

APPROACHING COMMUNICATION WITH MARX: ON THE SYMBOLIC
REPRODUCTION OF SOCIAL RELATIONS

by

Shannon K. Jacobs

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Communication
Boise State University

May 2015

© 2015

Shannon K. Jacobs

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the thesis submitted by

Shannon K. Jacobs

Thesis Title: Approaching Communication with Marx: On the Symbolic Reproduction
of Social Relations

Date of Final Oral Examination: 09 March 2015

The following individuals read and discussed the thesis submitted by student Shannon K. Jacobs, and they evaluated her presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Julie Lane, Ph.D. Chair, Supervisory Committee

Ed McLuskie, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Seth Ashley, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by Julie Lane, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The thesis was approved for the Graduate College by John R. Pelton, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

To Naomi Livingston and Franklin Jacobs for your unwavering support and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Julie Lane, for her support of my research. Her lessons inspired me as an undergraduate student, and she encouraged me to pursue my aspirations in the Boise State Graduate College, Department of Communication. I would also like to thank Dr. Seth Ashley for providing me with an insightful perspective on the field, challenging me to reflect deeper and examine these meanings from '40,000 feet above.' Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Ed McLuskie, for guiding me and believing in me. I appreciate the inspiration and the wisdom that you have extended to me. You gave me the courage to truly think and reflect.

ABSTRACT

This critical examination approaches communication with Marx to uncover the implications of the symbolic reproduction of social relations. The social reproduction of the past is characterized through an onset of parallel themes that run with depictions of the experience of people. Marxist inspired critical research illustrates the perpetuation of the internalization and normalization of ideological principles of the social sphere. Significance emerges from the dialectical questioning of the values and principles of the social. Overall, this collective reflection demonstrates the importance of the critical aspect in the current discussion of the dynamics of the social sphere.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Unpopular or Unknown?.....	2
Returning to Marx.....	5
REPRODUCING THE PAST: PART I.....	6
Marx and Ideology.....	6
Marx and Ideology.....	9
Marx and Social Relations	15
REPRODUCING THE PAST: PART II.....	17
The Relationship of People, Products, Production and Principles.....	17
People and the Material Forces of Production.....	17
The Division of Labor and the Social	19
Experience: The Contrast.....	23
Impact on Principles	25
Reproducing the Social Past	29
REPRODUCING THE PAST: PART III	31
Returning to Marx’s Parallel Themes of the Social.....	31

The Trade-Off: Ownership and Access	32
Internalization and Normalization	36
Retaining Marx	40
CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	44
REFERENCES	47

INTRODUCTION

The symbolic reproduction of social relations is characterized through an onset of parallel themes that run with depictions of the experience of class. Dialectically, these characterizations are inspired through the critical perspectives of Karl Marx. Marx is most known for his historic critiques of capitalism and the political economy. However, his influence goes beyond the economic realm usually associated with Marx. To say that his ideas about social life are taken for granted is an understatement. Marx's economic perspectives are interconnected to larger concepts of social life. Although Marx's works demonstrate a strong relevancy to the dynamics of the social world, the historic theoretical concepts he inspires lack attention in the current communication discussion. Despite this, it is notable that the historical and contemporary social issues that he influences are more applicable than ever, even though Marxian theory is virtually lost to communication studies.

As the textbooks have it, Karl Marx is noted as an original voice in the discipline of the critique of the social. "Marxism is clearly the originating branch of critical theory. Marx taught that the means of production in society determines the nature of society" (Littlejohn & Foss 2005, p. 46). Although Marx's significance is widely known through his inspiration of German philosophers and sociologists of the Frankfurt School, he has also inspired many other scholars. As a founding contributor to critical theory, Marx reemerges through this examination of the sphere of social relations.

Although Marx is not completely forgotten, his significance is not fully realized. Marx is too often cited for his influence in the political and economic realms. In a sense, he is limited within these topics of discussion. However, he contributes much more, acknowledging the bigger picture of historical social relations. Marx encompasses an overarching view of communication, thereby characterizing the dynamics of the social world. Marx illustrates the prevailing ideology of the sphere of social relations. This ideology is founded upon the internalization and normalization of a relationship between people, products, productions and principles. His theories shed light on the historical perpetuation of social themes. His theoretical perspective offers an unabbreviated and ubiquitous scope of communication. The field, however, at best chooses to acknowledge fragmented dimensions of his philosophy.

Unpopular or Unknown?

Why is Marxian theory confined within the economic disciplines? More importantly, why is Marx not apparent in the discussion of communication? Because Marx provides a historical critique of social relations, it is all the more ironic that he is seemingly absent in the inquiry of communication studies altogether.

Many scholars blame the decline of attention to intellectual figures such as Marx on the nation's educational institutions. James (2006) makes such a point regarding communication education, when discussing the reception of Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*. She attributes this Marxist scholar's declining reception to "the dumbing down of American higher education and the commodification of learning" (p. 18). The critique of commodification in learning applies to communication studies, she argues, explaining how Marxist scholars such as Marcuse simply 'fell out of favour' (James, 2006, p. 18).

This aspect is generalized to the lack of attention in critical theory altogether. Over the past decades, we have seen the education system lean towards more of a 'for profit' capitalist nature. James includes that the "political economy and the critique of capitalism fall by the wayside as tiresome, dry, and retro in the worst sense of the word" (2006, p. 18-19). She notes that the typical higher education student knows little to nothing about Marcuse or critical communication studies. altogether. The same can be said about the sparse attention to Marx in communication studies. Chapters Two and Three elaborate how the notions of the social experience often fail to account for the internalization of dominant ideology. As a result, the study of society and communication are over passing the critical dimensions of social significance.

Another example of the lack of attention to Marx is the apparent stigma. The inherent criticism of the everyday assumptions of society deems Marx unpopular with the masses. It is not surprising that Marx is not in discussion within culture. With the fear of Communism and the perceived threat to freedom, citizens have stayed away from the stigma of Marx. However, this was not always so. Historically, Zinn's *A People's History of the United States* shows some of the clashes during the rise of union movements. "A meeting in New York at Cooper Institute in late 1873, organized by trade unions and the American section of the First International (founded in 1864 in Europe by Marx and others), drew a huge crowd, overflowing into the streets" (Zinn, 2005, p. 243). Moreover, we cannot ignore the Red Scare and the radical events after the Second World War. Although the influence of war spurred an interest in Communication with social propaganda, it also reinforced American values, and undermined its questioning. "Psychological warfare programs helped shape mass communication research into a

distinct scholarly field” (p. 3). However, Simpson (1994) adds, “the story of their impact on this aspect of academe has been largely forgotten or suppressed” (p. 5). While there are many cases made about the taming of communication inquiry and theory, the consequence puts Marx out of favor in contemporary society and in communication studies.

Despite the lack of attention and stigmatization, Marxian theory remains relevant to the uncovering of contemporary social problems. The political debate over Marxism is not the main focus of this thesis, however. It is the interpretation of Marx from a social standpoint, to highlight Marx as a social theorist. In doing so, it is recognizing Marx as a contributor to communication theory and research. Although there may not be a direct solution to the social issues of society, it is valuable to promote a general awareness through a Marxian critique. As Hardt (1992) states, “the extraordinary intellectual diversity of Western Marxism after the Second World War, marks an essential encouragement of social theory in general” (p. 7). Specifically, Hardt writes, “The fate of communication research in the United States may well rest in its ability to recover its sense of history” (Hardt, 1992, p. 8). The focus on the critique of the social through Marx is a way to bring to light the taken for granted assumptions of the social world. The following chapters explore the analysis of Marx in the field of communication and society. Chapter One addresses the notion of ideology in relation to society. Chapter Two explores the significant relationship of people, products, production and principles in light of the critical uncovering of the reproduction of social themes. Chapter Three examines the experience of the middle class to illustrate the parallel structuring of ideology and the Marxian implications of the state of the social sphere of relations.

