuation of subordination through punishment which gives anxiety of pain to the

¹⁶ For the beginning of slavery, it is known that the captives of a war were used to employ as slaves in the slavery societies. They were free before losing their own humanized world and sometimes that world was even destroyed by the invader. Moreover, it was the mercy of the invader to forgive the lives of the captives and to give them the status of slave.

¹⁷ On the same subject about the slavery in Morocco in 19th century, Mohammed Ennaji (1999,p.26) asks if the slaves were compensated: "Did slaves always receive the rewards they deserved? ". After, he continues with explaining the reward of the good slaves who are close to their masters: "Managers of all kinds, henchmen, preferred concubines, house-servants familiar to the master's gaze, and all the rest who surrounded him closely had food, shelter, and benefits assured them". On the other hand, "many others, however, kept far from his vicinity, did not always receive his trust and charity". It is obvious that Ennaji treated the compensation of slave as a generous reward of the master if the slave could gain the trust of the master. Moreover, if the slaves were not close to the master they were not able to receive his reward.

slaves requires the close supervision of the master, and he claimed that the enthusiasm of the slaves to serve can be maintained without incessant supervision of master by giving ordinary rewards even their consumption may surpass the subsistence of perpetuating their lives:

With ordinary rewards, the consumption of the slaves tends to exceed the subsistence. On the other hand, they can be motivated to work without supervision by being allowed to retain their product at the margin... (Fenoaltea, 1984, p. 639)

However, he claimed that the supervision cannot be totally removed since it may remain necessary for other reasons like in the case that the slave lacks talent or he tends to escape. Nevertheless, the rewarding partially liberates master from supervision and from the workplace¹⁸. Moreover, the replacement of punishment with rewards improves the paternal position of the master while the slaves obey (maybe even with appreciating the master) without grudge as a result of the displacement (or the mitigation) of violence. Moreover, with the complete transformation of punishment with a cause-effect cycle as a negative rewarding mechanism, the execution responsibilities of social supervision can be carried out by the slaves (as they are capable of comprehending and using the tools for subordinating themselves in that compromise) instead of master because such a regulated system of reward and punishment is comprehensible and fair to be communicated¹⁹.

In fact, the slave creates his slavery seeing that his obedience for the reward as a return for his subordination strengthens the master in the work relation; and with the transfer of his reason (volition) in work, he becomes obliged to accept the world conceived and dictated by the master through deprivations. In other words, the slave is

¹⁸ As an example of rewarding system, in Roman Empire, the masters were giving a money called *peculium* (which also means property) to their slaves or sons as a reward their obedience. The use of *peculium* was accepted as an intensive or the slave to accept his position in social organization for them to keep the hope of buying their freedom. In addition, a similar system of manumission was used in other forms like in Latin America, which was called *coartación*. “There was considerable variation among societies as to whether a slave was allowed to accumulate property that he might keep after manumission. One form of such accumulation was the Roman *peculium*, which legally belonged to the master. One of its heirs was called *coartación*, the self-purchase system, widely used 1,500 years later in Latin America.” (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2010)

¹⁹ The mask of violence (as it is previously mentioned) can be considered in that sense. The master keeps his fair role by rationalization of punishments within a masking context like the rationale of crime as he does in rewarding. Thus, the emergence of reward in the maintenance of subordination does not only displace punishment but it coerces it to turn rational. In that sense, punishment is altered into a method of negative rewarding even it was the reason of it.

captivated as a result of his acceptance of the given the human world in the circular form of nature and he seeks for the return of his obedience as perpetuation of his humanity which is correlated with fulfilling process of his volition through being rewarded²⁰. In the way that the slave obeys to the authority of the master, the master is salvaged also from the work of maintaining the fear on the slave since the mind of slave does it alone and the obedience of the slave becomes a natural part of the human world like an instrument with the role of execution. Thus, the slave's state of perpetuation in work stays linear which must be maintained with rewarding and punishment while his use of his mind remains circular like an instrument in the workplace since he is an executer who is not free in volition or in deciding and in cogitating the purpose of his own work.

2.1.6 Freedom of Master

The slaves are identically subjected to the master's mind since their volition has no effect in the labor process, and they are indistinguishable entities of work as instruments of execution in the workplace because they are only concerned of sustaining the existence of their volition in the human world through the mercy of the master who seizes their volition, and, consequently, their power of labor. On the other hand, the master, the center of the authority relation, assumes the role of the father figure who is generous and thoughtful, and who punishes those who deserve it with their disobedience while rewarding his quiet subjects who silently obey. However, he is not free in the workplace since he is obliged to continue this paternal role so as to keep his position and freedom of leaving the execution process. Therefore, the freedom of the master is not in the household or in the workplace but it is a result of the master's ability of leaving the sphere of production (Arendt, 1998, pp. 28-38).

...the master, according to Greek common opinion (which was still blissfully unaware of Hegelian dialectics), was not free when he moved among his slaves; his freedom consisted in his ability to leave the sphere of the household altogether and to move among his equals, free men. (Arendt, 2006, p.105)²¹

²⁰ In fact, even the subsistence of slave is a degree of humanity although it sounds animal; he eats cooked food, he sleeps in a shelter etc. In that sense, it is not possible to find a direct correlation between slaves and animals. They are human and they want to continue being human in its borders.

²¹ Although Hannah Arendt may not acknowledge such a parallelism between the modern world and the ancient times as she supported that today's world is a great family (and this is quite true) which is only

With the complete transfer of the duties of execution (including the tasks of conservation of the master's status in the authority relations) from master to slave, the master can only be totally liberated from the drudgery of laboring and be able to actualize himself among *liberta* with his free volition with his possibility to go out of the household-workplace to join the political life of *polis* despite the fact that the slaves are locked and isolated from action in the household so as to produce (Arendt, 1998, pp. 175-243). In brief, the slave is an inactive member of humanity in view of the fact that he is obliged to labor for both obtaining his reward and liberating the master from the workplace while master becomes free so as to concretize his wishes in reality.

2.2 Workplace and Struggle between Capitalist and Worker

The modern workplace is the production department of the needs of the human beings for upholding their social existence. The need is the reason of the worker to go in the workplace so as to attain it in consumption. On the other hand, the worker is obliged to join the labor process through using the instruments of work under the control of the capitalist while the impossibility of production of human needs out of the capitalist workplace is the coercion of the worker to accept the authority.

In fact, the freedom of the capitalist as the master of the production process in the capitalist mode of production is his ability to go out of the workplace while the rented worker is present there in order to reproduce his own human life through the capitalist labor process. The only concern of the worker in that process is to find the possibility to access to consumption that he partially participates in the creation of consumption while the capitalist who rents the labor power of the worker has the ability to quit the workplace and to act in other spheres than the perpetuation department of human life

interested in laboring without acting, the situation was the same for the masses in the ancient times despite the fact that mostly the acts and rattling lives of the great figures are told in the history today. In fact, the situation has not so much changed for the masses as still they are locked in the workplaces while there are still some masters. Moreover, the capitalist's obligations in the workplace so as to maintain his status illustrate the parallelism between past and today. The author does not accept the nostalgia of Hannah Arendt towards the ancient times even though her analyses on the master-slave relations are instrumentally employed so as to understand the concept of freedom.

in consumption by means of the power of labor which is concentrated in his hands as a result of the labor power transfer from the worker to capitalist.

2.2.1 Choice of Humanity Coercing Worker

In order to comprehend the situation of the worker, it is necessary to understand the state of both parts in production relations. The worker apparently is present in the workplace so as to execute the work by using the instruments which are possessed by the capitalist. His labor is instantaneous and not stored; however, it has the possibility to transform the object of production through transferring his labor power by using the means of production. Marx (1995, p.132) explained that ability of the worker in the following manner:

The labourer adds fresh value to the subject of his labour by expending upon it a given amount of additional labour, no matter what the specific character and utility of that labour may be. On the other hand, the values of the means of production used up in the process are preserved, and present themselves afresh as constituent parts of the value of the product; ... by being transferred to the product. This transfer takes place during the conversion of those means into a product, or in other words, during the labour-process.

Although the worker has the ability of using the labor power in the execution of work by combining the object and the instruments of work, he does not labor with his cogitation. He accepts to offer his labor in order to take part in the workplace of another; who keeps the possession rights of the means of production.

At this point, it is clear to see the situation of the second part of the modern production relations: the capitalist, who possesses the object and the instruments of work. The possession on the means of production is the labor power that the capitalist holds: the accumulated labor which is the source of transforming the humanized world in the form of instruments of production. Thus, the capitalist is the one who controls the instrumentalized part of the human world, which can be accepted as its core since without those instruments nature could not have been altered in the course of the labor process. He, as the possessor of an amount of stock of instruments, hires labor force from the society for the cooperative commodity production under his supervision. That is, the agglomeration of a group of the worker in a workplace is the starting point of capitalism.

A greater number of labourers working together, at the same time, in one place (or, if you will, in the same field of labour), in order to produce the same sort of commodity under the mastership of one capitalist, constitutes, both historically and logically, the starting-point of capitalist production. (Marx, 1995, p.214)

In the capitalist mode of production, the main attribute of the economic relation is the leader role of the capitalist while the worker is in a rational agreement with the capitalist in selling his labor power to join the humanized world. Indeed, “instruments of labour not only supply a standard of the degree of development to which human labour has attained, but they are also indicators of the social conditions under which that labour is carried on” (Marx, 1995, p.119). Nonetheless, the worker is free in his choice of working for the capitalist without coercion via means of violence²² although out of the workplace he cannot find the occasion to earn a humanized livelihood as a result of the fact that the human world is continuously being capitalized in favor of the capitalist²³. Hence, it is obvious that although the worker is free in his choice, he cannot say more than ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the capitalist as the human world is already possessed by him. As a human being, if the worker would like to continue his existence in humanized world without the coercion of nature (through its circular repetitions) against his volition, the worker is obliged to accept the capitalist's offer of shouldering the execution of work. In doing so, the worker does not only accept earning his humanity from the capitalist, but he also concedes to be instrumentalized in the labor process while his wants are no more brought forth by his own cogitation. Yet more, as an entity of work, the worker leaves his cogitation ability in view of the fact that he is only allowed to use his human mind as an executer, as an organon in the capitalist workplace.

The demand of the capitalist in purchasing the labor (in order to continue the labor process in the workplace and to coerce the worker to accept leaving his mind behind in the production process) is a kind of detachment of the worker from his identity during

22 That is the situation in developed capitalisms which have achieved a higher level of capitalism. However, in the under-developed capitalisms, use of violence can be employed so as to avert the resistances.

23 The capitalization of the human world is a result of the possession right of the capitalist on the means of production since the control of the capitalist on the possessed means of production as accumulated labor power is the part of labor process which can reproduce and alter the human world in the course of time.

the process of obtaining his needs and desires. Hereby, in the production of his own needs the worker claims the detachment from his identity as a result of the capitalist's intervention in the production process by holding the means of production, although he has the living labor power which has the ability to realize what one imagines. In short, "capitalism is the transfer and the concentration of that power from the owners of the living labor to the owner of the capital composed of dead labor" (Braverman, 1998, 31).

Capitalist as the owner of the dead labor and of the core of the human world concentrates the labor power in his hands. He improves his ability of realizing what he cogitates at the cost of the disfavor of the worker in realization of his volition in the struggle. Actually, the capitalist concentrates the labor power in his hands by captivating the cogitation ability of the worker. In other words, the worker forgoes of his ability of cogitation; thus, he allows capitalist's patronization on his volition through intervening in the relation between the human being and objects (which means also allowing the captivity of volition). Consequently, the capitalist improves his freedom in realization of his wants in expense of the freedom of the worker in the struggle for freedom.

2.2.2 Capitalist as the Master in the Struggle for Profitable Production

The capitalist authority in the workplace shows parallelism with the authority in master-slave relations since the capitalist becomes the core of the human world while the worker accepts the subordination as a result of his deprivation of the productive stock and the return of the worker in the labor process turns more into a reward from the capitalist²⁴. Moreover, as the capitalist, the core of the human world, gets rid of the execution part of production just like the father-master of the household, he is also free to leave the workplace and with his authority, as a result of the concentration of the labor power in his hands, he does not only improve his volition in personal desires but he also becomes a political actor in society of inactivated workers. Hence, the authority of the capitalist emancipates him from the labor process and enables him to act and to

²⁴ In that context, Hannah Arendt (1998) addressed to the modern society as a big family which has got together around the common benefit of production while the members of it forgot their ability of realization of their volition out of the produced choices of the production department of the society.

use his volition freely while it locks the workers in the workplace. On the other hand, the capitalist's volition gains a social characteristic as his decisions affect all society.

In fact, the control over the production-consumption cycle is not the freedom of the capitalist's volition like the father-master and he has obligations in the workplace like maintaining his authority; but it is the source of this freedom as the capitalist is free to go out of the workplace and act in society where the workers are only concerned in perpetuation of their consumption. Nevertheless, the perpetuation of his power is not as natural as the master since his authority is not a sacred unhistorical right but it is secular and instantaneous as it is acquired from the struggle for profit in the production-consumption cycle. Hence, profit in production-consumption cycle is the capitalist's obligation in authority relations for him to preserve the possibility to leave the workplace and be able to continue to act freely in the future since profit is the reflection of concentrated labor power of the future. Thus, although the capitalist gains an instantaneous freedom from that authority, he is obliged to defend it through conserving the profitable production. This is the coercion on the capitalist in the workplace.

The use of punishment and rewarding mechanism shows parallelism with the mechanisms in master-slave relations. Moreover, although the capitalist tries to gain the sacred right of being master or even the shepherd of the society, he does not have the same power of morality. On the other hand, the direct supervision on the worker so as to maintain the workplace authority of the capitalist contradicts his freedom as the master. Thus, rewarding in consumption becomes more important for the capitalist in perpetuation of his status.

In this way, the authority of the capitalist is a result of a destructive process - consumption - and its state of perpetuation is linear like the volition of the human being as that authority is based on captivity of the worker's volition in consumption as a result of the intervention of the capitalist in the relation between the human being and his wants²⁵. Thus, this authority rises and dies in time (just like a want) and its perpetuation can be only possible by its unremitting reproduction in time. Accordingly, the capitalist's authority can become natural (like birth and death cycle of nature) if the

²⁵ Linearity of human volition has been discussed in the previous part as it is a result of a willing which occurs when one desires and disappears when the desire is fulfilled.

capitalist can continue the profitable production as a result of unremitting consumption so as to fulfill the volition of the workers²⁶.

2.2.3 Father-Capitalist and Devaluation of Worker in the Struggle

In the capitalist production relations, the role of the capitalist is to support development and creating new job opportunities for the industrious society so as to foster and to patronize it in the profitable production. The capitalist is the father of the society who is the owner of all the productive stock, and who generously carries it to the nation. Thus, the capitalist increases the productivity of the total labor and strengthens his authority as the patron of the human world since “the more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself – his inner world – becomes, the less belongs to him as his own” (Marx, 2000, p.29).

On the other hand, it is obvious that the worker improves his ability to consume and to increase his wealth in time in the capitalist mode of production as a reward if he obeys. However, this abeyance of the worker’s situation in the labor process does not liberate him from laboring so as to freely realize what he cogitates. The worker as the executer of realization of the other’s cogitation becomes more like an instrument and more unable to freely actualize his human volition due to being disfavored. The more wealth the worker produces, the more he is deprived of the ability to concretize his volition. “Labor’s realization is its objectification. Under these economic conditions this realization of labor appears as *loss of realization* for the workers” (Marx, 2000, p.29).

The worker’s labor is instrumentalized and transformed into a commodity in the capitalist market for execution. In that sense, the human-worker is degraded to the animal form of laboring who can limitedly use his human mind like he does in utilizing the instruments of work as an executer-instrument. The degradation of human

²⁶ If the end of work is accepted as the individual’s process of realizing a want, the path of a single want is linear since it has a beginning with the emergence of the want and an end with satisfaction. However, the continuity of the recent human world depends on the circulation of want-satisfying acts of the individuals regardless their personal ends. In other words; since the human world can also die one day as it is said in the part 2.1.1 ‘Volition and Detachment of Human from Nature’, it can only continue if people continue to want. Consequently, the continuity of those cycles is vital for the capitalist in order to maintain his social status as he is the master in the ongoing organization of the human world and he has to preserve it for keeping his position.

work to an animal activity which is only concerned with the maintenance of his existence in the social conditions as a result of detachment of conception from execution is claimed as a “dehumanization” process by Harry Braverman (1998, p.79):

...as human labor becomes a social rather than an individual phenomenon, it is possible ... to divorce conception from execution. This dehumanization of the labor process, in which the workers are reduced almost to the level of labor in its animal form, while purposeless and unthinkable in the case of the self-organized and self-motivated social labor of a community of producers, becomes crucial for the management of the purchased labor.

Consequently, human mind is instrumentalized and dehumanized as an executer in the capitalist labor process. His power of realization of what he cogitates becomes possible only in the consumption since he is deprived of the necessary instruments of work and he has transferred his labor power to the capitalist²⁷. In this way, the volition of the worker is more reduced to making choices among consumption tastes in capitalism as a result of the volition transferred from the worker to the capitalist, and “man (the worker) only feels himself freely active in his animal functions – eating, drinking, procreating, or at most in his dwelling and in dressing-up, etc.; and in his human functions he no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal” (Marx, 2000, p.30).