Returning to Marx

The symbolic reproduction of the past is characterized through the rendering of dialectical reflection. This perspective reflects the overall importance of the critical paradigm in Communication. Marx's critical scope is useful to uncover social aspects of Communication. This perspective encompasses a broad view of the world, examining society as a whole and its thematic intersections of meaning. Although Marx's perspective focuses on the large-scale social views, it can be applied dialectically in ways to uncover specific problems across different dimensions. Critical theory is extensive and can be useful across academia and to specific, more practical issues. This approach with Marx, symbolizes the acute value of the critical element and the overall importance of Communication. The communication field is extensive, bridging academic studies, and platforms with the consistent focus on the impact of social interests and relations. This aspect is relevant in all discussions of and within society. The significance of the inspiration of Marx within this reflection begins with an analysis of ideology. Retaining Marx's notions collectively exposes a larger examination of society. He uses economic views to shape his ideological perspective of human life. Marx's historic analysis is valuable to the communication field, encompassing an unabridged diagnosis of the social sector.

REPRODUCING THE PAST: PART I

Marx and Ideology

First, we must recognize Marx as a contemporary communication scholar. Illuminating the links of the reproduction of the past signifies a relevant scope of the present perspective of the scope of social relations. Marx not only symbolizes the reflection of the social, but also the direction of humanity. Historically, Marx's works can be used to characterize the communication environment through renditions of class distinction. As a primary element of the social relations in society, this aspect can be used to represent the significance that Marx has in the field of Communication.

Calling attention to Marxian theory in the communication field is not new. Historically, communication scholars have drawn on Marx in times of social reform. For example, The Frankfurt School represents a group of theorists that are inspired by Marx. "The members of the school believed in the need for integration among disciplines... in order to promote a broad social philosophy or critical theory capable of offering a comprehensive examination of the contradictions and interconnections in society" (Littlejohn & Foss, 2008, p. 47). Frankfurt intellectuals Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse represent some key members of the Frankfurt School, inspired by Marx.

Horkheimer and Adorno expose, in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1972), the distortions of ideology that are produced through culture in society. With Marx in mind, they specifically focus on the influence and consequences the industry of culture as a

forthcoming aspect of the social world. Horkheimer and Adorno present a “general sense of progressive thought” through the ‘concept of enlightenment’ (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972, p. 3). The implications of their perspective overall relate the Marxian roots of the critique of the social.

Another Frankfurt intellectual, Marcuse, elaborates a Marxist-inspired critique of the social through the perpetuation of ‘one dimensional thought.’ Marcuse points out the repetitive themes of the social. He calls attention to the implications behind these themes, and the general acceptance of society. Specifically, Marcuse criticizes the lack of social criticism, through a Marxian inspired perspective. Collectively, they each contribute a critique of the social realm, extending the influence of Marxian theory.

Although this discussion lacks adequate attention, other scholars do recognize Marx as an insightful contributor to notions of communication. Although part of a smaller majority, more recently, scholars are recognizing the potential impact that Marx has in the communication field. More recently, Fuchs (2013) calls attention to Marxian theory in the American contemporary communication environment. He points out the 2008 economic crisis and the ‘renewed interest’ of Marx. Specifically, Fuchs offers an interpretation of capitalism through the lens of Marx. Simultaneously, he connects Fornäs’ book *Capitalism: A Companion to Marx’s Economy Critique as a ‘Companion’* to Marx’s critique of the economy. In addition, Fuchs (2013) connects with Fornäs’ perspective as a way of understanding Marx’s approach to communication and society.

“Fornäs stresses that Marx’s method is focused on understanding ‘capitalism as a totality’ (p. 13) and that today’s academia is (not just in economics!) so much dominated and shaped by business and management studies that ‘[n]obody looks at the totality

anymore' (p. 8). Marx reminds us of the importance to critically engage with the large power structures that shape our lives" (Fuchs, 2013, p. 295). Fuchs (2013) points out Fornäs' view of Marx and the overall relevance of critical theory. Fuchs demonstrates the value of emphasizing Marx and the application of his perspectives to the communication field.

In another way, Fuchs (2010) reinforces the focus on Marx through his own interpretations and the patterns of the social through a demonstration of a systematic representation of Marxian theory and how it relates to communication. Specifically Fuchs calls on the influence of Marx in the media. Fuchs approaches the goals of the media from a historical perspective:

A goal of the media industry is to decrease the share of variable and constant capital in order to increase profit rates. This is partly achieved by rationalization and automation of media products. Unequal market conditions, organization structures, class struggles, different levels of innovation, rates of the division of labor, rates of surplus value, and so on, cause different fixed costs, wages, and productivity in media corporations. (Fuchs, 2010, p. 21)

Fuchs (2010) discusses the significance of the media in critical communication studies. He contrasts the media's capitalist structuring with an alternative solution. Reinforcing Marx, he delivers the vision of a public entity that "should be noncommercial and nonprofit in order not to become corrupted by capitalist pressures" (Fuchs, 2010, p. 32). This rendition of Marx is unique in that it intertwines the historical concept of the media with that of contemporary capitalist structuring to foster a view of communication. Fuchs uses Marx's precedent to analyze the historical perpetuation of social themes within the rationalization of the media structure.

Similarly, Fuchs (2010) relates Marxist theory to the critique of the media structure, anchoring Marx in the contemporary communication environment. Too often,

scholars only recognize the influence of Marxist theory in a singular dimension. For example, “Marxist theory is called the critique of the political economy” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 46). However, Marx transcends the economic and political realm, offering a critique of the social. Fuchs (2010) demonstrates one way that Marxian theory can be applied in different proportions with his insightful comprehension of Marx and the media. Similarly, Marxian theory can be applied to uncover other social themes, such as the preservation of ideology.

The interpretation of Marx stipulates that the state of social relations relies primarily on ideological connections. Uncovering the themes highlights the reproduction of principles throughout time. The contemporary world carries historical significance in the symbolic sense of ideology. Although many themes exist within this structuring, it is first important to explore the implications that are bound within repetitive patterns of the social. Representing the constant ideological relationship between social concepts, Marx inspires a particular enlightenment of the social. Linking the past, present and the future, this analysis emphasizes the scope of ideology.

Marx and Ideology

In connecting Marx to the contemporary communication environment, we cannot ignore the relationship of ideology. It is necessary to point out the significance of ideology in Marx’s terms, because it represents the primary social theme of reproduction. The interconnection between the past and the present is more than just a linear arrangement. Today is a thematic reproduction of the past. The absent echo of Marx in the discussion of communication today and then is not just a simple coincidence. Theoretically, Marx points out the preservation of ideology throughout time.

In a way, Marx recognizes the social consequences that accompany the ideological structuring of society. This concept is illuminated through the examination of the structuring of social relations in society. Figuratively, we can think of the demonstration of Fuchs resurfacing the enlightenment of Marx through the connection of concepts past and present alike. It is a symbolic representation of the distinction of ideology within Marxian theory. It lays the groundwork for an important indication of ideology as a recurring social theme.

Marx contributes a theoretical framework for understanding communication and the structures in which we relate to one another. The implication of the concept of ideology is important here because it represents the principles of the social. It is not just about what Marx defines as ideology. It is more about the way in which it operates within the social experience.