In the meantime, the instrumentalization of the labor power of the worker hoggies him because the captivity of his volition in that process neutralizes his mind through defusing his cogitation ability. The individual is depersonalized as he is clothed in the uniform of the identical worker who is an ordinary commodity in the labor market and an inactive member of society. On the other hand, renter-capitalist finds the possibility to evade from the drudgery of laboring, which confronts the freedom of his volition, through transferring the responsibility of execution to the worker.

If all the parts of the production process are rational and they are seeking for their best benefit, the system works in an unprompted way. The worker accepts the authority of the capitalist materialized in the workplace and the master-status of the capitalist becomes more the capitalist’s innate right like a father. This naturally working mechanism appears as a sacred nature for the human being as if it is prompted by an

²⁷ Moreover, with fulfilling his volition in consumption, his volition loses its ability of imagining what to produce before it exists in reality. In fact, the loss of that ability can also be also considered as his volition’s captivity.

invisible hand. In that cycle, the profit obtained from the exchange of goods produced in consumption becomes the extension tool of the capitalist authority as a result of its analogy with the exchange of the volition from the worker to the capitalist. It grows with higher participation and it decreases with an augmentation of irregularity in the cycle. In this cycle, the capitalist obtains the degree of freedom to leave the workplace and use his volition among the inactive worker nation.

Under the profitable production circumstances, the worker is instrumentalized by the capitalist and turned into a commodity of the capitalized world, which is identical to all other workers. Moreover, as much as he continues to participate to the capitalist labor process, the worker transfers more power to the capitalist while he becomes more ordinary and cheaper; meanwhile, his labor is continuously trivialized in these production-consumption cycles. Marx (2000, p.28) described that situation in the following way:

The worker becomes all the poorer the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and size. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more commodities he creates. The devaluation of the world of men is in direct proportion to the increasing value of the world of things. Labor produces not only commodities; it produces itself and the worker as a commodity – and this at the same rate at which it produces commodities in general.

This devaluation of the worker is a result of his subordination to the capitalist work conditions which is consolidated through profits from consumption. As the worker creates his obedience in the future with submitting his labor power to the capitalist, he becomes more vapid to the work that he conducts, and he turns into a professional executer who uses his human mind in the circular fashion of instruments. Finally, he becomes an identical entity like any executer as an instrument in the eye of the capitalist.

As somebody who only screws some parts of a product, the worker loses his importance in the production process²⁸ and the wage given by the capitalist in terms of money becomes rather a generous reward. In this way, while who does not accept to take part in that structure of the human world cannot survive as a member of society,

²⁸ It can be seen from the shift of the signification of word ‘producer’ from the laboring worker towards the patronizing capitalist. Before ‘producer’ meant more the artisan of the work and it was almost a synonym of ‘worker’. However, today that word excluded the worker as the capitalist occupied more his place in the labor process and now it means the owner of the capital in which the production occurs.

who accepts that subordination is rewarded with the possibility to consume and to fulfill his captivated volition in the continuous devaluation of his existence. This is the paternal role of the capitalist in the politics of production.

2.2.4 Transfer of Freedom and Profitable Production

The transfer of volition from the worker to the capitalist is not possible only by means of violence given that “muscle and brain cannot be separated from persons possessing them” (Braverman, 1998, p.37). However, the worker naturally seeks to take part in the capitalized the human world as a result of being deprived of other choices.

The worker accepts to participate to the labor process since he seeks the possibility to access to the consumption of the social production as Braverman (1998, p.36) indicated: “The worker enters into the employment agreement because social conditions leave him or her no other way to gain a livelihood”. The worker takes part in those production relations since he lacks the necessary instruments of reproducing his life as a human being while he becomes a member of the human world with transferring his ability of work and his labor power to the capitalist.

This deprivation is the source of the capitalistic authority while the return of the volition transfer from the worker to the capitalist through intervening in the relation between the human being and materials can be considered as the major means of coercion. In this way, the capitalist is not only the owner and the core of the human world but he becomes the center of the authority relations in the modern production process as a result of the transfer of volition.

The exploitation of worker’s labor power can be thought as an action to make profits. However, profit has no sense without any further utilization in another domain. Actually, the profit rendered from the surplus value created in the labor process is vastly allocated in reinvestments and the repurchase of the labor power. Furthermore, the consumption of the goods produced in the capitalist workplace is not only for the capitalist’s consumption but it is for the workers as well seeing that the capitalist is not only the owner of the means of production but he also possesses the humanized environment of the worker. To be precise, the production is to generate profit for the

capitalist in the exchange of the commodities so as to intervene the relation between the human being and materials:

The production of commodities with a use value is not the sole goal of the capitalist. He needs to exchange those commodities for a price greater in value than the costs incurred in production. The process of production must therefore combine the labour process with the creation of value. Hence the labour process becomes inextricably linked to the struggle for profitable production. In purchasing its components, the capitalist must not only provide the right materials, but seek to exert control over the conditions under which the speed, skill and dexterity of the worker operates. (Thompson, 1983, p. 40-41)

Thus, although the capitalist exploits a part of the labor exerted in a production process, in fact, the labor turns back to its owner while the supervision of the work is transferred to the capitalist. In other words, the capitalist appears like a trader who makes profit from the commodities by interrupting the relationship between the worker and the means of production as he displaces the worker from the cogitation of his labor process. The replacement of cogitation from the worker's side to the capitalist seems like an irreversible transformation which simultaneously occurs with profit creation. This can be thought as the parallelism between the struggle for a profitable production and the struggle for freedom in the capitalist mode of production.

The creation of the profit is depended on the degree of the coercion on the worker for him to join the labor exchange market. Thus, the worker has to accept the status-quo in the way that he is motivated to exchange his living labor-force with the consumption goods that he produced under the complete supervision of management. In other words, the worker must accept the rationalization of the market that the prosperity is the potential to consume so as to obtain the essentials (psychological or physical) of life and one must seek for the maximization of his returns from the work in terms of money while he accepts to sell his labor with a complete obedience. Thus, the capitalist is the one who attributes the purpose while the worker is reduced to the degree of conducting the work orders dictated from the management. This is the transfer of freedom from the worker to the capitalist by subdividing cogitation and execution.

The capitalist needs direct control on the conditions of the work since he needs to be sure of the profitability of production. The protection of his freedom is based on the protection of the profitable struggle, or it can be thought that until the production is

profitable in the capitalist mode of production, the status-quo of the struggle is on the advantage of the capitalist at the same time as the production–consumption cycle is protected. In that manner, Thompson (1983, p.41) continued the discussion in the following way:

Hence, when Marx referred to the labour power of workers as variable capital, it was not just an economic category. Only living labour could create value, and the surplus varied according to 'the relative strengths of the combatants in the production process'. (Nichols, 1980a: 35)

The relativity of the strengths of the combatants in the struggle, as mentioned by Nichols, is the outcome of this intervention of the capitalist in the production process: the attributions of social roles of the parts which is either the executer or the cogitator regarding their degree of freedom: the active and the passive. Thus, the relationship between the capitalist and the laboring worker is rather political in an exchange of volition.

Actually, profit has a sense of extending the capitalist's capability to rent the labor and to seize it in the workplace in the future. In other words, since profit, as potential capital, gives the capitalist a purchase power on labor²⁹, the capitalist extends his domination on worker in the future with generating more profits in today's production. That is, the worker reproduces his submission in the future through his obedience today while he enables the capitalist to breed the profit in consumption just like the slave does in view of the fact that the profit of the capitalist is a possibility for him to purchase the labor force more intensively in the future. In that sense, profit can be assumed as the analogical reflection of the capitalist's tendency to extend freedom in the future since the profit extends the capitalistic authority in time. Hence, it is comprehensible why profit is the major goal of capitalism as it is the synonym of "authority" in the capitalist mode of production.

²⁹ Adam Smith introduced possession as a purchase power on labor and Marx claimed that potential. "The power which that possession immediately and directly conveys to him, is the *power of purchasing*; a certain command over all the labour, or over all the produce of labour, which is then in the market." (Smith, 2008, p. 13) "Capital is thus the *governing power* over labour and its products. The capitalist possesses this power, not on account of his personal or human qualities, but inasmuch as he is an *owner* of capital. His power is the *purchasing* power of his capital, which nothing can withstand." (Marx, 2000, p.11) Thus it is possible to say that profit as a possession possibility is also a possible power of purchasing on living labor.

In that conservation process of the capitalistic authority, the worker turns into an instrument which can be bought and sold repeatedly; thus, the labor power of worker turns into a commodity compensated with wages (as a possibility to access consumption) which is continuously getting cheaper for the capitalist regarding the fact that consumption of the worker feeds the profit mechanisms just like his production. Namely, the labor is more subordinated and becomes more available in the capitalist market as more profit is generated.

From that point of view, if the profitable production is impeded, the capitalist becomes unable to employ the labor power of other bodies while the use of the capitalist's possession devaluates as it becomes less useful. The devaluation of the capitalist's possession is also the devaluation of his authority since it can only be established through coercing the worker to accept being present in the workplace. Moreover, this devaluation is also the depreciation of the human world's current structure seeing that it drains with the halt of its reproduction of human volition in consumption since captivity of worker's volition in consumption becomes less possible with increasing unemployment. Thus, it is possible to say that an economic disorder is accompanied by some authority disorders and the consequent authority crisis is accompanied by some economic reflections in the capitalist markets.

The social consequence of regression of authority is mostly violation of its constructive rules. As the possession is the basic right of the capitalist organization of the human world, stealing becomes a phenomenon in any authority crisis. Accordingly, punishment mechanisms turn incapable of preventing the violations of rules³⁰. In the film "Modern Times" of Charles Chaplin (1938), the social disorder of the Great Depression period was illustrated as a natural result of the contemporaneous socio-economic conditions. Although the prisons were full and the police was severe against any kind of property crime, the impossibility to prevent the violations of rules was clearly illustrated in the film.

Similarly, England experienced a social disorder era as a result of demographical explosion³¹ during the period of 1770-1830. All urban population of England

³⁰ It is obviously convenient with the argument that the violence and authority are excluding each other and punishment can be only used for evocation of the current human organization's structure.

³¹ In fact, demography is accepted as the result although it can be also thought as the result of the high degree of urbanization due to industrialization of the society. The migration from rural areas to the

increased from about 7 to 14 million while only London's population augmented to around 1.7 million (Gatrell, 1994, p.18). Consequently, all the production of England was not sufficient anymore for society; later crime had inevitably increased and become an unavoidable phenomenon of the society. The use of capital punishment dramatically increased and approximately 35,000 people were condemned to death in the era between 1770 and 1830. 7,000 of those condemned to death were executed as the rest were reprieved by the king's mercy. Above all, two-thirds of all executed prisoners in that period were hanged because of property crimes (Gatrell, 1994, p.7). The intensive rate of property crimes resulted in capital punishments is illustrating the process of disorder against the base of the authority despite the severity of the authority.

Marx (1853) wrote the following passage for *New York Daily Tribune* on the use of capital punishment:

Plainly speaking, and dispensing with all paraphrases, punishment is nothing but a means of society to defend itself against the infraction of its vital conditions, whatever may be their characteristic. Now, what a state of society is that which knows of no better instrument for its own defense than the hangman, and which proclaims through the 'leading journal of the world' [The Times] its own brutality as eternal law? (quoted in Tunick, 1992, 47)

In this passage, Marx's argument was that the society was protecting itself through punishment methods as it had no other instrument against infraction of its vital condition (the possession right) than brutal capital punishment for reproducing its authority relations. Thus, while the possession right was disrespected, the punishment of its violation evidently turned crueler. However, the brutality of punishments was not able to prevent the violations since the authority started to weaken with its inadequacy in reproducing itself in profitable production as the 1770s was also a period of economic recession in England.

In that context, the capitalist authority is not limitless in time and it must be preserved in this struggle for profitable production process while violence fails sustaining process of authority. Thus, to understand the condition and the burdens of the capitalist in the workplace, it is important to comprehend the worker's deprivation

urban accompanied this expansion of population in numbers. Thus, maybe demography was a symptom rather than a reason of the authority crisis of the era.

of the necessary conditions of production in time and the capitalist methods of profitable production in relation with each other.

In the next chapter, the ongoing deprivation process of the worker will be investigated as a process of capitalizing the human world while the tool for this expansion is the process innovation which replaces human's ability of making tools as this ability is the reconditioning factor of human in the relation with his surroundings; that is the ability of altering the status-quo.

CHAPTER 3

SOCIETY IN INNOVATIVE LABOR PROCESS

The inadequacy of violence in establishing the authority (as the individual's voluntary acceptance of authority only can be the source of obedience like even in the example of slavery) is also the case for the capitalist. Thus, the acceptance of the authority can only be possible by choice if the one is deprived of any other possibility. At this point, the hegemony of the capitalist in a society through possessing the instruments of work which are the core of the human world in the course of reconditioning the human being must be examined in the context of deprivation.

Accordingly, the situation of the worker in society should be examined to understand the mechanisms which conserve the status-quo in favor of the capitalist. In this sense, the first question to raise can be: "Why is the worker eager to take place in a society so as to produce his needs?"; since the investigation of the capitalistic hegemony on the ability of improving the productive stock can only be replied by comprehending the reason of ensembles of production through subdividing the tasks of work among its members.

In this chapter, the deprivation of worker which coerces him to choose the social production under the control of the capitalist will be investigated within the context of the main apparatus of the capitalist in the process of reorganizing the world at the same time as depriving the masses of the ability of making tools through controlling it by conducting systematic process innovations in its market mechanisms: hegemony on cogitation of work. To commence, the dependency of individuals to a form of social production will be examined in the context of the productivity of division of labor in the first part of the chapter while the advantage of the capitalist will be discussed regarding the fact that every worker in the capitalist mode of production is deprived of the ability of creating any alternative world as they cannot compete with capitalism. In addition, the capitalist process innovations will be handled as the tool of deepening

that deprivation of worker by means of transforming the individuals into industrious executers.

Finally, the process of development of the capitalist authority will be discussed in the second part in the context of methods of the systematic process innovation introduced by Taylor and their implementations by Ford since in both cases the worker is put in position of making a compromise of prosperity in return of obedience which is voluntarily accepted although they lack any other chance while he fortifies capitalism by participating in its expansion.

3.1 Social Production and Challenging Capitalism

The human being goes in a social form of production so as to benefit the productivity of the division of labor. Similarly, Adam Smith introduced division of labor as the greatest improvement in productivity as it is the cooperative production of common interests in a group so as to allow the individuals to specialize on a certain field. In this sense, in this part all the improvements of the division of labor are introduced as a result of a production process seeing that the main constraint in front of an individual so as to develop his productivity is the impossibility of concentrating on producing the necessary instruments (which recondition the human being in nature) for each department of production as all production is limited by the stock (since producing instruments is not different than any other production process and instruments can only be produced on the basis of existing instruments). Consequently, the role of the stock in the process of making tools so as to recondition the human being in his own activity is investigated within the context of the capitalist process innovations which continuously accumulate the productive stock in the hands of the management of the great corporations.

3.1.1 Individuals' Limitedness and Division of Labor in Social Productivity

The labor power of an individual (or the capability of realizing a want) is bounded by the instruments of work that one possesses and he only may attempt to improve his productivity through another production process. But this production process is limited

by the same circumstances of labor process as improving the productivity requires some existing instruments of work like tools and technical knowledge. Namely, an individual who seeks for improving his conditions through producing new tools and technical knowledge in his quest is also constrained by his stock of instruments of work as this improvement is another production process.

Accordingly, an individual may improve his productivity if he executes the production of technical improvements by using his existing stocked tools and technical knowledge although that process is physically limited by the availability of stock of both instruments of work and goods for perpetuating his life. On the other hand, the life of an individual is not only based on one need as his volition includes varied wants while those needs may tend to increase in time with the effect of volition which is the impetus of work at the linear state of existence. Thus, for improving the human being's condition, one needs to conduct technical developments in varied fields of production. At this point, the impossibility of improving productivity for all needs is apparent as their production requires diversified instruments of work stocked by the individual and one has to improve separately all the instruments of each branch of manufacturing. Hence, without diversifying the improvement tasks of different needs through division of labor, the development of productivity of each individual is constrained by the difficulty of stocking all the necessary instruments for improvements. Otherwise, the human being cannot recondition himself in nature:

In that rude sense of society, in which there is no division of labour, in which exchanges are seldom made, and in which man provides everything for himself, it is not necessary that any stock should be accumulated, or stored up before-hand, in order to carry on the business of the society. Every man endeavours to supply, by his own industry, his own wants, as they occur. When he is hungry, he goes to the forest to hunt; when his coat is worn out, he clothes himself with the skin of the first large animal he kills: and when his hut begins to go to ruin, he repairs it, as well as he can, with the trees and the turf that are nearest it. (Smith, 2008, p.111)

Thus, an individual is impeded in humanizing the world by the physical constraints of developing productivity as there is not only one task of human life. However, that obstacle of development tends to disappear with subdividing the work in groups of workers. As the tasks of work are subdivided among the individuals, each individual can get specialized in one part of the whole production process while the production of improvements in each domain might be mutually shared. In that way, individuals

become a part of a symbiotic group of production in which one can cooperatively produce without the obstacle in front of developing labor productivity. That symbiotic group of cooperative production can occur only in society “since every specialization presumes the simultaneous presence of several individuals and their mutual cooperation” (Durkheim, 1984, p.180). Thus, the same number of people can produce a higher amount of materials with the effect of specialization of individuals on certain parts of production of new instruments with the division of labor:

The quantity of materials which the same number of people can work up, is increased in a great proportion as labour comes to be subdivided more and more; and operations of each workman are gradually reduced to a greater degree of simplicity, a variety of new machines come to be invented for facilitating and abridging those operations. (Smith, 2008, p.69)

In that sense, division of labor enables the human being to produce over his physical individual limits with the possibility to specialize on a certain part of cooperative production and develop new instruments so as to facilitate the work. Adam Smith, accordingly, accepted the division of labor as the center of the human world; while the ones who do not participate in that prevailing organization of division of labor can only support ‘the rude sense of life’, the society can achieve a much more higher productivity rate because “the greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour, and the greater part of skill, dexterity and judgment with which it is anywhere directed, or applied, seem to have been the effects of division of labour” (Smith, 2008, p.2).

The productivity of labor process and division of labor are directly proportional in view of the fact that “the more work is divided up, the higher the production is” (Durkheim, 1984, p.179). The productivity of division of labor enables human activity to improve its limits in the process of concretizing wants, which, namely, is also realization of satisfaction. In that sense, the higher productivity of human activity in labor process is accepted referring to augmentation in satisfaction and happiness. That is, the more the human being produces, the happier he is and “it seems that he [the worker] must be the happier the more of them that he possesses, and consequently be

naturally induced to seek after them” (Durkheim, 1984, p.179). This is only possible in a social form of production.

3.1.2 Need of Stock and Challenge of Newcomer in Society

In this context, the progress of the human world whose impetus is human volition is possible by means of division of labor. Consequently, it can be said also that somebody cannot achieve the same level of productivity and happiness out of any symbiotic group of production since cooperative work is essential so as to achieve division of labor. Thus, the one who is not a part of any society can only create a natural state of life in the rude sense with his labor power as he is deprived of cooperative production.

But when the division of labour has once introduced, the produce of a man’s own labour can supply but a very small part of his occasional wants. The far greater part of them are supplied by the produce of other men’s labour, which he purchases with the produce, or, what is the same thing, with the price of the produce, of his own. (Smith, 2008, p.111)

As division of labor is a barter of labor in society, it can be also said that it is a result of commodity production³³ since “commodity is a product which is not produced for use or consumption but to be sold in the market” (Bocock, 1993, pp.35-36). In other words, with the emergence of the division of labor, individuals do not only produce for their own consumption but they produce in return for other’s labor in the barter. Moreover, as the far greater part of their needs are supplied from the production of other members of society, individuals produce much more commodity than their own direct needs. However, for thus doing, one must achieve a certain level of productivity which is only possible with a certain stock of instruments so as to achieve commodity production in a specialized part of the production process. In addition, one must also acquire an additional amount of stock to uphold his life during the production of commodities since the exchange of labor is posterior to the labor process, and “this purchase cannot be made till such time as the produce of his own labour has not only been completed, but sold” (Smith, 2008, p.111). Thus, stock is the prerequisite of joining division of labor. Moreover, “as the accumulation of stock must, in the nature of thing, be previous to the division of labour, so labour can be more and

³³ The indispensability between the commodity production and the division of labor is a deduction of Adam Smith.

more subdivided in proportion only as stock is previously more and more accumulated” (Smith, 2008, p.111).

On the other hand, an individual takes part in that society as he can join in the barter of labor through the exchange of goods. One who can produce and sell products obtains the right to buy the products of other members and he becomes useful for the others in the group. Otherwise, society does not allow idlers who take without respectively putting due to the mutuality of labor barter. Furthermore, a member who is not capable of producing at the required minimum rate of productivity may also be accepted as an idler seeing that his labor is not productive enough as a result of being lack of sufficient amount of stock. Even in that situation this person is threatened as an idler while an idler can only survive in a society with the mercy of other members, which subordinates his volition and coerces him to accept the authority.

At this point, it is understandable if a newcomer who is thrown in the middle of a society chooses accepting an authority in the social cooperation of production within a situation of being deprived of necessary stock to produce in view of the fact that it obviously can yield a more humanized world. Thus, an individual who cannot join the labor process with a certain level of productivity is compelled to accept the authority of the one who perpetuates his human life as a result of the idler’s dependency in the production relations. Otherwise, that individual may be labeled as a parasite and rejected from the society, and, accordingly, he cannot find the chance of joining in the cooperative production of the society.

For instance, in a patriarchal society, the idler-son accepts the authority of the craftsman-father, who is a member of the cooperative society, and he obeys the father as a master. Furthermore, he specializes on the father’s field of work as he is the one who will acquire the heritage and the physical familial stock. In that way, the idler turns into an effective member of society, and even takes the role of the father-master in the future. Similarly, an apprentice attempts to evade from idleness through entering the workplace of a master in order to obtain recognition in society while he can stock the necessary knowledge in order to become a respectable free craftsman-member of society.

In both examples, the dispossessed individuals like the newcomer have to accept the authority of a master in social form of cooperative production since they are deprived

of necessary stock of work instruments (including knowledge) so as to produce and freely take part in the barter of cooperative labor if they want to live in that group. This authority is not a result of the social rules which are equally³⁴ imposed all members (although they reinforce it) but it is a result of coercion regarding to the situation of dispossessed individuals who are deprived of the technical capability of commodity production in order to be useful in society.

3.1.3 Capitalist Stock and Division of Labor

By joining the capitalist production relations, an individual thrown in the middle of the capitalist world envisages to attain to mass consumption in order to continue his human life since he cannot produce more than the capitalized society as a result of the fact that he is deprived of the necessary stock in order to improve his productivity which may allow him to take part in the social cooperation of work without the hegemony of the capitalist. He works in this workplace so as to obtain the possibility to access the consumption with the ticket-money given by the master-capitalist in return of his labor. In this sense, the capitalist as the mediator of commodity trade in the middle of the labor process pays the worker with the consumption in which he also captivates the volition of worker.

On the other hand, as the capitalist generates profits, he accumulates his stock by the profitability of production-consumption cycle while the accumulated stock lets more improvements in productivity like in division of labor among the workers. Namely, this cycle continuously transfers the productive stock from the worker to the capitalist. In economic terms it is called process innovation; any attempt for developing the efficiency of the profitable production. Hence, comprehending the situation of the worker in this organization of the society is possible only in the company of understanding of how process innovation works in the process of capitalizing the human world.

First, the capitalist patronizes the subdivision process of work among the laborers present in the workplace (as he patronizes the necessary stock of achieving productive division of labor) at the same time as he becomes the master of the labor process against the worker, just like in the case of the mastership of craftsman against

³⁴ At least, it can be theoretically said the social rules and regulations are equally applied to all members of a society.

apprentice, since the worker is deprived of the necessary instruments of work so as to produce. Moreover, even the worker can produce at a certain level of productivity, he cannot compete with the capitalist in commodity production as his labor power is insignificant compared to the high productivity rate of capitalism:

If we now go more into detail, it is, in the first place, clear that a labourer who all his life performs one and the same simple operation, converts his whole body into the automatic, specialised implement of that operation. Consequently, he takes less time in doing it, than the artificer who performs a whole series of operations in succession. But the collective labourer, who constitutes the living mechanism of manufacture, is made up solely of such specialised detail labourers. Hence, in comparison with the independent handicraft, more is produced in a given time, or the productive power of labour is increased. (Marx, 1995, p.225)

Moreover, the worker cannot attain the social level of productivity which is under the control of the capitalist even in a cooperative group of other craftsmen since that group will be lack of the necessary stock so as to produce new methods of production in order to compete with the capitalist production. Thus; so as to balance their position in society, workers accept to expose their labor on the capitalist's means of production.

On the other hand, the worker gets more specialized in the execution as long as he produces profit for the capitalist. Even the work of producing a single item is subdivided into varied tasks with the help of highly specialized machinery which reinforce the increasing simplicity of work in order to facilitate the operations while the augmentation of the capital intensity in production (due to accumulation of more stocks and advancements in production technologies with innovations regarding the amount of stock) has decreased the production costs and increased the profitability.

In the augmentation procedure of profit, the specialization of the worker is not anymore in the production of a specific item from beginning to the end but it occurs in the tasks of a single item's production as the worker becomes a specialist of a very simplified job which is insignificant without whole labor process; consequently, the individual worker's labor power respectively turns useless out of the capitalist workplace.

In that point of view, it is obvious that the technical improvements through process innovations, which foster the capitalized cooperative labor's productivity, gradually deskill the individual worker. Consequently, Brighton Labor Process Group (1977,

p.16) indicated deskilling process of capitalist production methods as one of the 'immanent laws of the capitalist labour process' (quoted in Thompson, 1983, p.90). Moreover, Thompson (1983, p.91) emphasized the importance of deskilling so as to achieve the maximum possible speed, cheapness, replaceability, standardization and calculability in production for securing the continuity of the cycle.

As an objection, it is possible to support the idea that the laborer is skilled more in whole labor process as he turns more professional and productive on one aspect of the production; however, that argument accepts that the worker develops his own skill on the grounds of his knowledge as if it is a development based on his own efforts and stocks. Unfortunately, that development is exogenous for the worker while he only acquires the execution part of all process. Accordingly, Thompson (1983, p.92) pointed that confusion in the concept of skill and he emphasized the fact that "the skill is largely based on knowledge, of the unity of conception and execution, and the exercise of control by the workforce". Thus, as the endeavor and the knowledge of worker is irrelevant in the process innovations, any individual worker is trivialized in the process of technical change at the same time as the skill is more seized by the management.

Accordingly, the capitalization of worker is accompanied by the trivialization of labor in the workplace since the worker turns less important in whole production process as a result of that deskilling process as Marx (1995, p.235) indicated the fact that:

In manufacture, in order to make the collective labourer, and through him capital, rich in social productive power, each labourer must be made poor in individual productive powers.

In brief, although the craftsman-worker was able to produce a certain product from the beginning to the end, today's laborer is allocated in a very detail execution part in the whole production process as a result of increasing division of labor in view of the fact that "not only is the detail work distributed to the different individuals, but the individual himself is made the automatic motor of a fractional operation" (Marx, 1995, p.235). Moreover, the tasks are noticeably simplified with the help of highly specialized machinery. Thus; the more worker performs the tasks in the capitalist workplace, the more his labor turns stagnant in the capitalist production process at the same time as he becomes only a capitalized worker who cannot produce elsewhere.

Namely, “division of labour within the workshop implies the undisputed authority of the capitalist over men, that are but parts of a mechanism that belongs to him” (Marx, 1995, p.233).

3.1.4 Expansion of Capitalism through Process Innovations

In this procedure, the worker loses his knowledge of work like any productive stock and he cannot perform his job without the continuous supervision as the contrary of the case of master-apprentice relations since the worker in that production process can never acquire the technical knowledge and his labor gradually becomes more dependent on the instruments of the capitalist including the knowledge and dexterity as a result of the fact that the work that the worker conducts is continuously subdivided through process innovations parallel to his labor process. Finally, the worker turns more obliged to work in the capitalist workplace on account of the trivialization of his existence in the workplace with higher degree of dissociation of cogitation from execution. Namely, that can be considered as the devaluation of labor in the production process as a commodity in his own activity through process innovations based on profit objectives.

On the other side, the same number of workers happen to be capable of producing at a higher level (thanks to the refinement of productivity in work with technical improvements) although he is concurrently devaluated as a commodity since the production costs of the same items are decreased in the course of time in view of the fact that the productivity is improved as the stock of instruments is augmented. Namely, the commodities of consumption goods are devaluated parallel to the devaluation of the laborer in the production process, and the devaluation in production commodities including the living labor is accompanied by the devaluation in inflated consumption commodities³⁵.

³⁵ The devaluation of things including commoditized human through deprivation from gaining a human livelihood elsewhere than in the capitalist workplace is not surprising for the reason that the impetus-volition satisfaction at the state of human existence requires an unremitting aggregation of the products of work (which is the propulsive activity in the process of satisfaction), and it is obvious that the only product of capitalist human work is the production of things as it reifies everything in itself so as to destroy them in consumption. In that sense, the problem is not the development of technology but it is the fact that technology is instrumentalized in the conservation of status-quo which protects the capitalist's position in society.

Finally, as the laborer cheapens in production, his consumption respectively cheapens. In fact, that is the inflation of the world of things by means of process innovation (like a *souffleur*) as the human being is commoditized and joined the world of things with reification in the capitalist labor process. Contrarily; regarding that devaluation in double sense, the world turns more expensive for the worker while the capitalist becomes more capable of realizing his volition in consequence of being more favored in the transfer of labor power from the worker as it is cheaper for the capitalist to continue the process of labor power transfer.

As the world of things devaluates in that procedure of growing stocks, the worker turns more depended on the market during the period that the capitalistic barter of labor strengthens in the transformation of all society into a great corporation. Consequently, the individuals who seek for a livelihood in the human world are progressively more coerced to take part in the capitalist relations of production as a result of the devaluation of things due to the fact that the capitalist productivity gradually disables and deprives the outsiders from any competition and the workers turn more into some interchangeable entities of work who have no signification but surviving owing to the gratification and the mercy of the capitalist. Hence, the newcomer outsiders have no more choice than saying 'yes' or 'no' on the arrival although there is only one rational answer since 'no' means rejecting the humanized world and living as an idler-parasite who is rejected from society.

In this context, Marx claimed that “it would be possible to write a whole history of the inventions made since 1830 for the sole purpose of providing capital with weapons against working class revolts” (quoted in Thompson, 1983, p.18). Nevertheless, the capitalist introduces himself as the submitter of the progress in technology since he has the paternal role as he is the narrator of the political expression in society of inactive capitalized workers.

On the other hand, the balance of labor power transfer is not ensured by a coercion of violence which deprives the human being from any kind of volition satisfaction (as such means of coercion can bear some authority crises as a consequent of violence), but it is more based on a compromise with the workers for being rewarded through consumption so that the individuals can still find the possibility to fulfill their wants. In this way, the capitalist could use the profits rendered from the commodity trade in new

investments of process innovations for its very best purpose: establishing capitalistic authority.

3.2 Capitalist Process Innovation in Theory and Practice

Capitalism's continuous accumulation of productive stock by transforming it into capital is the outcome of process innovations for improving the profitability of production. In this way, capitalism continuously deprives society from the freedom of work while it intervenes in all relations of the human being with material. Consequently, the human being turns more depended on the capitalist workplace so as to attain his wants parallel to the progress of process innovations.

In this sense, Taylor argued that if the worker-society accepts the compromise of the capitalist so as to transfer his productivity by conceding his status of an executer, he will acquire his wants with the mediation of capitalism through consumption. He introduced methods to systematically continue process innovations through more subdividing the tasks of work, and he supported the mutuality of the compromise based on the idea of prosperity which means for the capitalist continuing profitable production so as to more intervene in the relation between the human being and his wants while it means for the worker achieving consumption at a higher degree if he obeys.

Henry Ford was one of the first implementers of those ideas as he augmented the wages with respect to the improvements in productivity due to continuous process innovations. Accordingly, the political aspect of Taylor's theory became evident seeing that Ford even declared himself as a leader of society due to the responsibility that he shouldered: meeting the demands of society. In brief, this part investigates Taylor's theory as a process of progressing capitalism in the quest of capitalizing the world while the implementation of this theory by Ford Motor Co. is discussed so as to comprehend the outcomes of this process based on the mutual prosperity compromise.

3.2.1 Taylor's Scientific Management

The main apparatus in the diminishment of labor is the detailed subdivision process of execution tasks of a single item, which is formulized in the *Scientific Management*

of Taylor although the concept of division of labor existed before Taylor's formalization. The advantages of dividing tasks between and within mental and manual labor (or, as Braverman (1998, p.78) supported, within conceptual and executive) compose the profitability of the Scientific Management methods. However, its contribution to the subordination in the workplace through the bait of consumption can be seen as the real output of the method for buttressing the the capitalist mediation in the relation between the human being and materials seeing that profitable production is only possible with obedience of the masses in also consumption.

Even before Taylor's formalization of rules to organize an effective workplace, the organization of work was against the freedom of worker and the workplace forced him to leave his identity and to turn into a part of an execution army. Taylor's formalization is more like a moment of realizing the existence of the worker's resistance against the workplace by means of 'soldiering' while there could be a consensus between both parts if the worker was coerced to accept the transfer of his living labor force in exchange of higher potential of consumption while the productivity could be improved more with new process innovations. Consequently, Taylor introduced a theory so as to reinforce and to improve the position of the capitalist by employing some scientific methods. In this manner, Taylor's "Principles of Scientific Management" can be utilized so as to comprehend the capitalistic logic in process innovations and Taylor can be accepted as a spokesman of capitalism since in his work "there lies a theory which is nothing less than the explicit verbalization of the capitalist mode of production" (Braverman, 1998, p.60).