The power and the influence of ideology are not easily understood. Interpreting ideology from a standpoint within communication theory can be difficult. The diversity of the field defines it in many different ways. But, "For Marx, ideology is the expression of dominant class interests and the attempt to control the dominated" (Fuchs, 2010, p. 31). These are the everyday assumptions that dictate the relations of the social. Marx's interpretation of ideology grounds him within the praxeology of critical communication theory. Here, Marx's standpoint bases his perspective of the social on the ideological premise of the dominant interests. Ideology produces the unquestioning and general acceptance of the so-called 'free' world. Ideology's significance in the social structure defines its complexity. Marx simplifies its terms of social relations:

The abstraction, or idea, however, is nothing more than the theoretical expression of those material relations that are their lord and master. Relations can be

expressed, of course, only in ideas, and thus philosophers have determined the reign of ideas to be the peculiarity of the new age, and have identified the creation of free individuality with the overthrow of this reign. The error was all the more easily committed, from the ideological standpoint, as this reign exercised by the relations (this objective dependency, which, incidentally, turns into certain definite relations of personal dependency, but stripped of all illusions) appears within the consciousness-of individuals as the reign of ideas, and because the belief in the permanence of these ideas, i.e. of these objective relations of dependency, is of course consolidated, nourished and inculcated by the ruling classes by all means available. (Marx, 1858, as cited in Marx, Engels, & La Haye, 1979, p. 107)

Because the premise of ideology is tied directly to the social, it becomes a part of the perception of the social system in which we live. Essentially society operates on a socially divided framework. The split of interests is counteracted with the illusion of opportunity. The consequences that are brought on by the ideological split of interests within the social produce diametrically opposed realities. Dominant interests are hidden within the very ideal of possibility. They are enabled through this principle, thereby stripping the lower interest of its substance. The dependency that is projected on the lower interests dilutes the meaning of possibility. It is not to be asserted that the value of possibility is inherently false. Instead, it is the stark difference of the position of the concept in relation to the dominant interests and lower interests. For lower interests, possibility is subtracted from the dependency of dominant interests. This social equation acts as a metaphor for the division of interests. Historically this proportion is reproduced, thereby preserving the maxim that is ideology.

Another dimension of ideology is found within aspects of hegemony. As a part of the continuing effort to connect ideology and hegemony, one of the central critiques of Marx (and critical communication studies) can be used to demonstrate the social reaction to the stipulation of dependency. Discussed previously, the public's denial of dependency

(dominant and lower class denial) can be referenced to the altogether lack of attention to Marx. Despite its cause, the impact of this reaction compromises the concept of hegemony. This general response is tied to the social contract, as Gramsci understood it, as hegemony. Hegemony is consent supplied by those dominated in society. Fuchs highlights the scholarly link of Marx and Gramsci, who is academically credited with originating the notion of hegemony.

The Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci added to Marx's theory of ideology; he offered the insight that ideology is not simply imposed by dominant groups on the dominated, but that the latter also agree to domination by refusing to resist, by hoping to gain advantages by supporting domination, or by not seeing through the presented lies so that, as a result, they consent to their own oppression. Gramsci has used the term "hegemony" in this context. (Fuchs, 2010, p. 32)

Hegemony represents a connection to ideology. The complexity of ideology is often misconstrued because of the symbolic hegemonic implications found within the split of interests. The connection of ideology and hegemony is further illustrated by Žižek (2012). He sees the social as "the ideological hegemony indispensable to the reproduction of capitalist relations of production" (p. 116). The ideological link to hegemony is distinguished through a relationship that generally runs beneath the surface of our social interactions, but taking on a symbolic form. Specifically, the notions of hegemony and ideology mutually define each other, reproducing and projecting the sphere of the social and its interests.

Another important concept within the discussion of ideology is the distinction of theory. Substantially this rendition marks the discrepancy of theory and practice (ideology). It is important to distinguish the concept of ideology from theory to better understand the relation of the social structure and communication. Compare this Marxian definition of ideology to the way we internalize academic themes. A key perspective is

articulated through the relationship of theory and ideology. For example, the way we interpret ideology is distinct from the way we interpret theory. These concepts are related, but they are not the same. Although we may live and breathe ideology, much of the action is in the interpretations we uncritically take on. Theory is an examination of such blind-spotted interpretation. Although change and revolution directly originate from theoretical concepts, they transcend the realm of theory through transformative action. Many scholars define theory as a way of organizing experience and directing attention. Here, theory is implied to be something that is used for understanding, thereby guiding our actions. Theory is rooted within ideology because it represents a tool for social navigation. Theory represents a perspective that we use in attempt to understand our social structures. However, in a sense, ideology presents a perspective that transcends theory. Ideology represents that which is practical. Society is guided by this hegemonic platform of ideology.

Where theory represents an alternative way of thought with the potential of a critical dimension, ideological principles transcend theoretical ideals through the embodiment of the social. It is what is practiced, unquestioned, defining the way social life should be. “Practical discourse abounds in such metadiscursive commonplaces, which are important in everyday life for all sorts of pragmatic functions” (Craig, 1999, p. 70). Although Craig promotes his perspective of ‘dialectical-dialogical coherence’ or the push for the alignment of theories as informed perspectives within the communication field, his view can be used to exemplify the problematic notions of ideology. He aims for “reconstructing the traditions of communication theory” in order to exemplify a “practice relevance” (Craig, 1999, p. 71). Craig’s notions seem to undermine theory’s

representation as an alternative way of thought and promote ideals ideology instead. His perspective is insightful, however, as he highlights the significance of 'practical discourse' through the illusionary assumption of ideology (practice) and theory. Ultimately, though, he presents his theory in favor of ideological practice through practical aspiration that reinforces the impact of ideology.

Where theory symbolizes a cognitive tool of the social, ideology is a definer of the social. Too often, we intertwine these two concepts, illustrating the direct influence that ideology takes on. Dominant interests reflect the illusion of ideology interconnected as a social synonym of theory. Marx acknowledges the power of ideology in the ways that it can paralyze us, and blind us from the reality in which we live. Casting an illusionary perspective of the structure of society, ideology represents the unquestioning normalization of the social.

Although the interpretation of Marx represents theory, it establishes an alternative rendering of ideology outside of the normalized patterns. He reconstructs the distinction of theory and ideology to highlight the historical impact of its confusion. Socially, ideology has been reproduced throughout time through social relations. Theories survive as well, but they do not collectively represent the interests of society as a whole. Ideology's encompassing of these dominant interests is thematic to the continual reproduction of the past.

Overall, Marx's inherent notions of ideology and social relations run parallel within the critical theory of communication. Examining specific Marxian concepts bring a valuable understanding of social significance. More importantly, it represents the diverse ways in which Marx is relevant to the communication field. Ideology's historic

phenomenon and its relationship to Marxian theory can be used to illuminate other important social themes in the contemporary communication environment.

Marx and Social Relations

Marx's structuring of ideology leads directly into the critique of the social. Expanding on Fuchs (2010) rendering of Marx and the media brings forth the Marxian influence in the articulation of the sphere of social relations. Fuchs raises two important conclusions from his interpretation of Marx. His first point notes the circulation sphere. Essentially Fuchs touches on the contriving of value for the 'products' that are produced. He includes the means of production into the value of a product. However, "surplus value is generated by unpaid labor. Capitalists do not pay for the production of surplus, therefore the production of surplus value can be considered as a process of exploitation" (Fuchs, 2010, p. 18). Marx relates the concept of surplus value to accumulation. Fuchs goes on to say, "Marx did not apply the notions of concentration and centralization directly to the media and culture industry but spoke of a general development tendency of capitalism" (Fuchs, 2010, p. 18). The process of capital accumulation from the Marxist viewpoint can be directly tied to social relations. Fuchs uses the media as an example of the capitalist relations of the social. The Marxist concept of ideology can also be used to construct a powerful demonstration of the social critique.