Frederick Winslow Taylor was a mechanical engineer in the United States, and he wrote the book "The Principles of Scientific Management" to show the inefficiency in all parts of the cooperative labor, which costs to the nation. The book starts in a very nationalist manner with admonitions of the author and his demand to establish some scientific methods in management.

For attending to those objectives Taylor suggested that each individual must reach to the highest state of efficiency. However, he claimed in the workplace the worker is not giving all of his effort to the job, they are not so much enthusiastic as they are 'soldiering', in other words 'hanging it out'. To overcome that situation, he suggested a solution which promised that "each workman will work to his very best advantage

and at his best speed, accompanied by the intimate cooperation and the help ... from the management” (Taylor, 2008, p.8).

Taylor foresaw three major problems which must be overcome for fortifying the workplace authority; those are the fallacy, the defective systems of management, and the inefficient rule-of-thumb methods. First, the fallacious beliefs of the workmen like if they work harder they will face unemployment (as a result of high productivity) motivate the workmen to ‘soldier’. However, according to Taylor, the high productivity would lead to low production costs and reduced prices of the articles which would result in a largely increased demand. Accordingly, he supported that the fears of workmen are pointless and if they would like to keep their job, they should work harder. In order to overcome that fallacy, he suggested that a national education program can help people to realize the fact that workers will earn more if they work harder (Taylor, 2008, pp.9-11).

As the second problem which results in inefficiency according to Taylor is the argument that under almost all contemporaneous systems of management in common use, the employer's ignorance results in ‘soldiering’ since the employer brings a group of workmen doing the same job together and gives the same salary which leads the workman consequently to raise the question ‘why to work hard to take the same salary than the other workman who works less’. Moreover, in that case the workmen can misuse their employer’s ignorant of “how fast work can be done” which is named as *Systematic Soldiering* (Taylor, 2008, pp.11-16).

Finally, as the third reason of 'soldiering', Taylor introduced the fact that the tasks of the workers are not scientifically designed and workmen perform one of the various ways of doing the same job which is not the most efficient. According to him, through only a scientific method and analysis the best method and the best implement can be discovered (Taylor, 2008, pp.16-17).

Correspondingly, the famous methods of Taylor are introduced to solve those problems of inefficiency. All those methods were considered as the employer's responsibilities or deeds despite the workmen. In fact, the main aim of the methods is to standardize the labor process in the workplace and to increase the efficiency since the workmen perform the necessary job to be done in various methods which cannot be the most efficient one. Accordingly, the duty of the employer is depicted as

removing the workers' mind and implementing the most efficient method which can be found with the assistance of scientific methods.

... among the various methods and implements used in each element of each trade there is always one method and one implement which is quicker and better than any of the rest.

And this one method and best implement can only be discovered or developed through a scientific study and analysis of all of the methods and implements in use, together with accurate, minute, motion and time study. This involves the gradual substitution of science for rule of thumbs throughout the mechanic art. (Taylor, 2008, p.17)

Thus, the help of science is required in order to improve the existing methods and to discover the best method to produce at the highest level of efficiency in process innovations; meanwhile, the worker has to be reduced to a repeater of tasks designed by the scientific mind of the engineers. In fact, even all the methods look like as if they serve the improvement process of productivity in the workplace, they more reinforce the authority of the capitalist as "Taylor dealt with the fundamentals of the organization of the labor process and of control over it" (Braverman, 1998, p. 60).

After declaring the importance of science for advancing the division of labor, Taylor designated the objective as the maximization of the prosperity of both parts of production relations: the employers and the employees. He rejected the antagonism between both since he considered that their true interest is mutual in the way that "prosperity for the employer cannot exist through a long term of years unless it is accompanied by prosperity for the employee, and vice versa" (Taylor, 2008, p.5)³⁶. With that description, the struggle was reduced to the aim of the employee as wage maximization and of employer as labor-cost minimization³⁷.

³⁶ Taylor was not alone with his ideas concerning the prosperity. In fact, those ideas are quite parallel to the ideas of Adam Smith since Adam Smith was also supporting the idea that the individualistic rationality of profit maximization in society would lead to an increase in the national prosperity. Both Taylor and Smith were concerned with the national level and overcoming the struggles between the workers and the capitalists through achieving a complete obedience in the workplace. In other words, Taylor would like to say that if one obey his boss and accepts losing his personality in the workplace, he will obtain more access to consumption in the market of the commodities (that can only exist with you) in order to meet his needs, actually which is his major motivation for selling his labor force.

³⁷ Taylor claims it prosperity objectives of both parts in the following way: "That [the prosperity] is possible to give the worker what he most wants --higher wages-- and the employer what he wants --a low labor cost-- for his manufactures" (Taylor, 2008, p.5). Although the labor-cost minimization objective is a reverse explanation of profit-maximization goal, it reflects more the ultimate aim of the objective which is devaluation of labor in workplace with the end of better obedience in the workplace.

Among all three reasons of the necessity for a scientific management, the first one is pointed to a demand from the worker to accept the work conditions in the compromise of mutual prosperity. Actually, the fallacy introduced in Taylor's book is a rationalization of the work conditions to prove to the worker that if he accepts the employer's request of voluntarily obeying and if he accepts his instrumental role in execution, he will benefit from improved productivity through obtaining higher wages.

In this way, Taylor asked the cooperation of the worker from the beginning of the book and his attempt for overcoming the struggle between the labor force and the capitalist (or in terms of Taylor; the antagonism between the employers and the employees) is the introduction of prosperity as a mutual benefit. If the worker accepts to sell his labor force to the capitalist, and if he obeys the rules in the workplace, he is ensured to receive a better salary given that the profits of the capitalist would increase the volume of production as a result of improved productivity parallel to the growth of capitalist's intervention in the production.

At that point, it can be seen that the maintenance process of the authority is a result of the compromise between the capitalist and the worker. Although the objective of both parts looks parallel to each other as they both seek for a sort of prosperity, those prosperities serve in different directions: the worker's prosperity is to consume more in the market in order to meet the needs of a human life whilst the prosperity of the capitalist is to produce at lower cost of labor which also indicates better subordination of the labor force. In that cycle, the worker finds more occasions to passively consume in the market for satisfying his human volition while the destruction of his labor in consumption serves the process of creating more production in which his labor will be less important despite the fact that the position of the capitalist will be improved.

In that point of view, it is evident that the demand of obedience from the worker in the direction of process innovations based on profit motives, regardless of the fallacious beliefs which are introduced above, is to say that the one who obeys will be rewarded and that reward will be improved in time proportional to the continuation of the obedience as it is mentioned that the obeying worker will receive a continuous improvement in consumption. On the other hand, the one who does not work in that system will be punished through losing the opportunity to work for the capitalist which

is the unique possibility for the dispossessed worker in order to attain to the human productive cooperation of work.

Accordingly, in the second problem of ignorance which is claimed by Taylor explicitly illustrates the importance of rewarding the obeying worker seeing that the worker who works harder deserves higher reward than the one who soldiers as the hardworking worker is more profitable in labor process. Thus, the profitability has been considered as an ethical unit of measurement in Taylor's methods for estimating the degree of a worker's obedience in the workplace.

On the other hand, the solution for the inefficient rule-of-thumb methods problem through employment of science in place of worker's mind trivialized the position of worker through his complete dependency on the supervision of the management by means of the detachment of mental instruments of cogitation (like technical knowledge) from the worker with the methods of *Scientific Management* in order to implement the most efficient and appropriate methods at the same time as the worker is reduced to an identical executer of designed tasks of the supervisors in the company. Consequently, he is more disfavored from the possibility to disengage his productive power from the capitalist for disembarking from the capitalist world since he deprives himself more of productive stock as more he transfers it to the capitalist.

In that process, the worker can no more acquire the necessary knowledge so as to become productive with his own stock of instruments through which he may gain the social recognition as the agreement is that both parts respectively improve their prosperity (which is destruction in consumption and continuous regression in productive stocks for the worker while it means production and improvement of stocks for the capitalist). Thus, the labor of worker does not end with any stock of instruments whilst it even disfavors the worker from technical knowledge in the meantime that the capitalist progressively improves both his accumulation of stock and systematical ability of both subdividing the tasks of work and conducting more process innovations³⁸. That situation is unique for capitalism.

The division of labor in capitalist industry is not at all identical with the phenomenon of the distribution of tasks, crafts, or specialties of production

³⁸ It was mentioned that the existence of stock is the prerequisite of division of labor while the magnitude of the stock can also determine the detail of subdivision of tasks.

throughout society, for while all known societies have divided their work into productive specialties, no society before capitalism systematically subdivided the work of each productive specialty into limited operations. (Braverman, 1998, p. 49)

As a result of that gradual subdivision process of work which does not only prevent the worker from acquiring the necessary stock of instruments but also gradually deteriorates the worker's skills with the continuous process of subdivision of work as a result of unremitting amelioration of the capitalist's accumulation of instruments. The social recognition of the individual is respectively disengaged from his contribution in society while only his consumption capability is left for the worker in order to gain a place in the social organization. Thus, one who has the capacity of consumption (regardless to its foundation) is accepted as a part of society.

In this sense, despite the situation of master-apprentice, the worker is locked in the position of the subservient (while he believes he improves his prosperity through being rewarded as a result of his obedience) seeing that he is more deprived of any other possibility whilst he turns more into a consumer than a producer since the only human satisfaction left for him in that capitalist world cannot exist anywhere else than in the commodity market. Namely, the consumption of those commodities becomes the impetus of the human world and the waste of consumerist destruction is the excessive output of that perpetuation cycle.

In short, the subordination in the workplace is reinforced through the methods of Taylor as the worker obtained higher degree of consumption in return of his increased contribution to the capitalized the human world. In other words, the worker is rewarded as a result of his quietism and obedience in the workplace so as to preserve the social circumstances which perpetuates and ameliorates the position of the capitalist through more process innovations in transforming the existing world into a capitalistic world while intervening more in the relation between individuals and their wants.

In that sense, Henry Ford's production methods in overcoming managerial difficulties of workplace can be thought as one of the first implementations of Taylor's principles for conserving the subordination in the workplace through the compensation of obedience in process innovations accompanied by the increment of consumption regarding the degree of profitability. Thus, the material situation of the worker in the

capitalist production can be comprehended through investigating the consensus between the worker and the capitalist in Fordist production methods.

3.2.2 Implementation of Taylor's Methods in Ford Motor Co.

Henry Ford is mostly known with his implementation of assembly line scheme which systematically deskills the workers through the monopolization of conception in mass production of highly standardized Model Ts. seeing that it was a successful implementation of Taylorist methods. However, the profitability of Taylor's methods of Scientific Management depends on the idea of a continuous circulation between production and consumption which is formulated by Ford as "mass production requires mass consumption which means high wages" (Foster, 1988, p.1).

Indeed, that formalization of the production-consumption balance is quite parallel to Taylorist methods as Taylor (2008, p.64) indicated that "management must ... recognize the broad fact that workmen will not submit to ... more rigid standardization and will not work extra hard, unless they receive extra pay for doing that". Thus; as a compromise with the workers, Henry Ford, despite of all other contemporary entrepreneurs, decided to increase wages in his factories so as to improve the productivity and to curtail the labor-costs while the social consumption was enhanced to facilitate balancing the mass production due to the scientific arrangement of the workplace.

Ford believed that the mass production of their automobiles was a very big opportunity for society by way of the very simple idea of producing a simple, strong car. As a result, he introduced directly or indirectly many job opportunities (nearly 600,000 employees³⁹) to society while he actualized a dream of the human being although the opportunities in a society were limited. In fact, as a result of bounded opportunities in society, he admired that they were cruel and fierce in the competition during the period that the corporation attempted to conquer the market (Ford, 1998, p.4).

³⁹ Ford (1998, pp.2-3) claimed that Ford Motor Co. was directly employing around 200,000 employees while roughly the dealers and service stations of the company employed 200,000 employees as well in 1926. On the other side, he supported that 200,000 workers were employed in outside factories thanks to purchase of intermediaries of Ford Motor Co. Thus, in total 600,000 employees found a job with the enterprise of Ford.

“The man who possesses health, strength, and skill is a capitalist;” said Ford (1998, p.152), “if he can use his health, strength and skill to the best advantage, he becomes a ‘boss’. If he uses himself to still better advantage, he becomes a boss of bosses – that is, the head of an industry.” Fortunately, Ford accomplished as the triumphant among all the bosses and he became the boss of bosses. However, for the ones who did not believe in the opportunity and who lost the competition had still the chance to continue in the market by accepting the leading of the boss:

Those who do not believe in opportunity will still find place within the opportunities that others have created; those who cannot direct their work successfully will always find it possible to be directed by others. (Ford, 1998, p.4)

Although Ford destroyed the opportunities of others with his cruel and fierce competitiveness, he embraced those who were left worldless under the wing of his big corporation. The masses were left without choice and they had to accept to be recruited in the industrial army of the Ford Motor Co. in order to be directed in the way the company desires. Actually, the corporation prospered and extended as a result of that mercifulness of sharing wealth with people through transforming the society into laborers in big factories. Likewise, “it is very characteristic that the enthusiastic apologists of the factory system have nothing more damning to urge against a general organisation of the labour of society, than that it would turn all society into one immense factory” (Marx, 1995, p.233).

Even mostly it is a tendency to analyze the phenomenon of Ford related to his innovative assembly line production system which successfully subdivided the labor up to a very high productive level; maybe it is more important to remark the fact that Ford was not a boss who used the old thumb-method in which the capitalist was giving the lowest wage possible to the employees by way of bargaining so as to improve the profits of his corporation seeing that bargaining just gave contradiction between the capitalist and the worker:

The old theory ... is that the rate of wages depends on the bargaining power of the worker as against the monopoly power of the employer. Under that theory, both parts lost. Under that theory, labour unions rose and organized war began, with boycott and lookout as the weapons. (Ford, 1998, p.153)

Moreover, according to him cutting wages was not a solution for the low consumption; on the contrary, according to him “in this way, consumption can only be

lower than before” (Ford, 1998, p. 154). Thus, he “envisaged a new, corporatist age of high-wage, high-consumption, easy-credit and high-productivity capitalism, based on the firm foundation of the mass production assembly line” (Foster, 1988, p.1).

In that respect, according to Ford, the laborer is more a buyer rather than a seller, and the reason why he seeks work is the buying end. Consequently, the duty of the capitalist is making things easier for the plain people to buy. “That makes work. That makes wages. That makes surplus for extension and greater service.” (Ford, 1998, p.18)

For that reason, in a period of regression, Henry Ford increased the wages of his workers to five dollars a day despite of other bosses who were paying to their workers as low as possible. On the other side, those other bosses of the industry claimed Ford’s move as an insane act and they even accused him of being communist. However, according to him, as he wrote in his autobiography, the payment of five dollars a day for an eight hour day was one of the finest cost-cutting moves they ever made (Foster, 1988, p.3).

Indeed, Ford had realized that the laborers in the factories were also the customers in the market; and wage cutting policies were curtailing the purchasing power of the consumer-laborers although “one of the objects of industry is to create as well as to supply consumers” (Ford, 1998, p.154). It was obvious, at that point, why mass production required the accompaniment of mass consumption since the consumer was the hired worker of the capitalist out of the workplace too.

If you cut wages, you just cut the number of your own customers. If an employer does not share prosperity with those who make him prosperous, then pretty soon there will be no prosperity to share. That is why we think it is good business always to raise wages and never lower them. We like to have plenty of customers. (Ford, 1998, p.156)

Thus, capitalizing the society could only be possible by creating both more workers in the workplace and more consumers in the quotidian. That dependency of the capitalist on labor can be thought as the root of the generous wage policy of Henry Ford. Moreover, he realized the mutual return of that compromise with the workers, which improves the profits of the firm while the firm benefits the occasion of extending its area of activity through that new mass production – mass consumption balance.

Ford interpreted his wage policy as a profit sharing agreement; and as he increased the wages, that was a dividend of consumption given to the worker as a return of his effort. Thus, when the productivity flourished, the corporate reflected the resultant cost diminution to both the prices of goods and the wages of the workers. That policy of waging and pricing mutually improved the profits of the firm in the next sales since the cut prices increased the volume of sales at the same time as the worker, whose wage is raised, increased his consumption in the market. Finally, the new profits let the boss to advance the productivity more which would lead to a higher degree of consumption in the company of higher profits and higher productivity:

... by sharing the profits with the public comes an immediate and great public benefit, there is a stimulating reaction on the business, prices go lower, business increases, thousands of men are employed where but scores found work before, wages increase, profit mount. (Ford, 1998, p.18)

The eagerness of the corporation in expanding their boundaries is one of the most evident facts about the activities of Ford Motor Co.. The corporation did not continue just to make big profits but they continued to hire more workers as they continued growing. Thus, the profit of the firm changed its meaning: it turned into an instrument of the corporate for expansions in the market through gradually hiring more workers.

Consequently, the corporation was unremittingly seeking for some ways of development and extension in the market like technical improvements or new power resources as Ford (1998, p.6) claimed that they were always going to the coalfields, to the streams, and to the rivers for searching cheap and convenient source of power that can be transformed into electricity, conveyed to the machine, to increase the productivity and output of the worker, and to raise the wages.

However, in those quests, the aim was not to decrease the labor costs through replacing the labor with machines, but it was to improve both the share of machines and the number of laborers in the labor process so as to continue the galloping development of the corporation. Although there were many layoff periods of the firm⁴⁰, it is obvious that the firm gradually hired more workers parallel to the development of the profitability of production as Ford claimed that the workers would not be thrown

⁴⁰ The layoffs in 1920 can be an example of those layoffs. As the total sales of the firm drastically dropped from 998,029 in 1919 to 530,780 in 1920, massive layoffs followed an enormous speed-up on the production line. (Foster, 1988, p.5)

out of work as a result of improved productivity, but the firm wanted to widen the market and to create more jobs at higher wages regarding to the decreased costs.

On the other hand, Ford supported from the beginning the idea that “... buying labour is just like buying anything else – you have to make sure that you get your money’s worth” (Ford, 1998, p.156). Accordingly, he expected the return of the wages that he paid with improved productivity in the workplace. In this sense, a worker had to work in his best performance, just like Taylor had mentioned, although Ford (1998, pp.5-6) supported that they were not working as hard as before as “he [the worker] will tell you that the killing pressure has let up”. Nevertheless, letting a worker to ‘soldier’ was to help him to lower his wage and there was no bigger injury than that according to Ford. Thus, in Ford Motor Co., the raised wages followed higher productivity as in the instance of the year 1929 when the 17 percent wage increase accompanied by 47 percent higher production quota for each worker (Foster, 1988, pp. 6-7). In those improvements in payments, Henry Ford was waiting that the workers fulfill his expectations. He established even a department of espionage for that purpose in his company which was called “Sociological Department”.

Sociological Department of Ford Motor Co. was organized in March 1913 for directing the financial aids and wage rates of the workers as a result of “profit-sharing arrangements” in which the basic hour wage rate of 34cts per hour was supplemented by an additional payment of profit sharing rate of 28.5cts per hour as a financial aid to the worker. Accordingly, the aim of the Sociological Department was alleged to improve the life quality of the workers (which was convenient with Ford’s belief that “business can live only as it develops within corps of employees the talent and the force which will carry business along” (Ford, 1998, p.22)) through distributing those financial aids and profit by selecting the eligible ones who were meeting some requirements among all workers:

These included, in addition to being a satisfactory worker on production line, such requirements as thrift; having a home that was worthy of a Ford worker; not letting out rooms in one’s house to boarders; not having an outside business of any kind; not associating or allowing one’s children to associate with the wrong people; not occupying or intruding upon sleeping rooms while others are asleep; cleanliness; ‘good manhood’; good citizenship; demonstrating proof of marriage; not drinking or smoking excessively; prohibiting one’s wife (in the case of a male worker) from

working outside the home; demonstrating progress in learning English; etc.
(Foster, 1988, p.4)

Consequently, Foster claimed that 28 percent of the workers were disqualified for one of the reasons while some were even disqualified “for spending money too freely; some for lying or not cooperating; some for not demonstrating proof of marriage; some for having ‘domestic troubles’; some (men) because their wives worked, etc” (Foster, 1988, p.4). In this way, Ford extended his control and continued supervising the workers out of the workplace. Moreover, he was even capable of intervening in the domestic problems and use of money issues of his workers.

As he was the payer of the labor, he believed that he had the absolute right to direct his workers even outside of the workplace. Moreover, he used that department for the espionage among the workers because cooperating with management was also in the list of requirements of being qualified for the profit-share. At the beginning, department had about 200 investigators for surveillance of the workers and the number fell to around 50 later⁴¹. Although the department was disbanded in 1921, the espionage mechanism in Ford Motor Co. continued in Service Department throughout 1920s and 1930s (Foster, 1988, pp.4-5).

The duty of the capitalist was to direct the society like in the example of ‘Sociological Department’ because the labor was supposed to be lazy per se, according to Ford (1998, p.152), and the human being does not want to work as in nearly every social theory:

Men must be lead into prosperity. A mob is powerless except for destruction. All men are not voluntarily intelligent; they must be taught. All men do not see the high escape from drudgery in work by putting intelligence into work; they must be taught. All men do not see the wisdom of fitting means of ends, of conserving material (which is sacred as the result of others’ labours), of saving that most precious commodity – times; they must be taught. (Ford, 1998, p.16)

Obviously, men must be taught only about execution, not about cogitation, to be led by the capitalist so as to be converted in an industrious instrumental society from the form of a free destructive mob. Correspondingly, the corporations were considered as

⁴¹ That can even be considered as a proof of cooperation of workers with management since the department did not decrease the number as a result of high costs of investigations while it was a period that the company was increasing the labor force.

political actors in society which should direct the society since the human world always needed leadership:

The world has always needed leadership. Yesterday the leadership was military and political. ... Neither military nor political leadership is creative. Business was called successful only when it took away something that someone else had already created. ... But times have improved and today political and military leadership cannot serve the people as well as industrial leadership. (Ford, 1998, p.15)

At that point, Henry Ford (1998, p.14) supported that although people had been taught to fear the great corporations, the industry should take the leaderships because he claimed that the industry could exist only with the demand of society. Consequently, he alleged even that the big corporations were serving the society for more freedom and democracy, and he introduced the role of industry as a stage of liberation and democratization of society relying on the idea that the industry meets the needs of society⁴². Accordingly, he buttressed industry's leadership:

Industry must have generalship – and of a high order. The great corporation is the inevitable consequence of industrial leadership. (Ford, 1998, p.16)

At that point, the source of leadership transfer from the politics to the industry is obviously the emergence of the great corporations which gather a big amount of labor power in their hands. The method of Henry Ford for enlarging his company was a result of an implicit discernment of the labor power by which the power of the capitalist augments. In this sense, Ford did not want to share his influence on the workers with any other institution like labor unions as he was fiercely in the competition of accumulating labor power. For instance, in March 1932, the demonstrating workers in the famous “Ford Hunger March” were fired at close range with pistols and a machine gun by the police force under the leadership of Ford's

⁴² With that leadership of industry, Ford thought that they served to civilization process of human in view of the fact that the intellectual independence is highly correlated to economic independence. According to him, “civilization in terms of material well-being indicates a degree of intellectual well-being, for without economic independence there can certainly be no intellectual independence. If a man spends twelve hours a day hunting his daily bread, he is not going to have much time left over for clear thinking” (Ford, 1998, p.166).

However, his workers were not economically independent even out of the workplace and they were spending around eight hours a day hunting their daily bread; thus, they were not able to benefit the intellectual independence as a result of labor productivity and they did not have the time for clear thinking. Nevertheless, they were able to consume more than ever while their obedience increased the power of their boss.

Service Department (Foster, 1988, p.7). Three marchers were killed while even a photographer for the New York Times was shot in the head. Correspondingly, Ford resisted against the unionism of workers in his company until the establishment of United Auto Workers in 1941.

Likewise, Ford did not want the intervention of even the government in the domain of business as he argued that the government should “stick to the strict function of governing. That is a big job enough. Let them let business alone.” (Foster, 1988, p.7) His demand of *laissez-faire* is coherent with the fact that his political power was a result of the free market in the inequality of the division of stock where the workers were coerced to accept the capitalistic authority in the course of searching a livelihood so as to realize their volition; the social rules which are equally exposed to every member of society are not the direct source of that authority (although they reinforce it) at the same time as the role attributed to the government as a regulator of those social rules indicates the objection of the capitalist against any political intervention which can alter the status-quo against the advantage of the capitalist.

From this point of view, since the high wages and the high consumption policies are to maintain the position of the capitalist in the production relations, the intervention of the management to the expenditures of the workers is convenient with the idea that the compromise can be profitable for the capitalist if the worker creates more consumption out of the workplace with his high salary. Moreover, while the workers reproduce their loyalty to the boss, they facilitate the process of recruiting more free people in the industrious army.

For that reason, Ford claimed the purpose of those wages as a tool of consuming rather than accumulating some stock:

Putting the worker in position to buy what he makes, of course, has its exceptions, and the thought applies principally to commodities. One would not expect the worker to buy a pipe organ, or a steamship, or a skyscraper. As a worker, he would have no use for any of these things. But he has use for good food, good clothing, good housing, and a reasonable amount of pleasure for both himself and his family. (Ford, 1988, p.14)

The worker was supposed to buy only the use of consumer commodities from the market. He could have a happy life with the consumption of good food, good clothing, good housing, and a reasonable amount of pleasure. However, the money had no more

use than that like accumulating a proper amount of stock and he could attain to the good only through the wonderland of consumption with the ticket given by the capitalist.

Similarly, Ford was against the standard wages as the consumption of workers was designed to follow the expansion of the great corporations. In other words, the consumption of a worker would not stay constant in time and he was supposed to consume more each year than the year before. Thus, “there can be no ‘standard wage’”. A wage based on any standard of living is destructive, for it implies that all men are alike and can agree on how they want to live. Fortunately, all men are not alike, and fortunately, only a few care to live this year in the way they did last year.” (Ford, 1998, p.156)

In brief, the compromise of Henry Ford with workers was based on an unremitting exchange of better consumption with better obedience and quietism while all the talent of work transferred to the management of the great corporations. As the worker consumes all, he continues working harder and improving the productivity while his tasks of work are more subdivided in the course of time and he loses the opportunity to accumulate enough knowledge and instruments to be able to actively produce something that he freely wants. However, he more turns into the worker of Ford Motor Co. and he consumes more than the year before while he can only define himself regarding his consumption. Finally, the worker becomes the consumer and the capitalist takes the role of the producer. That is the true irony of the modern production.

On the other hand, that dependence of consumption cannot be pursued without the demand of society as the capitalist is depended on it. Thus, the massiveness of production in the path of expansion could only be sustainable with the mass consumption in the way that Ford believed. Namely, the growth in production through process innovations has to be accompanied by an unremitting progress in consumption which requires overcoming the boundaries of limited demands of society with the assistance of technology. That is to say, process innovations can help the capitalist can only be possible in the quest of transforming the world into a capitalist world with the accompaniment of product innovations. In this way, the captivity of the worker’s volition is deepened as the intervention of the capitalist in the relation between individuals and their wants is buttressed so as to canalize them in the desired way.

CHAPTER 4

GROWTH OF CAPITALISM THROUGH PRODUCT INNOVATION

In the first chapter, the labor process and its power were investigated in the context of the conditions of human's detachment from nature by means of purposive activity of work. It was said that the human being enters in the work relations not only for the rude sense of perpetuation of his life, but he seeks for the benefits of work like the concretization of a want. On the other hand, the stagnation of the human being in the execution during the concretization process of a want was handled as an obstacle in front of freedom of volition since body and mind are indispensable for each individual. Thus, it was said that the freedom of concretization of a desire is bounded by the execution process which can be overcome through further instrumentalization of the human being by another. Moreover, this instrumentalization of the others reinforces master in the struggle for freedom by also pacifying a group which can no more contradict master's volition as they are allocated in the coercion of execution. This premise has been accounted as both the logical and historical reason of slavery by captivating another in the relations. In this captivity, although the master finds the occasion to leave the workplace, he is stuck in the obligation of perpetuating his status through incessantly reproducing the slavery conditions of the other. In that sense, the master takes the role of a father by rewarding as well as punishing while he sanctifies his position and his role in society.

In the second part of the first chapter, the situation of the worker was discussed within the parallelism between the struggle for freedom and the struggle for profitable production as only with the profitable production the status quo in the favor of the capitalist can be sustained. On the other hand, the continuity of the struggle was handled as a continuous process of transfer of volition in the company of the transfer of labor power as the captivity on volition means the control of the purpose of work by seizing all the cogitation. That is to say, as the capitalist intervenes in the relation

between the worker and his wants, he seizes worker's power in transforming nature while the worker loses his ability to use this power for an end that he cogitated.

In the second chapter, the expansion of capitalism through profitable process innovations is discussed. In the first part of the chapter, the reasons of the productivity of the labor process in a cooperative group was argued in the context of division of labor as only with a certain amount of stock it is possible to alter the human condition in nature. Moreover, the stock is treated as the prerequisite of division of labor and improving the technical capability of the cooperative group for improving the conditions of human life. Similarly, it was stated that stock becomes also the prerequisite for each individual for producing up to a certain level of productivity which allows individual to join the social bargaining of labor in the exchange of commodities which are separately produced. Accordingly, the situation of a newcomer was considered as situated in a coercion to accept an authority in the settled society, else than the sanctions of social rules which are equally exposed to every member of society, as a result of the fact that that newcomer is deprived of all kinds of stock for attaining a productivity level that can enable him to freely join the social bargaining of labor. Similarly, the worker has accepted his situation seeing that he cannot attain to a higher degree of human life with satisfying his volition because he is behind the capitalist productivity rate in the contest of stock accumulation. Even in collective working groups he cannot achieve it since the capitalized society confronting them is vast.

Finally, the situation of the worker thrown in the social relations of capitalism was analogically compared to that newcomer individual in this part of the chapter, and it was found inferior to the situation of the newcomer idler in a traditional society as that newcomer accepts an authority in a master-apprentice relation after which he even takes the role of the master as he accumulates the necessary stock of knowledge in his service to the master. However, the worker cannot get rid of his role as the subservient in the production process, and he even turns more deprived of the necessary stock of production as he facilitates the capitalist-master's accumulation of capital which gradually subdivides his tasks in production.

In the second part of the chapter, the expansion of capitalism is investigated as the process innovations are to increase the mediation of the capitalist in the labor process

through the struggle for profitable production. Indeed, it is obvious at that point that the reason of the worker to join the capitalist production relations is a compromise with the capitalist, since he seeks for a human life while the capitalist seeks to maintain his position. In this sense, Taylor's attempt of solving the 'soldiering' problem in the workplace (which is actually challenging the capitalistic authority) through the promise of gradually rewarding the workers is handled as a compromise with the worker. Furthermore, the implementation of Taylor's high wage policy in Ford Motor Co. and the acquisitions of the company from the resultant ameliorated workplace authority, like even the leadership of the nation, demonstrates the usefulness of those methods, as in the case of the master who tries to get rid of his obligations for perpetuating his position through rewarding the slaves as well as punishing.

In this last chapter, the maintenance of that compromise in the expansion, which serves the conservation process of the capitalistic authority in society, will be investigated in the context of its promises and their durability for continuing the quietism in obliviousness of consumerism. Thus, consumerism will be the basic issue of this chapter as the use of commodities in the capitalist mode of production will be handled as an instrument for extending the incentive of consumption over a period of time. Thus, the limits of consumption will be discussed in the course of volition satisfaction of the masses so as to give the capitalist the power to canalize the masses in the desired way while product innovations are supposed to be sustainable only with existence of the demand as Ford claimed. What's more, consumption is crucial in all those discussions seeing that although it is difficult to assign the rational limits of production, consumption is rationally restrained by the needs; and if it is not extended, capitalism cannot sustain its balance.

4.1 Consumerism and Product Innovations

The generation of profits is related to the consumption occurring in society. The innovativeness of the capitalist mode of consumption can only achieve being profitable if the improved productivity can be transformed into profits throughout the consumption. However, any consumption is limited if it occurs in a rational sense as the needs are restricted for individuals. At this point, product innovations of capitalism

appears like a tool for extending the consumptiveness of society so as to intervene more in the relation between the human being and his want in the process of captivating the volition of the masses. This part discusses the need for a mass consumption for continuing the mass production of capitalism.

4.1.1 From Consumption to Consumerism

In a very basic sense, consumption is the destruction process of the production's outcome in the course of its service. Its destructiveness appears like excluding and opposing production as an antonym of the word; however, although they seem opposing each other, consumption is more like the complementary of production seeing that production is for nothing but to create consumption as we consume what we produce. Alternatively, it can be said that if there is production, it is only meaningful with the presence of consumption. Hence, production and consumption are no longer opposing each other; just as consumption has to be produced (Butler, 1999, p.52) and "production is simultaneously consumption as well" (Marx, 1993). In this way of look, consumption itself is the determinant and prerequisite of production and the labor process in the capitalist mode of production can only exist by maintaining it. On the other hand, Baudrillard (1998, p.35) supported the reciprocity between consumption and production in the following way:

Even there is the role of culture and it is important to include those factors in order to avoid from a one-sided economic approach, there is no way of avoiding the central importance of the concept of capitalism as the mode of production and, it might be added, the associated mode of consumption, for the primary aim of capitalism as an economic and financial system is to make profits upon invested capital.

Thus, as there is a capitalist mode of production, it is clear that there is also accompanying consumption and "consumption must be seen in the mode of production of industrial capitalism" (Baudrillard, 1998, p.34). Likewise, the capitalist mode of production is only sustainable with the accompaniment of the sustainability of consumption.