Ideology's influence is a product of social relations and a determiner. Gramsci's concept of hegemony reinforces this point. Ideology's forging of consent is not without consequence. The social involvement within this process generates a lasting effect. First, it produces the value of moral justification within society. The social involvement of ideology represents a labor, and a means of production. Society's reciprocation is evident

here. As a social routine, we reproduce ideology through simple acceptance, or hegemonic practices, with a lack of reflection and questioning. Surplus value is derived by sustaining the evolution of ideological principles. Ideology is thereby a product of social relations.

Ideology is the suppression of reasoning within the structuring of society. The historical rendering of Marxian theory is useful to uncover the contemporary problems we so often overlook. Specifically, Marx's ideas illustrate the sphere of social relations through the distinction of individuals. Separately, the implications that run parallel with this theme highlight different characteristics of society. However, it is important to keep in mind the reproductive scheme of social relations. Despite the passing of time and technological advancements, the relationship of people has not changed. The characterization of people and ideology is made clearer through the link to the forces of production. The sphere of social relations is the organization of people through the process of production. Collectively the aspects of the social stand as symbolic indications of the continual reproduction of the past.

REPRODUCING THE PAST: PART II

The Relationship of People, Products, Production and Principles

The implications of the symbolic reproduction of themes render an overall insight of the sphere of social relations. The Marxist perspective applies ideology as an unexamined rationale for the structuring of society. Familiar themes reemerge through repetitive patterns of the social. The interconnections between these themes represent the overarching ideology of the reproduction of the past. The complexity of the structure is defined through an originating relationship between people, products, production and principles. Collectively these themes symbolize the historic preservation of social relations. The social structure is defined through the ideological relationship between people, products, production and principles. These themes carry a weight and significance that encompasses a multidimensional view of communication. Marx carves this perspective, inspiring scholars to interpret an enlightenment of social relations, creating a link between the past, present, and future.

People and the Material Forces of Production

Fundamentally, the social structure represents a relationship between people and the material forces of production. As a key concept in approaching communication with Marx, the context of the structure is defined through the relations of production driving everyday life. It is applied through the normalization of the human experience. On a basic level, Marx identifies transportation as a defining force of material products. Revisiting

Fuchs, we can examine the impact of the circulation of products on relations of the social. Drawing on Marx, Fuchs uses the example of the media to highlight the process of the circulation of products.

The role of the media in the circulation process is on one hand the sale of transmission capacities. On the other hand they play a role on a more general level at which they are used for accelerating the circulation of commodities and reducing the turnover time of capital. (Fuchs, 2010, p. 28)

Inspired by Marx, Fuchs points out the mode of acceleration in the process of circulation. The transportation of goods in the sphere of production marks a technological achievement. As an advancement, production offers “a dialectical relationship of technology and society” (Fuchs, 2010, p. 25). Technology can be used inversely with the ideas of products with its global character. In addition, it symbolizes the impact it has on the social. Our society places high value on technology and products in demand. More importantly, we elevate the overall reduction of time. This concept spills over into many facets of society, from fast food restaurants to instant text messaging. In the sphere of production, it is no different, and is of equal value. As part of this relationship, society normalizes the superiority of convenience that products and technology bring. The relations of production demonstrate the impact that this has on people.

Fuchs shows that a symbol of the Marxist relations of production is the circulation sphere. As before, Fuchs describes a system of capital accumulation. Fuchs demonstrates the Marxist ‘circulation sphere’ through the connection of Marx and the notion of media. This aspect constructs the acceleration and continual reproduction that is happening within the social. Even more, he illustrates how the Marxist view of production can be applied as a representation of social relations. This discussion of production transcends the traditional economic realm. It is more than just the equation of the sphere of

production. Although we begin with this basic structuring, the overall significance of this relationship is summarized through the connection of people and material forces. “In the sphere of production, the value of the necessary labor and means of production are added to the product” (Fuchs, 2010, p. 18). Meaning is derived from our role as a part of this process. Labor is highlighted as a major theme in the Marxist view. It bridges the gap between people, products and production. By this, I mean to highlight two overlapping themes of the divide of labor and society. Altogether, this representation is crafted with a Marxist scope of communication in mind. This examination serves to emphasize the ideological concepts that are reproduced over time. Specifically, this aspect can be illustrated through the division of labor and its impact on the social sphere.

The Division of Labor and the Social

The social sphere is characterized through a social arrangement based on the division of labor. “In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank” (Marx & Engels, 1848, p. 6). Marx and Engels (1848) depict a historical social order. They point out the continuous reproduction of “new conditions of oppression, and new forms of struggle in place of the old ones” (Marx & Engels, 1848, p. 6).

Marx and Engels present a view of a society, split in half through the division of labor and the social. This rendition can be used to compare the similarities between the societal past and the current environment. Historically, society has been divided. The implications of the divide carry a significance that extends beyond the nature of work and into the everyday lives of people. The split thereby results in a structuring of classes. Socially, the class system exists as a means of justification of the organization of people.

This premise guides overarching principles and represents a macro view of the modes of the organization that exists within society. Specifically, the focus on the theme of the division of labor and people carves a perspective of the sphere of social relations. The state of social relations relies primarily on the significance of class directly through the organization of production and its relationship with human labor. The division of labor is significant because it is reproduced and preserved throughout history. The perpetuation of the division of labor substantiates the projection of the organization, and the overall division of the social.

Labor and production are essential elements of the social, available for critique of these driving forces that connect people and products. The divided structuring of the labor system is reflected through everyday life. We are separated by our labor in such a way that it determines possibility and limitation. In turn, this division shapes our reality. Craig and Muller (2007) provide insight to Marx and Engels' 1845 articulation of ideology: "life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life" (p. 433-434). This division is normalized in a manner so that it creates a representation of who we are socially. Because the division of labor and the division of the social run parallel, its implications cannot be ignored. Its impact on reality creates a critical distinction in the everyday experiences of people. The embodiment of this ideology is evidenced through its prevalence of the phenomenon of contrast in the quality of life among people through the division of labor. Although I present a mere depiction of social relations, this discussion does correlate to many social issues of the past, present and future. The division of labor is just part of the larger hegemonic scheme, exemplifying the taken for

granted aspects we continually misinterpret as 'ordinary'. The architecture of the already established system is directly tied to its preservation throughout history.

The continual presence of the division of labor is not meaningless. It represents an ideology central to society. Through Craig and Muller's (2007) articulation of Marx and Engels (1845) we see how a split is forced upon the working class, and reinforced by the ruling ideology. The symbolism of theme of the social divide evidences its reproduction and overall preservation. However, the power behind this implication is witnessed through the economic production performed by the majority of the working class. Here lies the distinction and characterization within the divide. This concept is then justified through its normalization. The division of labor generates a myriad of experiences that are so unlike and dissimilar. As divided members of society, we are left with only two things in common. If not for our own humanity, we would be left with only an understanding of the underlying premise of the social realm; we come to know that nothing is free, and you must work hard to be successful. Although the ultimate internalization of this implication reaches into far greater realm, its influence as a widespread belief and principle should not be ignored. This ideology is what is driving the overall normalization of the established system. In turn, this normalization is perpetuated, as a reproduction of the social divide throughout history.

The distinction of working and dominant classes is made clearer through direct characterizations of experience. The experience of people is really the experience of production. The divide within the system is defined through the social experience and is maintained through the ideological structuring of society. The working class participates as active members of production to gain a wage to support his or herself. Thus,

knowledge is constructed through the ideology of division of labor. The relationship of people and material forces is shown through the implications that it has on our principles. The system is maintained through its normalization. The division of labor is a defining feature of the social structure because it is preserved throughout time. The account of the experiences of people further demonstrates the impact of the divide.