On the other hand, the capitalist mode of consumption is not only the domain of introducing the outcome-commodities to the masses, but it means more as it is the profit generating activity which is the reason of production and the source of the

capitalistic authority. Thus, consumption does not only mean the department of acquiring the interests of one in the exchange, but it is also the department where the coercion of the worker to join the capitalist labor process is recreated with the profits generated in the exchange. Moreover, it is the only place where the worker can be rewarded regarding his obedience and passiveness as the outcome is distributed through consumption. Similarly, Robert Bocock (1993, p.50) underlined this point by referring to Baudrillard (1988):

People now work, in the advanced social formations, not just to stay alive, but in order to be able to afford to buy consumer products. The goods which are advertised serve as goals and rewards for working, even if not everyone buys all, or any, of them. The important point is that consumption has taken off into an ethereal, or hyper-real, symbolic level, so that it is the idea of purchasing, as much as the act of purchasing which operates as a motivation for many in doing paid work.

Similarly, Baudrillard (1998, p.74) supported that that new consumerism is the next stage of capitalism following on from the nineteenth century when the workers were trained and industrialized in the processes of industrial production (like timekeeping, disciplined actions). Namely, consumption becomes an instrument of the capitalist in the execution of the authority as in the case of master's salvation from the burden of perpetuating his authority with the close supervision, described by Stefano Fenoaltea (1984) in the first chapter, where the consumption is the reward as a return of a comprehensible duty while unemployment is the punishment which is as comprehensible as the reward since it becomes negation of the reward of obedience:

Unemployment is more an upset if houses, furniture, cars, holidays, clothing, or even many kinds of food and drink, can no longer be afforded. The unemployed may lose the desire and the capacity even to dream of consumption. Yet it is such dreams about consumer goods and experiences which keep many people going when they are, in paid work, and may sustain others in unemployed state. (Bocock, 1993, pp.50-51)

In this sense, the interest in the exchange of consumption is altered as a reward mechanism which motivates the workers to work harder, just as Taylor demanded, which stimulates the process innovation and the capitalist productivity; and although they are not in the misery of poverty, the workers voluntarily go in the workplace (like even in a contest in today's developed capitalist societies) so as to acquire their interests in consumption. Moreover, since the interest appears for the workers even before purchasing as a reward regarding that the worker is aware of its existence in the

market and he works to obtain it, the capitalist consumption is not anymore only the act of purchasing but also its idea as an incentive and a dream; that is, consumption does not mean anymore only the act of buying but also it refers to an idealism of consuming, consuming the idea of consuming, or, in short, a consumerism.

4.1.2 Emergence of Capitalist Consumerism

The early consumerism within a distinctive capitalist structure was first experienced in England during the post Civil War period, in the second half of the seventeenth century. This first practice of the capitalist consumption was supported by the capitalist mode of production which employed an officially free and paid labor force (not composed of slaves or serfs) while an amount of rational profit was systematically generated through the sales of commodities produced for a free market in the exchange between production commodities (labor) and consumption commodities (product); in the meantime, commercial agriculture in new-style farms also implemented production models for free market in the sale of the foods, or other goods. (Bocock, 1993, p.11)

On the other hand, consumption habits started to take a central role in people's lives in the United States and Western Europe (as industrialized capitalism was developed there) since nineteenth century. During that period, those consumers of the early modern period even personified themselves with ways of marking themselves off from other social status groups, and, namely, with a social identity. However, that sort of consumption was restricted, and only wealthy groups of society were able to consume in that manner (Bocock, 1993, p.15). That is, although first capitalist consumption was occurred in the free market, the choices were limited for the masses as the low income groups were only able to afford some limited sort of products. However, with the new methods of Taylor, which were implemented in Ford Motor Co., the meaning of consumption was altered since it more became an incentive for the laborer masses as the consumption was extended to those classes, which Smith described as *frugal and industrious*, while the choices in the market varied with the emergence of the consumer-workers. Namely, mass production began to be sustained by the mass consumption which was spread among the laboring masses. (Bocock, 1993, p.22)

It was after this stage that consumption became more a reward for the worker than an unvarying department of maintaining the human life. It was not anymore only for coping with the grueling circumstances but also an opportunity to improve one's

quality of life. Moreover, as in the compromise of Ford, the productivity followed more prosperity with a market which was satisfying more needs than before with the continuity of enlargement of capitalism. Accordingly, after 1950s, particularly 1970s and 1980s, for some groups, consumption started to play a central role in the way of life (Bocock, 1993, p.27) and this situation has continued until now. Featherstone (1991, p.83) pointed that alteration of the sense of consumption in the following manner:

The term life style is currently in vogue. It connotes individuality, self-expression, and a stylistic self-consciousness. One's body, clothes, speech, leisure pastimes, eating and drinking preferences, home, car choice of holidays, etc. are to be regarded as indicators of the individuality of taste and sense of style of the owner/consumer.

What's more, consumption, by means of its diversifying choices, even became central in identity issues as the professions regressed in view of the fact that the social role of the worker could only be measured according to his wage rate in terms of money – the credit consumption. Consequently, a new sense of identity emerged in society regarding the consumption habits like in the earlier phases among the wealthy groups; and use of items of consumption such as clothing, footwear, popular music or sporting activities, including being a supporter of particular music groups, singers or soccer clubs started to be used to personify the individuals (Bocock, 1993, p.28).

Likewise, production augmented due to that expansion in consumption since production is the department of reproducing consumption. The continuous growth in both consumption and production is obvious throughout the period between the first experiences of capitalist production and today's complex consumerism. That achievement in consumption has even served to legitimize capitalism, maybe not in the hearts and minds, but in the eyes of millions of ordinary people (Bocock, 1993, p.2).

The legitimacy of capitalism is nurtured by this obliviousness of society. In addition, this growth does not seem to cease, as it may continue until everybody is converted to a worker of a capitalist and all the professions are destroyed in the simplicity of execution while there will be only one identity which can be gained in consumption. That kind of a centralized unity in a society is scary as it brings the direct use of everybody's volition with deciding in place of masses which can continue

to a very high degree of militarism like in the example of the US or of the Nazi Germany.

4.1.3 Capitalist Expansion in Consumerism: Product Innovation

The growth of consumption is also the growth of capitalism as without consumption capitalism cannot reproduce its authority and people's acceptance in society. This growth can be because of many reasons for the side of the capitalist: the competition among the capitalists, which Ford mentioned as "to be the boss of bosses"; the liberal Protestant tradition, as Weber discussed; or just a simple ambition of profit and power; etc. However; it is evident that the capitalist mode of consumption gradually expands by engorging even the expectations and hopes of individuals as it incessantly promises more to have in the future.

The expansion of capitalism in the domain of consumption can be seen in the context of its expansion in production which is increased parallel to the methods of Taylor and policies of Ford. As the capitalist improves the productivity in the workplace, it conquers new demands of the human being like even proposing to meet a reasonable amount of pleasure as a reward for those who works under the supervision relying on the implicit thesis that "the more you earn, the more you want, and better" (Baudrillard, 1998, p.62). Consequently, this new consumerism becomes influential in the social life of the individual out of the workplace as it introduces more choices of consumption for pleasure and self-satisfaction.

It is obvious that this expansion in choices means an unremitting process of product innovations. The use of that innovative path of capitalism results in its progress in authority even out of the workplace as it more provides individuals with the means of satisfying their volition in the controlled freedom of consumption. However, the most important aspect above all is worker's passiveness in that freedom which is not a freedom in reality but a freedom constrained in the choices of purchasing. Moreover, the capability of purchasing from the wonderland of consumerism is also restrained by the purchase power of the individual which is related with the degree of his obedience in the workplace as he has no other choice to generate money-ticket for the entrance.

For discussing the role of "progressive consumerism", first the progress of consumption must be understood in the context of its openness to manipulations as a

result of its closeness to understanding since individual consents to accept this new type of freedom although he is not obliged to follow the market of the capitalist for obtaining his reasonable amount of pleasure like the one that Henry Ford offered. Namely, the question of “why consumers take the bait, why they are vulnerable to this strategy?” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.74) can be replied if this shift in the meaning of consumption is examined seeing that today the package of a good means more than what it serves.

4.2 Pacification in Consumerism

The intervention in the relation between the human being and his wants is obviously a process of pacification of masses. In this sense, the capitalist consumerism serves this aim so as to master the society. On the other hand, rationality as a decision making tool so as to decide what the need is restrains the progress of this pacification. However, once rationality is vanquished, the pacification in consumption can even continue in any personal desire of somebody as a result of impossibility to apprehend (also to designate) its purpose. Thus, the defeat of the activeness in the workplace can be pursued in the quotidian of the individuals within the domain of the irrational. Masses can be turned into passive executors of their wants in consumerism while even the identity can turn into a passive manner of consumption. This part is to discuss about the pacification process of capitalism against the industrialized society in consumerism.

4.2.1 Rationality in Consumption and Triumph of the Irrational

If consumption is taken as the department of meeting the needs and the wants of life, it is a rational activity of human founded on a comprehensive basis. However, in the capitalist mode consumption consumerism displaces the rationality of consumption while need and want dim as a result of passiveness of the society in the labor process. In this part, the triumph of the irrational in modern consumerism will be investigated. First the rational basis of the consumption will be discussed, and then the displacement of the rational will be examined regarding the passive position of the worker society by utilizing the ideas of Heidegger on technology.

The use of an object is in an instrumental logic (*poiesis*) as more or less any good includes a meaningful use for it to be employed in a human activity. Consequently, in order to understand the tendency of consuming more parallel to product innovations in an incessant growth, first, consumption must be handled as a simple exchange process as it occurs at the individual level although the culture or the society can be assumed influential in it.

A person goes in exchange for an interest, something that he does not possess while this interest can be food for staying alive, a necessary instrument for producing or just a want. Similarly, on the rationale of exchange, Adam Smith claimed that one goes in an exchange only in return for something that he lacks; otherwise, man is not willful to share what he possesses. In other words, people barter the goods in the division of labor as they want to acquire an interest from the other like in Smith's example of dinner: "it is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest" (quoted in Bowles, 2007, p.29). In brief, the exchange is a result of deprivation and the interest is for those things that one is deprived of.

Hereby, in consumption of consumerism, the interest is rather a want (even though the consumer may be convinced about that it is a need of his life) because acquiring a demand is personal. Accordingly, want can be accepted as the interest of an individual in consumerism; he attempts to fulfill a want in the process of consumption by matching his want-interest within an interaction with some consumption items while that interaction does not obligatorily mean the use of the items as it can also be only possessing them or even just hoping to possess them one day. The process of contact between the buyer and the item has been assumed, by Robertson (1970, p.5), occurring in the following way:

- The consumer will be exposed to the product stimulus.
- If the consumer is exposed to the product stimulus, response will occur if the product is in some sense consistent with his self-concept.
- Response is an instantaneous act.

In that sequence of the process of purchase, the buyer is assumed as a rational decision-maker seeing that his response is supposed to be consistent with his self-concept of interest. Moreover, in reality a buyer is faced with many competing items

among which he seeks to maximize the satisfaction by choosing those products with the highest utility relative to price (Robertson, 1970, p.3). Consequently, consumption is bounded by the rational limits of exchange in the mind of the consumer.

In this interaction, as an outer to the individual, the consumption items pronounce some stimuli, which contain a perceived set of want-satisfying attributes (Robertson, 1970, p.2). Namely, the stimulus of a consumption item is its message of commitment for supplying to the individuals something that they are deprived of in pre-consumption phase although it can include some socio-cultural codes like promising a more respectful social status or prestige. Consequently, consumption occurs if the individual is convinced about the stimulus' commitment about fulfilling his want-interest. That is, consumption is a result of any match that occurs in the contact between its two parts, the buyer with an interest and the item with a stimulus.

Product stimulus is expected to be convenient with its purpose (*telos*) while this purpose is strongly related to what the product is, or namely, to its essence. That is to say, purpose is a degree of being *organon* which will be convenient by serving an aim of the consumer. However, although there is a connection between the ingredient of the product and its purpose, the linkage between them is ambiguous as the product is more like a black-box as it may give many outputs regarding an input despite the general definition of technology: a means to an end. The ambiguity is a part of the absence of the product's essence as the product happens to emerge in a concealed aspect (*eidos*) hiding its consistency. On the other hand, the stimulus of the product is more connected to the aspect than the essence as it is instantaneously exposed to the consumer while the essence is not perceivable; thus, the consumer is in relation with the aspect more than the essence. Nevertheless, with acquiring foreknowledge about concealing process in one's own activity before the phase of consumption, the buyer can guess the consistency of the product as a result of the fact that the stimulus can only be meaningful if it gives an idea about the service of the product which is strongly related to the essence.

Accordingly, the consistent way of combining the product exists unconcealed in the production phase as it is the moment when the ingredients of the product are concealed into the unity of an object for an end. As the essence is once concealed in production, the product is a single item with its own aspect and purpose among other things of

nature. However, if somebody keeps the purposeful sense of combining some objects in work for a desired end, he can still treat an object due to his active purposes. Namely, this is acquiring a degree of knowledge of how or *poiesis* allows one to overcome the discontinuity between the concealed object and its essence. Thus, although he has no idea of the production process of the item, he is aware of the purposive process of concealment in production and he can comprehend the existence of the object among the other things of nature within the context of its essence, not as if it is a miraculous object which happens to exist by chance. In other words, he has a sense of “technology as technology is a way of revealing” (Heidegger, 1977, p.12) seeing that he has the active interest with the accompaniment of the active labor power which can bring forth an object on purpose.

However, with loss of activeness due to the loss of productive stock in the incessant process innovations (which gradually subdivides the work and deprives the worker more from the consciousness of work), the understanding of technology disappears. Hence, the worker as the producer of nothing happens to be exposed to a stimulus of an object which miraculously exists; that is:

In every practice, the blessings of consumption are not experienced as resulting from work or from a production process; they are experienced as a miracle. (Baudrillard, 1993, p.31)

It is obvious that this individual is naïve about the consistency of the product and for him it stays as a black-box which serves him more in the way that it is written in its operating manual. Accordingly, stimulus is pronounced in the aspect, and the package of the object becomes more meaningful than the product itself as the product is (regarding the absence of the essence) in a state which is independent of its user; it independently exists in the nature of things and only its want-satisfaction attribute is in connection with its user.

As those objects can intelligibly communicate in society in place of the mediation of the reality (that can be acquired through essences of the objects or at least with a sense of ‘how to make’ or *poiesis*), they carry visually unique signs due to their identicalness and indistinguishability in their aspects as a result of the loss of the difference between the original and the copy with the emergence of the serial reproducibility of the consumption items (Butler, 1999, p.38). However; those messages that the consumer goods carry are empty given that even the identicalness of

each product appears like a sign, the product has no meaning than the stimulus for attracting the consumer. Consequently, the human being is surrounded by objects which are concretized according to their visual aspects at the same time as although those objects are convenient for some ends due to their essence, the purpose of object is susceptible to be replaced and it can pronounce more than one meaning including the domain of irrationality. This is the method of extending consumptiveness: the usefulness and the rationality are displaced while “the object of consumption is characterized by a kind of functional uselessness” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.112).

Namely, the freedom of buying turns into a dependency relation between the consumer and the product as long as the knowledge of *how* (poiesis) is hidden since the want-interest of the consumer becomes dependent on the stimulus of the object (as it is dimmed in the passiveness of execution) which absurdly appears due to the fact that in this comprehension of product’s stimulus “functionality is not use-value, it is sign-value” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.89)⁴³.

Finally, the consumption goods are available to be detached from their physical consistency with the loss of the sense of the purposive production, and the purpose of the object is more dedicated on the visual aspects that the marketer attached on it. What’s more, the consumer is no more active in the use of the objects as they are unknown in their concealed state in the market; consequently, he passively obeys the consumption purpose of the object dedicated by the package. That is to say, the consumer is excluded from his own consumption parallel to the increase in the amount of pre-packaged goods. As a consequence, the consumption purpose turns as independent as the item itself seeing that the all understanding (logos) about the item is externally represented in the product’s stimulus while the rationality is replaced by the irrationality of dimmed want-interest.

⁴³ As an example, the consumption of advanced technologies can be considered so as to understand the concept of “functional uselessness”. The development of the technology is not related to its function anymore but it is more correlated to some attributes as in the case of the wideness of a screen or the resolution of a camera. Although for some lower resolution or smaller screen can be functional enough, it looks like improving the products with smaller screens or lower resolution disappear as the purpose of the advancement of the technology in innovation is only to make masses to consume since the purpose is only to follow the development measured within the scales given on the aspects of products.

4.2.2 Passive Execution of Consumption

With the emergence of the capitalist consumerism, the goods and experiences have been prepackaged and labeled before arriving the consumption phase and the consumer can only buy those products so as to acquire the committed want-satisfaction. As a result of that fact, the consumers are less included in the dedication of the purpose of the products and “have been removed from experiencing a sense of creativity, of autonomy, in many activities by the increasing packaging of experiences” (Bocock, 1993, p.50). There are even some certain instructions for the buyer to execute the consumption on the package and the consumer is not supposed to consider the item more than the initial decision of saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the purchase (just like in the case of his freedom of saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the coercion of the workplace) when he is exposed to the product. Robert Bocock (1993, p.51) explained that dimension of today’s consumerism in the following way:

The goods and experiences which are consumed have become prepackaged, already created and coded to produce the required consumer responses. This has introduced a new dimension to alienation. Consumers may purchase ready-made meals, travel on packaged tours, watch sports, television, or listen to music on radio or disc, or drive a car they must not attempt to repair themselves.

This is called as the alienation of the worker in the consumerism while he is alienated to his own consumption parallel to the alienation that he experienced in the workplace with the mediation of a third part (the capitalist) in the relation between the item and the consumer-worker; thus, the consumer-worker’s freedom is restrained through that pacification process which deprives him of the possibility to imagine and concretize his own satisfaction as a human being. However, there is still the execution of satisfaction left to him for perpetuating the linearity of the individual’s volition within the instructive boundaries.

In this sense, the path of product innovation is liberated seeing that the manipulation of stimulus reconditions the wants of the consumers as the stimulus is also the slogan itself; specifically, “anything can become a gadget and everything potentially is one” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.112). Accordingly, once the satisfaction through consumption is achieved with the mystery of the concealed product, the substitution of it for the same end will not be possible because “under certain circumstances, a marketer is probably well advised not to emphasize the functional attributes of his product, since consumer

cannot perceive differences from one brand to another” (Robertson, 1970, p.3). That is, the product joins the system of needs of the consumer as a unique taste seeing that “needs point to a reassuring universe of ends” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.50), and it even turns into a choice which can be personal due to the unique match between the consumer’s want and the stimulus which has its own identity regarding its mysterious autonomy. For instance, a consumer who prefers Coca-Cola to Pepsi can personify himself with this aspect of his consumption habits as the visibility of products reflects a diversity code in society.

Personality is reduced to the atomized sense of individuality which is more ‘private’ and consumption’s freedom has taken the place of the freedom of act with the domination of personalized consumerism. This situation can also be considered as a result of the loss of productiveness and purposefulness of the human being in the midst of the capitalist’s continuous accumulation of stock depriving the society of even the basic instrumental knowledge of activeness in the human work; to be precise, the activity of transforming nature in the desired way. Namely, the devaluation of the human being in the production process continues under the capitalistic hegemony in the consumption process which degrades him more and more to the executer of his want satisfaction so as to push his volition forward in the same direction with the capitalist, who is in the core of the authority relations.

In brief, the product innovation achieves its domination on the tastes of individuals by manipulating the stimuli of products. By means of that manipulation, the product gains a unique existence (namely, an identity) which cannot be acquired as a result of passiveness of the worker in the workplace. Moreover, the passive executer role of the worker continues in his consumption as he is not capable more than following the instructions of the product so as to acquire the committed want-satisfaction.

4.2.3 Passive Personality of Consumerist

“For Baudrillard, consumption is an order of significations in a ‘panoply’ of objects; a system, or code, of signs; ‘an order of the manipulation of signs’”; says George Ritzer, in the introduction of Baudrillard’s book “Consumer Society”, and he continues in the following way:

The manipulation of objects as signs; a communication system (like a language; a system of exchange (like primitive kinship); a morality, that is

a system of ideological values; a social function; a structural organization; a collective phenomenon; the production of differences; ‘a generalization of the combinatorial processes of fashion’; isolating and individualizing; an unconscious constraint on people, both from the sign system and from the socio-economic-political system; and a social logic. (quoted in Baudrillard, 1998, p.15)

The disappearance of essence accompanied with the substitution of the purposefulness by the aspectual signs is an apparent phenomenon of the capitalist consumption. Moreover, as the consumer happens to be more in relation with the aspect of the consumption item, the image becomes more meaningful than the material while this is “the replacement of the world by its image, so that we do not experience things originally but only as a copy of something else” (Butler, 1999, p.23).

In fact, it must be understood that the consumption of images is not invented by the capitalist mode of production but it is utilized in the quest of expanding the production and the impact of capitalism in the human world. Indeed, as the images are prior to words, they have always carried a degree of mystery in this form. Similarly, the images have been consumed in art for a long time although their purpose is still ambivalent. Moreover, those consumers of art have been mostly from the rich classes of society. For instance, the consumption of nudity in art is treated from time to time as a tendency of capturing the naked image of a woman who obeyed to the owner of the painting (Berger, 1984).

Consequently, it is not the sign which is responsible here as using signs was an obligatory process for comprehending the world (like in the case of comprehending the essence purpose through the aspect by means of the assistance of foreknowledge or awareness about the activeness of the human work) seeing that without signs, world can appear as a total illusion as Butler (1999, p.24) indicated:

If you start from the idea that the world is a total illusion, then life, thought, become absolutely unbearable. So you have to make every effort to materialize the world, realize it, in order to escape from this total illusion. And the 'realizing' of the world, through science and technology, is precisely what simulation is - the exorcism of the terror of illusion by the most sophisticated means of the 'realization of the world'.

Thus, signs are necessary to acquire a sense of reality as the real does not purely exist. In this way, “the aim of simulation is not to do away with reality, but on the contrary to realize it, make it real. Simulation in this sense is not a form of illusion, but

opposed to illusion, a way of getting rid of the fundamental illusionality of the world” (Butler, 1999, pp.23-24).

On the other hand, in modern consumerism, the problem is the situation of living in an illusionary simulation in which an individual is encircled by some ambivalent signs of some forms and aspects attributed to a massive world of objects. Likewise, Baudrillard (1998, p.25) claimed that “the humans of the age of affluence are surrounded not so much by other human beings, as they were in all previous ages, but by objects”.

The ambivalence in the meaning of the items gets more social as much as they lose their purposive sense. They turn into words or phrases of an ambivalent social language while the images of the items are the communicative signs. Namely, those signs connote a *social-symbolic meaning* in the understanding of people as they reflect the divulgence of a socially agreed symbolism of a visible aspect: “A product, especially to the extent that it is differentiated and not a commodity item, also tends to possess a more abstract, *social-symbolic meaning*, or what has popularly been termed brand image” (Robertson, 1970, p.2). Thus, the detachment of the modern consumption from the commodity bartering of the simple division of labor (before the triumph of the capitalistic hegemony) becomes obvious since purchasing is not anymore for matching some needs in a commodity market which was merging the subdividing tasks in the earlier symbiotic group of cooperative production but people buy more for acquiring the uniqueness of the product and its identity carried by its identicalness; namely, “people buy things not only for what they do, but also for what they mean” (Levy, 1959, p.119). Robertson (1970, p.3) underlined it in the following way:

Products vary in the degree to which social-symbolic meaning is important. Cars and clothing are both products which are high in visual display and recognized in our society as "saying something" about a person. For other products, such as canned vegetables or work tools, social-symbolic meaning is of less importance, although still present.

Identicalness of the product in the visual aspect pronounces a social identity as well as a want-satisfaction. In brief, consumption bears a new communication way on account of the openness of the consumption items to carry some meanings from one part to another. As mentioned, this new language is strongly based on the visibility

since it is founded on the aspects of the objects rather than their purposeful essences, and since those objects gain some meanings with their identical appearance in society. Thus, “in consumption objects become a vast paradigm for another language to work through, for something other to speak” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.77).

To sum up, as consumption is extended in other domains of human life by carrying ambivalent signs, the limits of consumption due to the rationality of exchange based on needs and function is overcome while even issues of personality turn a matter of consumption which works in the process of pacifying the masses for consenting them to accept the legitimacy of ongoing status-quo.

4.3 Capitalist Growth and its Limits

After the defeat of rationality in consumption, the passive masses befall vulnerable for the marketers in their quest of introducing new needs throughout product innovations. Moreover, as the purpose turns ambivalent in consumerism, individuals cannot find any satisfaction through consuming while any consumption reappears as a bigger desire. Thus, the passive society's demands augment regarding the ambivalence of consumerism. Capitalism's role grows in the relation of the human being with materials and this growth results in a higher degree of authority. However, the pivot of this growth also restrains the continuity of growth as the dissatisfaction of man in consumption can also consume consumerism. What's more, the great devastation of this authority conservation method apparently is not sustainable as it destroys nature, which was thought as an outer in human activity although it is not, while it also deepens the inequality in the entire world. This part is to discuss about the growth of capitalism due to the defeat of the rational and the constraints of this irrationality.

4.3.1 Dissatisfaction and Limitlessness of Consumerism

Since the consumption can pursue its path in any domain, it progressively invades the entire the human world although the fulfillment of want is replaced by the

dissatisfaction of desire parallel to the ambiguity of image with ambivalent social-symbolic meanings in consumerism as Baudrillard (1998, p.44) claimed:

The need for a particular object as the 'need' for difference (the desire for the sociological meaning), then it will be clear that there can never be any achieved satisfaction, or therefore any definition of need.

The enlargement in consumption announces itself as an augmentation in the happiness of society as by referring to the economist beliefs of consumption Durkheim (1984, p.179) claimed that: "it seems that he [the worker] must be the happier the more of them that he possesses, and consequently be naturally induced to seek after them." Thus, through consuming of consumption goods, whose purposes are eviscerated, the individuals attain a level of happiness as there is still a meaning although the real end of the object attributed regarding its essence is replaced by a stimulus related to the visual perspective.

If the consumption of those items is considered within the context of its emptiness as it is more concealed by excluding even the purpose of the item, it can also be said that its consumption will not be satisfactory in view of the fact that the meaning of the item pronounced in its stimulus is independent of the material's presence. This does not mean, in consumption there are only items without any use, but it means the use of the item is secondary compared to its aspectual dimensions as in the case of the marketer who is advised not to emphasize the functional attributes of the item. In this context, the happiness from the consumption is always incomplete regarding the incompleteness of the function, and all satisfaction from consumption is ambiguous since the consumer is vapid to his own activity of freedom.

As a consequence of this practice, the human being with volition cannot achieve his goal of freedom. The want turns more into a desire as it is more impossible to satisfy them. In this sense, consumption turns independent of rational sense of need under the manipulation of the ambivalent. Something becomes a need for a period while it is forgotten for the next period as its meaning is consumed and replaced by another although it can reappear under another fashion of visual meaning. Thus, there occurs an abundance of emptiness, an incessant flow of goods, a circulation of vague materials only lucid in the vogue contemporaneous.

Hence, consumption is less rational and less matching a pre-existent want-interest. Moreover, as the visual aspects of the items excessively include diverse meanings, consumption is more an excess of desire over the object or even in the case of satisfaction there is another desire created by the previous:

According to Baudrillard, consumption is not about matching a pre-existing desire to a particular set of objects. Rather - and this is part of his brilliantly inventive re-reading of the work of the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan - consumption is not possible without a certain excess of desire over the object; or if desire is satisfied by the object, there is always another or an extra desire produced by this. Consumption in this sense is always incomplete, always involves or brings about a certain loss or absence. (Butler, 1999, p.50)

The concept of need as a reassuring universe of ends is at the same degree of ambivalence of the ambiguity of the end. The freedom is degraded to some choices among diverse consumer products which oppose the individual at the same time as “the worker as the consumer is sovereign in a jungle of ugliness where freedom of choice has been forced upon him” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.72). Moreover, due to the same ambivalence of social-symbolic meanings and the consequent dissatisfaction in consumption, the consumer cannot choose a path in consumerism while the defeat of rationalism, regarding the active participation of the individual, leads to the mist among the choices which coerces the consumers to try all consumable items similar to the argument that “you have to try everything, for consumerist man is haunted by the fear of ‘missing’ something, some form of enjoyment or other” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.80). It is a melancholic quest of personality, and a hazy way of freedom, lost in the illusionary concretization of a want.

In brief, the signs regarding the visual aspects, the *eidōs* of the objects have become independent of their purposive essence, which contains the *how to make* knowledge (*poiesis*) embedded in the product; specifically, they are free to gain many different meanings as it is free to manipulate the contents of those signs hidden in the products’ stimuli by means of visuality and visual communication channels. Individual is more lost in the consumption as he is more directed by the marketers for augmenting the productivity in the path of rendering society more industrious through manipulating the meanings of the products for improving consumption, and namely production. Consequently, need can less designate the good as the demand is more determined by

the supply. Similarly, Baudrillard (1998, p.74) supported the idea that “the truth is, not that ‘needs are the fruits of production’, but that ‘the system of needs is the product of the system of production’”. Fortunately for the industry, great corporations’ unique responsibility in society of meeting the demands⁴⁴ is trivialized in time with respect to the progress of capitalism in the deprivation process of society from any kind of productive stock.

4.3.2 Growth: Domination of Capitalism

The displacement of the boundaries of consumption regarding the limits of the set of rationalized needs by means of externalizing want-satisfaction attributes from the core of the objects to their outer visible aspects brings forth more occasions of consumption and the possibility for a limitless growth: what the capitalist desires these days. In this way, capitalism can intervene more intensely in the relation between the human being and materials as it incessantly conquers the domain of both producing and consuming; namely, capitalism intervenes in human’s relation with both materials and wants.

As an assumption, it can be said that every need is a reason to produce and a reason for the worker to join the production process⁴⁵; specifically for growth while it was shown in the previous parts that there is an abundance of needs in the developed capitalist societies due to the new consumerism. Thus, since in the struggle for freedom capitalist’s approach is to allocate the productiveness in his monopoly, while individuals are deprived of any other possibility than working for a capitalist, the capitalist has more chance to push his volition forward by canalizing the wants of society which is stagnated in the quest of freedom in consumerism.

Similarly, it can be observed that the growth is the most important issue of the contemporary politics, which is more important than the social gaps and the

⁴⁴ Henry Ford supported the leadership of the industry by saying that it is industry’s responsibility to meet the needs of the society, and it only gives what the society asks. In this way, the leadership of industry can only lead to, according to Ford, a complete freedom and democracy.

⁴⁵ “Because consumption creates the need for new production, and therefore provides the conceptual, intrinsically actuating reason for production, which is the pre-condition for production. Consumption furnishes the impulse to produce, and also provides the object which acts as the determining purpose of production. If it is evident that externally production supplies the object of consumption, it is equally evident that consumption *posits* the object of production as a *concept*, an internal image, a need, a motive, a purpose. Consumption furnishes the object of production in a form that is still subjective. There is no production without a need, but consumption re-creates the need.” (Marx, 1993)

humanitarian issues while the common belief is that all the problems can only be solved by securing the incessant growth of the economy, particularly in a free market; to speak more precisely, in modern societies “there are only the needs of growth” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.65). Moreover, in the course of that development, an individual can no longer be active and rational more than demanding prosperous consumption (something that the capitalist seeks for too) and “there is no place for individual goals in the system; there is room only for the goals of the system” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.65).

The growth leads to more production in the capitalist workplace which subordinates and systematically disfavors the workers from the possibility of using their labor power in their own acts as any attempt of pushing the volition towards a rationally consistent act other than of consumption (its base is irrelevant here; it can be either an ideology, a religion, or a personal belief) can oppose the harmony in society due to the balance between production and consumption seeing that in production capitalism generates authority while in consumption the consumers rejoice their passive freedom and create profits for being more subordinated while among the passives the capitalist strengthens his ability to concretize his wants in the struggle for freedom. Thus, growth preserves the inequality of the stock in the favor of the status-quo and it appears as a function of inequality (Baudrillard, 1998, p.53).

On the other hand, this situation of inequality should not be confused with any ethical or moral judgment as it serves only to capitalism’s survival by preserving the ongoing advantageous circumstances in the struggle for freedom. If there were a way to preserve the freedom without disfavoring some groups, it might be implemented as well. However, if somebody wants to stay as the master, there must always be the slaves as Hegelian master-slave dialectic shows to us. That is to say: “There could not (in any society in anywhere) be privilege without penury. The two are structurally linked.” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.66)

Furthermore, in consumption the emergence of social-symbolic meanings deepens the revelation of the inequality as the social codes of the signs include the price as a visual aspect as Marx (1857) indicated in the example of London:

The busiest streets of London are crowded with shops whose show cases display all the riches of the world, Indian shawls, American revolvers, Chinese porcelain, Parisian corsets, furs from Russia and spices from the tropics, but all of these worldly things bear odious, white paper labels with

Arabic numerals and then laconic symbols £ s. d. This is how commodities are presented in circulation.

Hence, also the prices become an identity of the individual carrying the barcode and the price label on their clothing, shoes, watches, etc; in brief, although it has always been an indicative of the social status, consumption classifies people in more detailed hierarchies today. Moreover; in the company of the replacement of the impartialness of use-value (which induces no comparison) by the visible vanity of sign-value (labeling its porters with its identity of identicalness) the inequality in society has faded in and rigidified seeing that “all men are equal before objects as use-value, but they are by no means equal before objects as signs and differences, which are profoundly hierarchical” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.90).