Reality is shaped through the experience of the division of labor. We come to know the world through our position within the social system. This ideology is ultimately maintained through interaction and the experience of the working class. However, this ideology is initially enforced through the projection of the ruling class. The distinction of the experience of people can be defined through the articulation of the role of labor in production:

The division of labour...manifests itself also in the ruling as the division of mental and material labour so that inside this class one part appears as the thinkers of the class (its active, conceptive ideologists, who make the perfecting of the illusion of the class about itself their chief source of livelihood), while others' attitude to these ideas and illusions is more passive and receptive because they are in reality the active members of this class and have less time to make up illusions and ideas about themselves. (Marx & Engels, 1845, as cited in Craig & Muller, 2007, p. 435)

Marx and Engels characterize the difference of experience between the social through the critical split of 'mental' and 'material' labour. This portrayal of production signifies a separation in the overall qualities and conditions of life between particular social experiences. In turn, the separation results in such a way in which knowledge is then materialized. This premise is the overall guiding basis for the direct classification of the social. The state of social relations is tied directly to the modes of production. Fuchs illustrates the direct connection through the Marxian circulation sphere.

In the circulation sphere...labour power is separated from the means of production, “the mass of the people, the labourers... as nonowners, come face to face with nonlaborers as the owners of these means of production.” (Marx & Engels, 1958, as cited in Fuchs, 2010, p. 17)

The elements of production represent the driving forces of the separation within the social. Because the division of labor runs parallel with the division of the social, it can be evidenced through characterizations of experience. The stark contrast of the conditions of living highlights the connection.

Experience: The Contrast

The different accounts of the experience of people represent the polarized dyad of the social. The contrast of life can be made clearer through the conditions of the material laborers of the working class. Harrington (1981) depicts a divided nation of first and second-class citizens. He focuses on the latter symbolizing what he terms as the ‘Other America’. His description serves as a means of illuminating the growing disparity between the social classes.

Thus in the society of abundance and high standards of living there is an economically backward sector which is incredibly capable of being exploited; it is unorganized, and in many cases without the protection of Federal law. It is in this area that the disabled, the retarded, and the minorities toil. In Los Angeles, they might be Mexican-Americans, in the runaway shops of West Virginia or Pennsylvania, white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. All of them are poor; regardless of race, creed or color, all of them are victims. (Harrington, 1981, p. 25)

Harrington criticizes the established system, blaming the contrast on the unequal distribution of standards of life. “In every crucial area – food, housing, education and other social responsibilities – the United States provides its worst-off citizens only a percentage of what they desperately need” (Harrington, 1981, p. iv). The ‘Other America’ represents the contrast in the way of life for many people. The division of labor creates

the distinction of conditions. Harrington warns of a 'hereditary underclass' in which "children of the poor will become fathers and mothers of the poor" (Harrington, 1981, p. xxii). This then begs the question of the perpetuation of inequality. The discussion of the experience of people within the division of labor hones in on the issues surrounding the concentration of wealth. The 'Other America' symbolizes the widening gap of the social classes.

As shown, the divide in social relations resembles the sphere of production. Although the experience of the hierarchy of the social system exposes the inequalities, we must continue to question its perpetuation, as the impact is signified through its preservation throughout time. Piketty (2014) directs the focus towards the discussion of capital accumulation, as he discusses the perpetuation and maintenance of contrast within the divide.

"Do the dynamics of private capital accumulation inevitably lead to the concentration of wealth in ever fewer hands, as Karl Marx believed in the nineteenth century" (Piketty, 2014, p. 1)? The accumulation of capital is important here because it defines the further divide of the social. It is not just about income, as capital solidifies the division within the social. This can be made clearer through the positioning of those that benefit from the system of production. "Conversely, within 'the 1 percent,' it is labor income that gradually becomes supplementary, while capital increasingly becomes the main source of income" (Piketty, 2014, p. 281). Specifically, we are facing a dilemma of sustainment. Although the accumulation of capital seemingly concerns the dominant class interests, it affects all. Regardless of class, members of the social are posed with the same understanding of its importance. The influence of the accumulation of capital

represents a concrete objective. For the 'Other America' capital symbolizes striving for a better life. For the dominant class, it is all about continuing and expanding capital. The relationship of people and production centers on this objective of capital. Although a small percentage of people may actually obtain it, the reality of each experience is affected by it in some way. Despite the vast differences of the experience of everyday life brought on by the division of labor, the contrast is undermined by the overall commonality of the influence of capital. The presence of capital in the experience leads into the discussion of principles. Altogether, this analysis represents the historic preservation of social relations through the defined connection of people, products and production. The concept of principles further illustrates the experience of people in this regard and the complexity of the structure of the social.

Impact on Principles

The discussion of the distinction of the social leads into the impact on principles. The complexity of the structure addresses principles in relation to the overall social scheme of production. Although the experiences of people are different through an acute contrast, a defining element exists as an element of likeness among normative principles. This ramification demonstrates complexity and ties back to the overall Marxian articulation of ideology. Thus, the discussion of principles ties back to the relationship of people, products and production.

Normative principles are interwoven within the social framework of society and in direct relation to ideology. These principles are reproduced throughout time and exist as a product of ideology. Like the past, today we reproduce a vision of the ideology of the division of labor. Specifically, it is taken for granted as a reproduction of principles. The

day to day functioning of the social system is maintained through principles. Members of all classes make sense of the world through the internalization of principles. This thereby establishes and reproduces the general passivity and unquestioning of the system of social relations. In turn, principles play a major part in the experience of the everyday lives of the members of society, bridging the connection of the social relations and production.

This concept can be exemplified through the historical and contemporary critical works in communication. First, we can explore principles from the standpoint of Marcuse. He approaches this analysis from the historical standpoint of a matter of 'needs'.

We may distinguish both true and false needs. 'False' are those which are superimposed upon the individual by particular social interests... Their satisfaction might be most gratifying to the individual, but happiness is not a condition that has to be maintained and protected. (Marcuse, 1964, p. 4-5)

If we consider principles from the point of view of human needs, we may be able to uncover hidden aspects. Marcuse's point of view is important to consider, because of the mass absorption of false needs. In this way, Marcuse demonstrates the impact on principles by questioning the necessity of the societal agenda. The concept of false needs represents a viewpoint that can be used on a macro and micro level. For example, from the macro level, false needs can be applied from the institutional standpoint. The communication field continually examines the values society places on technology. Redefining traditional notions of availability, we bear the weight of the principle of expectation. We are one dial away to reach, or better yet, one text message away to get a hold of. This macro view of technological availability can even be used in conjunction at the micro level as well. On the micro level, we may use this concept to question ourselves. As a reflective lens Marcuse's false needs can reveal characteristics of who we

are individually, not just on a societal level. For instance, at times, we may be tempted to feed into what we call 'upgrades'. I can refer to new versions of technology as in this case. It is not just about being available anymore. There are additional false needs that we must adhere to as well. It is as if being available is insufficient. We internalize the false need of the newest edition of the latest technology as well. There are numerous concrete examples that can illustrate this point. Nevertheless, we can use Marcuse's overall perspective of false to guide us through the contemporary concepts ahead.

Another historical view worth taking into consideration would be the dialectic visions of member of the Frankfurt School's Horkheimer and Adorno. One concept that they raise incorporates the prevalence of a lack of ownership among members of society. "Only at a late stage and with difficulty were they allowed to gain ownership of the means of production" (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972, p. 143). Horkheimer use the Jewish experience as a characterization an insight to the social sphere of relations. This characterization is comparable to the reproduction of the past, with the lack of ownership crossing the social boundaries of the human experience.

Although this aspect may only pertain to a segment of society, by production's standards, the reference of the lack of ownership is worth taking into account. It is not only because of the prevalence of the lack of ownership, but also because it's particular segment applies to a large majority. In addition, the concept of the lack of ownership is fascinating because it has taken on new forms, exceeding the social into more figurative commodified state of existence.

This historical examination begins with the concept of the lack of ownership. This idea can be taken at face value. Historically evident, the social participates as active

members of production, wherein the individual is separated from the output. The initial divide of production results in the separation of the individual and the product. This indication can be confirmed with the reformulation of accessibility in the material world. In a society enabled through financing options and rental agreements, the realm of possibility is extended for many. Ultimately, however, the public is captive of a system that they do not own. The analysis should not end here, to take solely in the traditional sense of members producing products they cannot genuinely experience or access. Although visions of Marx inspire this idea, Horkheimer and Adorno use it in more of a unique way that emphasize what Marxist theory can mean for communication studies. The lack of ownership has taken on more emblematic forms. Horkheimer and Adorno describe an industry of culture. The culture industry creates “the false identity of universal and particular” (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972, p. 94). Horkheimer and Adorno juxtapose these two concepts to emphasize the monotony of our social world. “The culture industry presents that same everyday world as paradise” (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972, p. 113). This concept describes a major facet of social relations. The culture industry is not to be mistaken for the traditional sense of production, in which working class members produce a product. I use Horkheimer and Adorno’s concept of the culture industry to go beyond this representation. Instead, the culture industry can be regarded as a systematic production of symbols.

Culture in society is interesting, because the cultural reproduction of symbols means the reproduction of a lack of awareness. We participate and buy into a culture that lacks originality. Here, we can use the view of culture in society to characterize the tendency to overlook, or completely miss the ideological implications of our society. We

can use the previous example of technology shown in the articulation of Marcuse to illustrate this theme. Society is impacted by principles that incline the individual to partake in and embrace activities of invariability. In the example, the term 'upgrade' can be viewed as an overused and diluted ideal. Society is inflated with notions of the new and the current. However, the application and experience of this concept is often times contradictory. It is an industry of culture that sells itself. Fostering a sense of déjà vu, we continually purchase devices that essentially look the same and perform the same functions. However, despite the repetition, it is as if the events are something that we all look forward to. This phenomenon is something to consider as a direct reflection of the true embodiment of societal principles and values.

All of these examples show social normalization. These Marxist inspired perspectives hone in on the reproductive nature of ideology. These principles have been established and reproduced through the social relations of production. As demonstrated, the system of production has transcended the literal senses. The impact on principles delivers a clear indication of the experience of people, illustrating the emblematic character in which the system has evolved. The relationship between people, products, production and principles thereby emerges as a symbolic representation of a divide. The overall internalization of the driving forces of production, and division of labor signifies the principle embodiment of the social experience.

Reproducing the Social Past

Ideology's role in the reproduction of the past is articulated through thematic relationships among people, products, production and principles. The state of social relations relies primarily on these connections, creating the distinctions of experience.

Although it may be represented as the internalization of principles in everyday experience, the aspect of reality cannot be ignored. The elements of the reproduction of the past foster a parallel phenomenon of the division of the experience of the social. The views presented serve to demonstrate the reproduction of the past social order throughout time. However, these implications do not exist without consequences. The theme of the lack of awareness is central to the system as well. As a direct consequence of normalization, this theme of unawareness persists within the ideology of the division of labor in the societal structure. The critical split in the production and in social relations marks a return to ideology. Questions arise regarding the absorption of ideology. We cannot forget the power of ideology is exemplified here through this historical concept, and can be evidenced its reproduction in today's world. In the words of Marcuse, the consumption of ideology into reality "does not signify the 'end of ideology'" (1964, p. 11). He warns that the advanced industrial culture is *more* ideological than its predecessor (Marcuse, 1964, p. 11). With Marx in mind, we can use these perspectives to articulate the parallel themes that lie with the social experience.

REPRODUCING THE PAST: PART III

Returning to Marx's Parallel Themes of the Social

Taking a closer look into the constructs of the experience of class can further illuminate the complexity of the sphere of social relations. Chapter Two briefly discusses the implications of the experiences of both the lower working class and the dominant upper class. However, the ideological relationship between people, products, production and principles can be expanded through the particular depiction of the experience of the contemporary middle class. Occupying an interesting position within the social productive system, the characterization of the middle class highlights different aspects of the principles that are reproduced through time. The modern middle class symbolizes a unique body within the social. As a hybrid representation of conditions of working class and dominant classes, middle class citizens simultaneously bear the tensions of possibility and limitation. The return to Marx offers the dialectical reflection of the aspects that result from the social divide. This approach with Marx signifies the importance of the critical standpoint within the communication field. With Marx's visions of the bourgeois in mind, the ideological link between the past, present and future becomes apparent in this chapter.

From a historical standpoint, middle class society represents an essential formation in America. The middle order reflects a standard of conditions, echoing the ideals and values of the nation. Consistent themes roll out from the middle order,

reproducing principles of opportunity and freedom. As a unique body within the social, the experience of the middle class continually offers hope to many. The articulation of the middle class is depicted through historical significance. However, the importance is defined through a consistent onset of social themes that coordinate through the characterization of the middle class. Focusing in on the specific themes that accompany the view of the middle class highlights the key aspects of the reproduction of principles.

The reproduction of the theme of expanding notions of access is witnessed throughout different periods of history. The middle class has many parallels that run with it. These parallels are a consistent onset of themes that reoccur within its construction and reproduction. However, these parallels are not be derived as fragmented. On the contrary, these parallels offer a complex interconnection across representation of class and status. Dialectically, these concepts are defined through a relatively symbolic relationship of ideological principles. There are a number of instances in history that exemplify these relations at work. In turn the internalization and normalization of these relations signify the critical ramifications of the social. We can call upon the various works of critical thinkers throughout different periods within American history to exemplify the persistence of the thematic reproduction within the social. However, these social manifestations can be dialectically examined through a retention of Marx.

The Trade-Off: Ownership and Access

The reoccurrence of thematic significance within the representation of the middle can be viewed through a proportion of ownership and access. First, the dimension of ownership is considered through a customary understanding within the social dynamic. We can examine the impact of this concept by revisiting Horkheimer and Adorno's

articulation of the lack of ownership. In Chapter Two, the connection of the prevalence of the lack of ownership throughout history was discussed. Although the meanings behind the theme are clear, Horkheimer and Adorno can provide a depiction that begins to encompass the patterns of the social internalization of such a principle. “Individuals, in having to fend for themselves, develop the ego as the agency of reflective foresight and overview; over successive generations it expands and contracts with the individual’s prospects of economic autonomy and productive ownership” (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972, p. 68). The critical implications behind the prevalence of the lack of ownership in society are shaded by the social and progressive ideology of its very existence.

Reflecting the ideology of the nation, the angle of access and the lack of ownership are evidenced through the experience that millions of Americans share today. Then and now, the contemporary middle class can be characterized through the experience of a more expanded access to the material also, proving its importance as an American principle. The availability of material products runs rampant throughout society. They are represented by the financial landscape of the social marketplace and the ubiquity of commodity. The forces of production foster suppositions of lending. Today, more cars are leased, homes are rented and goods are acquired through minimum payments of lines of credit. The availability of these financing options spurs the participation. This experience is justified by the idea of temporary financial commitment and maneuverability of the access of products through the consumer marketplace. However, this concept is overshadowed by the reality of the boundaries of ownership.