In this quest, needs are the engine of the growth that preserves the status-quo by rewarding some in consumption and punishing some with (at least) depriving them of the abundance of consumer choices. Particularly, needs are the strings of the authority that tie the individuals and force them to turn into consumer-workers as “needs are only the most advanced form of the rational systematization of the productive forces at the individual level” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.75). Thus, by removing the rationality in consumption, capitalism implements another rationalism (that disfavors the rationalism of the individual in any exchange and supports the system) for its own maintenance that coerces the society to work for a future of affluence, for an absolute utopia of happiness seeing that the need is indefinable and ambivalent due to the manipulations in the aspect (eidos). Similarly Baudrillard (1998, p.53) rejects the idea that the modern society is affluent in consumerism by claiming:

There is not in fact – and never has been – any ‘affluent society’, any more than there is an indigent society, since every society of whatever kind and whatever the volume of goods produced or available wealth is geared both to a structural excess and a structural penury.

In the contrary, as the more the worker labors in the workplace, the more he loses his poiesis, his productive stock, his freedom; and he becomes more obliged to sacrifice himself in return of consumption for the freedom of the capitalist by means of generating profit through nurturing the cold-steel capital share. As the growth of the present organization of the human world continues, capitalism dominates in all domains of the quotidian by transforming individuals into executors of their own lives

and man continues unlevelling his conditions as “the capitalist system (and the productivist system in general) has been the culmination of that functional unlevelling, that inequality, by rationalizing it and generalizing it in all respects” (Baudrillard, 1998, p.53).

In brief, the capitalistic growth is not on the path of the egalitarian myth that distributes more happiness which can be measured in terms of wellbeing. However, it deepens the inequality in its incessant expansion by dominating the relation between the human being and materials as a mediator (or a merchant) in the commoditization of both as simultaneous as the simultaneity between consumption and production. Nevertheless, the domination is not complete and it has still obstacles in its quest. The next part will examine those difficulties in front of this consumptive bait of capitalism: the limits of irrational happiness through consuming with dissatisfaction and the destructiveness of consumerism.

4.3.3 New Boundaries to Growth

The process of the balance between consumption and production is a result of the rationality of the worker who seeks for the satisfaction as a result of the incompleteness of all the fulfillments. The worker demands more and accepts what the market gives as he has the trust to the consistency and productivity of the existing the human world under the hegemony of the capitalist. However, there are three problems: within an assumption of the satisfaction in consumption the first problem is the critique of Emile Durkheim offering the limits of satisfaction due to the physical limits of perception; the second is the possibility of distrust to the consumerism without satisfaction in the capitalized world as Baudrillard supported; and the last can be due to the increasing unlevelling in the social gap as the growth indispensably encourages the social inequality.

First, Emile Durkheim (1984) presumed the happiness rendered from consumption as he claimed that “he [man] is happier the more of them [industrial products] that he possesses” (Durkheim, 1984, p.179); namely, the more productive society is, the happier the people are. Moreover, this premise implicitly assumes consumption as a rational act and there is the fulfillment of the consumer in consumption or in purchasing as he is purposeful.

Durkheim lived between 1858 and 1917 when the consumerism was in its very early stages and mass consumerism was not introduced at the era in view of the fact that he wrote the book “The Division of Labor in Society” in 1893. Accordingly, it can be said that he made the assumption of rational consumption as the image consumerism was not a phenomenon among the masses. However, he foresaw a constraint relying on the psychology discussions of those days about happiness due to the perception which has an upper boundary as well as a lower one. He stressed arguments of Weber and Fechner in those contemporaneous discussions and he claimed one point among all:

The variations in intensity through which a sensation can pass extend between two limits. If the stimulus is too weak it is not felt. But if goes beyond a certain level, the increments it receives produce less and less effect, until they cease entirely to be noticed. (Durkheim, 1984, p.181)

This suggests the inconsistency of the premise that “happiness has increased regularly with it [growth], it would have to be able to increase indefinitely, or at least the stages of growth that are feasible for it should be proportionate to those that have gone before” (Durkheim, 1984, pp.180-181) as the excessive of consumption can have a diverse effect on the happiness as it may not be noticed at all after a certain level; this is a stage of saturation in consumption. However, Durkheim failed in predicting that the division of labor had arrived to its limits in his era as it enormously augmented in the 20th century. On the other hand, he was right to assert that as the rational boundaries of consumption were loosened so as to achieve the progressive path of capitalism as it introduced consumerism.

Second constraint in front of the capitalist consumerism is related to this excess of perception. As it was discussed, the conversion of consumption into an abstract level which is independent of any essential purpose results in the evisceration of the meaning while in the ambivalence of meaninglessness can be filled with any attribute on the visual aspect. Thus, the consumer, after reaching the limits of rational boundaries of happiness through the prosperous consumption, continues consumption in an irrational way as there is no more fulfillment and real happiness; but there exist the smiles of advertisements.

In this sense, the second constraint in front of the capitalist consumerism is obvious: evisceration of consumption and distrust to its promises. As the consumers are more

disappointed in consumption, which led to consume the consumption, the market will not be able to create more myths on the images and slogans. What's more, "if the consumption society cannot produce anymore myth, this is because it is its own myth" (Baudrillard, 1998, p.193). This myth is the affluence of society inflated with the functionless needs and booms of images; the survival of capitalism strictly depends on this disbelief seeing that "affluence does not exist, but it only has to make us believe it exists to be an effective myth" (Baudrillard, 1998, p.193).

Similarly, the last constraint is the reality of that simulative prosperous society; which is the great devastation of capitalism, and the poverty that it leads to. As capitalism nourishes the growth for maintaining his advantageous status, it expands a vast consumption for pushing the volition of the individuals so as to maintain the present organization of the human world seeing that the human world exists as long as one wishes to realize something, and it will continue growing through work as long as the human being continues to consume for his wishes. However, as in the path of the human world, within human activity, the world is the cumulative of the products of work due to the interests of the impetus. As the impetus is canalized by capitalism in the direction of consumerism so as to preserve the status-quo, it destroys everything for producing its meaningless placebos while it cumulates piles of garbage of which has once served to temporize the mobs for a while. As this is the devastation of capitalism for conserving its existence, it leads to greater poverty in all over the world in the company of its purposeful unlevelling ends⁴⁶.

Finally, as an additional constraint, the human consciousness (which has not been totally captivated yet in view of the fact that capitalism continues attempting to disable the activeness of man) still questions the path of capitalism like in this thesis. It is because although the capitalist detaches one from the external stock -including knowledge- there is also an internal stock which has been the source of the entire

⁴⁶ Those environmental and humane problems of the growth are pointed in Oxford Dictionary of Economics (1997, p. 205): "Unlimited growth poses problems over limited natural resources, pollution, and congestion. Only experience will reveal how long it is sustainable." Similarly, The New Palgrave (1988, vol. 3, p.433) emphasized the devastation and the negative effect of the capitalist growth: "There are certain costs directly associated with economic growth, such as pollution of the environment, loss of leisure, and longer journeys to work. All of these costs may rise as output expands, but they are not entered as negative items in compilation of GDP, and many contend that the apparent gains from the growth thus recorded are wholly or largely illusory." As it can be seen, those negative aspects of growth are excluded in its measurement.

contemporary the human world, and capitalism cannot attain to that level of detachment although it can make mobs to forget it. Thus, this thesis can be counted as its reminder.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In general, although innovation evokes as if it is the progress of technology, in this big picture it is obvious that the functionality is less important than the profitability in technology which is developed by innovation policies financed by leading great corporations. The main impetus of all innovation process turns into the need of growth in the struggle of great corporations for taking the core of the human world which is the ability of making tools consistent with volition. Thus, parallel to the human's tendency of improving his tools and conditions in nature, the great corporations take the role of the active cogitation and leave the execution to the mobs so as to direct them by transforming and merging them in an industrious society.

In this sense, process innovations exclude the workers from all the domain of cogitation while they subordinate the masses by the compromise of higher prosperity and consumption which deprives the society of any instrument of acting even in their activity for fulfilling their volitions. Moreover, this deprivation means also lacking the ability of making instruments as in the compromise in the workplace foresees a conduit of detaching the worker from the cogitation part of work while process innovations take his place with the motive of profit. This situation is convenient as the worker himself is an instrumentalized executer which can function with a human mind in the cycles designated by the management. Thus, the acceptance of the worker to acquire fulfillment of his volition in the consumption of the outcomes of the labor process under the control of the capitalist means transferring the ability of making instruments to the capitalist which also means transferring the power of labor, the ability of reconditioning man in nature (through producing instruments, concretizing and bringing forth something in the activity of utilizing the surroundings) to a master.

On the other hand, product innovations appear like a supplementary of the progress of the process innovations as the production is not sustainable without any demand. However, those innovations are not necessarily functional and they are mostly based

on reorganization of the existing technology as the essence of technology has disappeared in view of the fact that the human being has regressed in the domain of cogitation. While one can no more perceive the purposefulness of work, he can only conceive the use of an item from its visual aspects containing prior messages. Consequently, product innovations happen to be more a process of manipulating the existing technology so as to enlarge the demand in consumption. Moreover, product innovation takes the role of extending the market more as the domination of capitalism in the human world is more secured.

The duality between process and product innovations for conserving the status-quo through assisting the domination of capitalism in the human world is parallel to the dualism between production and consumption. However; in the capitalist mode of production, similar to the fact that production is not anymore for consumption, process innovations are not anymore to sustain the developed technology of creative product innovations. On the contrary, a manipulative course of product innovation continues as capitalism dominates more in the domain of both production and consumption. Hence, the human world as the product of the production-consumption cycle in capitalism reproduces the social obedience which favors the dominators in the struggle for freedom.

Finally, innovation in general sense serves only to one type of growth, in which technology is gradually less developed and disfavored (as the development of technology can induce a degree of activeness). This growth is a result of capitalist's hegemony on the propulsive activity of work so as to dominate the impetus-volition with which he can direct people due to his wants. On the other hand, this situation also seems parallel to the growth of capitalization of the human world as everything is treated as a commodity in any exchange. Although this kind of a growth can only temporize without satisfying human volition, it is not sustainable forever as it has its own limits. Captivating human volition through canalizing it in a simplex process of fulfillment cannot definitely appease the struggle for freedom, the center of this discussion.

In this organization of the human world, the freedom of the capitalist is not this process of control in the workplace like in the case of the master, but it is his ability to continue being active in society of industrious passive masses while he also seizes the

labor power of those masses for concretizing his wants. This situation is convenient with the fact that the conservation of the capitalistic authority in both the workplace and the quotidian is in the circular state of maintenance of the human world through unremittingly pushing the volitions of the masses forward while the management (as the executive department of authority) is in the obligation of perpetuating the production-consumption balance. In this sense, the management is not the capitalist as the management is another executer working for the freedom of the capitalist.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the capitalistic authority is not completely accomplished yet as it is still in process of extending. Capitalism has not intervened in all the relations between the human being and materials while it progresses in this quest. However, the impossibility of the complete transfer of power from the worker to the capitalist is obvious at that point as this relation between the human being and materials is not completely acquirable, and this freedom for which man is struggling is nothing more than an ideal.

Indeed, this struggle is a result of believing in the concept of unconditional freedom for concretizing any want although this belief is not even consistent in itself. Moreover, it is the source of the struggle for power as power serves the ability of being free and without freedom power has no sense while freedom includes power of doing in its meaning as well. Consequently, the one who seeks for freedom in the externals has to lose it to regain it as it is an ideal which has no possibility to be completely realized⁴⁷.

To sum up, this thesis is written to reflect the instrumentalization of technology in the process of conserving the status-quo through utilizing the logic of the strugglers for freedom. That is to say, technology in innovation is not anymore a tool of developing the freedom of individuals by facilitating their lives but it is to pacify them in their activities for freedom through captivating their volitions. However, the thesis does not take technology as the responsible of sustaining the authority of capitalism as technology is vapid to the process of its instrumentalization for authority's ends seeing that it can be used in diverse goals like washing clothes or recruiting an industrious society. It is the active user who attributes the real aim.

⁴⁷ At this point, for the author, detachment from nature is impossible as a belief since nature is not a sum of many but it is a unity like human is nature while nature is not an external.

REFERENCES

Ammer, Christine; Dictionary of Business and Economics (Free Press, New York; Collier Macmillan, London: 1984)

Arendt, Hannah; Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought (Penguin Books, New York: 2006)

Arendt, Hannah; The Human Condition (The University of Chicago Press; Chicago, London: 1998)

Baudrillard, Jean; The Consumer Society : Myths and Structures (Sage pub., London: 1998)

Berger, John; Ways of Seeing: A Book (British Broadcasting Corporation; Harmondsworth, Penguin, London: 1972)

Black, John; A Dictionary of Economics (Oxford University Press; Oxford, New York: 1997)

Bocock, Robert; Consumption (London; New York; Routledge: 1993)

Bowles, Paul; Capitalism (Pearson / Longman, New York: 2007)

Braverman, Harry; Labor and monopoly capital : the degradation of work in the twentieth century (New York : Monthly Review Press, 1998)

Butler, Rex; Jean Baudrillard : The Defence of the Real (Sage Publications, London: 1999)

Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy, the; edited by Robert Audi (Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, New York: 1995)

Corsini, Raymond J.; *The Dictionary of Psychology* (Brunner/Routledge, New York: 2002)

Dictionary.com (<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/cogitation>: 2010)

Durkheim, Emile; *The division of Labor in Society* (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.: 1947)

Emery, H.G & Brewster, K.G.; *The New Century Dictionary of the English Language, Volume 1* (D. Appleton-Century Company: 1946)

Encyclopedia Britannica
(<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/448405/peculium>: 2010)

Encyclopedia of Philosophy, the; edited by Paul Edwards; volume3 & volume8 (Macmillan, New York: 1967)

Encyclopedia of political economy; edited by Phillip Anthony O'Hara; volume 1 (Routledge / Taylor & Francis Group; London, New York: 1999)

Ennaji, Muhammed; *Serving the Master: Slavery and Society in Nineteenth-Century Morocco* (Macmillan Press Ltd, London: 1999)

Featherstone, Mike; "The Body in Consumer Culture" in Featherstone, M., Hepworth, M. & Turner, B. *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory* (Sage, London: 1991)

Fenoaltea, Stefano; *Slavery and Supervision in Comparative Perspective: A Model; The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 44, No. 3 (Sep., 1984), pp. 635-668* (Cambridge University Press: 1984)

Ford, Henry; *Today and Tomorrow* (Cambridge, Mass; Productivity Press: 1988)

Foster, Bellamy; *The Fetish of Fordism – Henry Ford's Economic Ideas in Monthly Review of March, 1988* (Monthly Review Press, New York: 1988)

Foucault, Michel; *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of Prison* (Vintage Books, New York: 1979)

Gatrell, V.A.C.; *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People in 1770-1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Heidegger, Martin; The Question Concerning Technology And Other Essays (Harper & Row, New York: 1977)

Levy, Sidney J.; "Symbols for Sale" Harvard Business Review, July-August 1959, Vol.37; pp. 117-124 (1959)

Lovejoy, Paul E.; Transformations in slavery : a history of slavery in Africa (Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Marx, Karl & Engels, Friedrich; Manifesto of the Communist Party; Chapter I: Bourgeois and Proletarians; first published in 1847;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/ch01.htm#007> (Marxist.org: 1987)

Marx, Karl; A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Appendix 1: Production, Consumption, Distribution, Exchange; first published by Progress Publishers, Moscow: 1859;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/>;
(Marxist.org: 1993)

Marx, Karl; Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 1; first published in Germany: 1867; <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/index.htm>
(Marxists.org: 1995)

Marx, Karl; Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, first published in 1932;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Economic-Philosophic-Manuscripts-1844.pdf> (Marxists.org: 2000)

Moffat, Donald W.; Economics Dictionary (Elsevier, New York: 1983)

Mullaney, Tim; Global Ad Spending to Fall in 2009;
(<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aZ2ysU0uRIYo&refer=home>: 2008)

New Palgrave, the: A Dictionary Of Economics; edited by John Eatwell, Murray Milgate, Peter Newman; volume 2 & volume 3 (Macmillan, London; Stockton Press, New York; Maruzen, Tokyo : 1987)

Robertson, S. Thomas; Consumer Behavior (Scott, Foresman and Company Glenview, Illinois: 1970)

Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy / general editor, Edward Craig; volume 3 (Routledge; London, New York: 1998)

Smith, Adam; An Inquiry Into The Nature And Causes Of The Wealth Of Nations With A Life Of The Author; first published by Thomas Nelson, Edinburgh: 1843; http://books.google.com/books?id=8k_K8rf2fnUC&dq=intitle:wealth+intitle:of+intitle:nations+inauthor:smith&source=gbs_navlinks_s (Google Books: 2008)

Taylor, F.W.; The Principles of Scientific Management; first published in 1911; http://books.google.com/books?id=4qM7yJKC_nkC&dq=The+Principles+of+Scientific+Management+forgotten+books&source=gbs_navlinks_s (ForgottenBooks.org: 2008)

Thompson, Paul; The Nature of Work: An introduction to debates on the labour process (The Macmillan Press Ltd., London: 1983)

Tunick, Mark; Punishment: Theory and Practice (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1992)

Wiedemann, Thomas; Greek and Roman Slavery (Croom Helm, London: 1981)

Zellen, Berry; Emerging Markets Drive Global Advertising Market Growth Past \$400B (<http://enterpriseinnovator.com/index.php?articleID=5660§ionID=269>: 2010)