Horkheimer and Adorno go on to express the commodity principles that are in line with the implications of ownership and access. This aspect matches up with

Horkheimer and Adorno's Marxist inspired critique of society's prevalence of the lack of ownership. Success is classified by the mere reception of material goods, rather than true ownership. The aspects of 'authentic' ownership are those which are established at the institutional level. The social ideology promotes the acquirement of material goods over the social's own valid standards of ownership in the eyes of the system of production. Horkheimer and Adorno articulate that "the cheapness of mass produced luxury articles, and its compliment, universal fraud are changing the commodity character" (1972, p. 127). It is not the character of commodity that is just problematic. It is the ubiquity of commodity that is disturbing as well. The underlying effects of these implications cast consequences on the social, fostering a system of dependency. This aspect contradicts the American values of freedom and opportunity. The abundance of commodity stands as one of the projections of the prevalence of the lack of ownership within society.

The characterization of commodity in the scheme of ownership and access is not just exhibited through sales, clearance and most importantly, 'buy one get one free'. This particular language is of the expanding notion of access to the material. However, the implications arise within the character of commodity expanding into different dimensions. Horkheimer and Adorno also point out how the ubiquity of commodity has taken on new forms, transcending the material realm.

If public life has reached a state in which thought is being turned inescapably into a commodity and language into celebration of the commodity, the attempt to trace the sources of this degradation must refuse obedience to the current linguistic and intellectual demands before it is rendered entirely futile by the consequence of those demands for world history. (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1972, p. xiv)

The reality of the separation of ownership and the individual is made clearer through the element of material products within grasp. The implications are signified

through expanding impressions of access. This reoccurring theme is exemplified as a reproductive relationship of people, products, production and principles. Specifically, the articulation of ownership and access stand as an inverse connection. The angle of access and the lack of ownership historically sit in opposition.

We can easily interpret these connotations through the experience of many middle class Americans today. We can think back on the 1950's critical workings of C. Wright Mills. Familiarly, he illustrates the social distinction of the middle class through the historical labor structuring. Mills focuses on questioning the structure of power within American society and directs us towards a useful reflection and characterization of class. He points out "the increased security of the wage workers who during the war cashed larger weekly checks in stores crowded the sidewalks on Saturday" lead the way to "the big new automobiles of the small people" (Mills, 1956, p. 36). Mills uses this example to highlight the expanding social aspects of the time. Specifically, he points out an increased access to the material. Mills notions reinforce the transforming character of commodity that Horkheimer and Adorno speak of. Material aspects that were once out of reach become available through this social and historical process.

Although Mills uses a concrete example with the impact of war expanding the character of the social, we can use this perspective as a guiding influence of the character of commodity. For the 'small people' (encompassing the lower working and middle classes), the means of access and ownership are dependent on the system. The ubiquity of commodity demonstrates the overarching dependence of the social. The influence of the sphere of production repeats itself through a seemingly imminent trade-off. This trade-off is born from the principle that nothing is free and you must work hard to be successful.

However, this is where the reality of dependency arises. The trade-off is overshadowed by the overall internalization and projection of the symbols of progression and the values of prosperity. Approaching communication with Marx, we can continue to explore the implications of the symbolic reproduction of the past. Socially, the middle class reflects representations of hope and opportunity. This reflection signifies the internalization of the ideological principles of the social. With this dialectal questioning in mind, it is hard to ignore the underlying principles at work. This perspective illuminates one way that the characterization of the experience of the middle class simultaneously bears the tensions of limitation and possibility. This is a defining theme that reappears throughout time.

Internalization and Normalization

The discussion of the ramifications of the social through the reproduction of the parallel themes runs consistent with the depiction of the middle class. This dialectical perspective raises questions about the complex interconnections across the collective social system. The internalization and normalization of these relations signify the critical aspects of the social. Ideologically speaking, we see the effects of the prevalence of what Veblen (1965) terms as the 'pecuniary culture.' Ironically, the foundations of the expanding notions of access are a product of the financially driven society.

In another sense, we can think of these terms from a particular standpoint of values. The values of the social are highlighted and shape the interactions and relations between people. Apparel can be viewed as one of these characterizations. The value of apparel is a greater part of the scheme of the social expanding of access of the material, embodying an ideological principle. The significance of the social can be interpreted

through these terms, illustrating yet another parallel connection within the sphere of relations.

The example of the value of apparel raises thoughts about the social expanding of access of the material. This also ties into the discussion of Horkheimer and Adorno and the character of commodity. While clothing represents one piece of the introspection of the character of commodity, its significance is not to be taken lightly. That is not to simply state the obvious of the sheer availability of clothing and dress. Nor is this a critique of the industry of fashion or questioning the use of the very shirts on our backs and the overall need for clothing. This is a discussion of ideological internalization. Instead, I aim to narrow in on the balance of the standards of conditions in comparison to the scheme of social values.

First, apparel can be taken into account in terms of social reflection. “Our apparel is always in evidence and affords an indication of our pecuniary standing to all observers” (Veblen, 1965, p. 119). We can use the middle class experience as a unique precedent here, reflecting a standard across the social culture. It is not the material product itself; it is the character of society. This is not a simple representation of discerning expectations of dress. It says more about the pattern of the social scheme of relations. Veblen goes on to describe the beliefs of the social.

No one finds difficulty in assenting to the commonplace that the greater part of the expenditure incurred by all classes for apparel is incurred for the sake of a respectable appearance rather than for the protection of the person... people will undergo a very considerable degree of privation in the comforts or the necessities of life...in order to appear well dressed. (Veblen, 1965, p. 119)

This idea is clarified with the social internalization and normalization of the values of apparel. Clothing is a unique signifier of your normal status within society. It is

less often that we see individuals out of standard, because the patterns of basic apparel are normalized. The middle order reflects the aesthetic structure of apparel. The ideology at work here suggests the overarching principles of appearance verses actual purpose or use. While all individuals may not fall in line with this type of consciousness, it is more of a reflection of the collective ideology. The character of commodity thus symbolizes this trend, with the reproduction of its industry and shared engagement. Going further leads to Harrington's reflections of the social. He highlights the negative implications of how ideology informs the overall values of the nation: "It is much easier in the US to be decently dressed than it is to be housed, fed or doctored" (Harrington, 1981, p. 5). The objective truth of this observation is evidenced through the organization of the commodity character, relating back to the themes of ownership and access.

In this way, the 20th century's American dream is still projected in ways that describe the experience of people, thereby reproducing the past. We can confirm this reality through the Marxist repetitive patterns of the social discussed in Chapter 2. Again, the social relationship between people, products, production and principles has not changed. A glimpse into the past illuminates the resemblance of the repetitive patterns of the social in America today. The trade-off of the expanding notions of access and the lack of ownership are not new. This is reproductive characteristic that runs parallel with the middle class representations. The symbolism is magnified with the significance of the interconnection as well.

The highlighted examples do not serve to downplay the individual of these social systems. Instead, each contributes to the application of Marx on the symbolic reproduction of social relations. It is not reaching for a characterization of the attitude of

the individual who participates in such agreements. Instead, this examination serves a purpose of illuminating the system of the relations in itself. The truth is that for many, the pure values of ownership and the means of production are out of reach. The middle class represents the reality of the people enjoying the comforts of access within the limited parameters that the social structure allows. This says more about the system of social relations and the realm of possibility for the classes within it. The boundaries within the system should be called into question.

The middle class stands as a representation of the possibilities within the social structure. The normalization of the standard order rectifies the prevalence and reproductive of the thematic parallels. “Among the underlying population everywhere in America, there is much confusion and blurring of the lines of demarcation, of the status value of clothing and houses, of the ways of money-making and money-spending” (Mills, 1956, p. 30-31). The significance of this reflection is of the normalized nature of the internalization of ideological principles. While these principles are symbolized through a commodified character that is seemingly progressive, the social implications undercut such notions. Too often, this mark is overshadowed by the authentic ideological principles that subside within the ovation of the collective ideals and values. It is not something to be simply dismissed. With the underlying thematic parallels of the inverse relationship of access and the lack of ownership, American values are promoting the ideology of the material. By these standards, the definition or success is evidenced by the individual’s accessibility to the commodified material. America’s vision of the middle class embodies this principle as a symbol of access and opportunity for many, but it also contradicting in nature. The American dream is represented as an enduring ideological

principle. While the internalization of such an ideal seems to point into the direction of social progression, it ignores its significance and overshadows critical reflection. Like a casted veil, the absorption of mass principles directs attention from such critical questioning. This contradiction is a symbol of the reproductive past.

Retaining Marx

The discussion presented here articulates the tensions of the ideological structuring and the Marxist questioning of the social reproduction of relations. With Marx's visions in mind, the ideological link between the past, present and future becomes apparent. The parallel dimensions that are raised by the Marxist inspired critical scholars align this approach into the dialectical characterization of the social.

Marx's implications of the patterns of the social can be further defined through terms of ideological dependency. Specifically, in the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels provide an account of the symbolic patterns of the ideological linking of people, products, production and principles:

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. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind. (Marx & Engels, 1848, p. 11)

Marx and Engels articulate the study of communication and the symbolic reproduction of social relations through an analysis of ideological dependency showing

the extent of ideological influence within the system itself. In this way, the symbolic parallels are illuminated through a structure of social foundational rationale. This perspective magnifies the power of the social sphere of relations. This thereby signifies the understanding of the system and it is unquestioning. The social structure does not yield to these dialectical perspectives because of this characterization of its operation. The constant flow of production and the access to products signifies the abstract ideological sphere of relations. The relationship to people is metaphorically related to this process. Society is understood through these terms, symbolizing the active internalization and normalization of the principles that then belong to the system.

The symbolic reproduction of social relations can also be understood through Marx by the paradoxical dichotomy of experience. Marx exemplifies how the social structure is paradoxical in nature. The social constructs of the dichotomy of experience presented in Chapter Two are mutually defined through their characterization. The formations of class are socially constructed and are maintained through its own terms. This idea can be understood through the overall maintenance of the system itself. This paradox is made clearer through the symbolic reproduction of social patterns. Marx and Engels provide a rendition of the social sphere's evolution and the consistency of the division of people and its implications.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. (Marx & Engels, 1848, p. 7)

We take the previous discussion to highlight this parallel thematic social structure. The progression of time and historical significance presents an aesthetically proportionate

social sphere. Symbols of opportunity shine through notions of access and availability. However, the parallels at work expose a much more complex system of relations and the overall reproduction of inequalities. This paradox is amplified through the ideological absorption of mass principle and the overall unquestioning of the social. Society can be understood as a paradox of transformation, but also as a dependable structure of repetitive patterns of dissimulation.

The implications of the perspectives here form into a paradoxical view of communication. The symbolic reproduction of the past is characterized through this dialectical reflection. Retaining Marx's notions uncovers an imperative examination of society. The critical parallels that run with the characterization of the experience and the social constructs overlap and mutually define each other through different aspects of the sphere of relations. The significance arises directly within the act of the very observation. Critically, the social aspects are examined to put forth a reflection of our world. Simultaneously, these perspectives represent a retrospective view of the past and present. This arc of communication contributes to the overall theoretical visions of Marx. We can use his theory to continue to put forth dialectical reflections and apply them to other unexamined measure of the social structure.

Retaining Marx allows for the understanding of Communication through the overall scheme of social relations. Marx carves very distinct notions of class, but the characterization of the experience and unique position of the middle class demonstrates thematic orders of the social. The reflection of the social order presents a dynamic standard of conditions that thereby translates the ideological principles of society. The

mass absorption of these ideological principles forms a complex critical view of the communicative sphere of social relations.

This approach to communication with Marx is symbolized through a complex presentation of social parallels and themes that have withstood time and historical significance. The implications that Marx presents form a basis of the deconstruction of hidden meaning within the taken for granted aspects of society. Marx provides a view of parallel themes of the social sphere of relations. The inspiration of Marx is exemplified through the dialectical character of the questions that he raises. Marx offers a critical examination across different aspects of the social, providing a contemporary rendering within the field of communication studies. His ideals symbolize the paradoxical reproduction of the past simultaneously with elements of historical application and a contemporary relevancy. Metaphorically, the dialectics that Marx presents and inspires embody the paradoxical character of the constructs that it examines. This articulation of this reflection allows for an encompassing view of the very ideology that it calls into question. This account of the social offers a characterization of social existence that can reposition our thinking about communication in history. Withstanding time, Marx's works can be applied to then and now, epitomizing the disparities within the system.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The symbolic restructuring of the past has not received enough attention by scholars. Marx points out the character of society and its overall lack of critical questioning. The internalization and normalization of the societal principles illustrate the rigidity of the sphere of relations. The agenda of the system is not concerned with undermining its very operation. Instead, it is a system of social relations and constant reproduction of material and immaterial significance. However, this point magnifies the necessity of dialectical questioning.

The notion of ideology and the relationship of people, products, production and principles bring a critical uncovering to light. Considering Marx's perspective of social relations shows his relevance for the communication field. The articulation of the notions of ideology in relation to society set forth an account of internalization that can be considered to work in the most concrete interactions. Overall, the parallel structuring of ideology compares to the Marxian implications of the state of the social sphere of relations.

More importantly, the influx of this dialectical questioning represents a view of the communication field itself. Marx uncovers the lack of critical imperatives within the field itself. This study suggests that the critical element is losing its character in communication studies on a societal level. However, the disinterest in Marx leaves a gap in the field, reflecting the ideological suppression of critical theory in communication

studies. Overall, Marx depicts a reflection of society, thereby a reflection of history. Scholars of the Frankfurt School represent the efforts to maintain the critical element. The application of the discussion raised contributes to the refocus on critical theory. Fuchs is a great example of the revisit of Marx and critical theory. He offers a justification for the return to critical theory and defines its capability.

Critical theory does not accept existing social structures as they are, it is not interested in society as it is, but in what it society could be and could become. It deconstructs ideologies that claim that something cannot be changed and shows potential counter- tendencies and alternative modes of development. (Fuchs, 2009, p. 71)

Marx leaves us to ponder the state of the social and the direction it is heading. We can use the questions he raises to highlight a view of the future. The gap of critical theory in the field of communication also signifies a gap in the realization of potential of the social. The lack of attention to Marx and critical theory ignores the disparities that exist within social relations. The value in Marx's broad social perspective redirects the focus to the critical initiative, questioning the internalization of normal social function. The importance of the critical element within the communication field is historically urged. "The acquisition of knowledge and the emancipatory goals of critical communication studies are defined by the prospects of change" and "renews itself as it confronts different conditions and is propelled into different historical situations" (Hardt, 2001, p. 179). The dialectical questions that arise are something to consider.

This collective reflection is valuable to uncovering the taken for granted aspects of the social sphere. The dialectic of Marx examines these aspects and calls them into question. Marx's perspective is useful because it can be used across different dimensions as an approach to different problems. The persistence on the impact of social interests

and relations emphasizes the extensibility of this critical approach to Communication and its applicability in other academic fields and to specific real-world issues. The versatility of critical imperatives reflect the potential in Communication. To ignore the critical elements within Communication is to neglect the capability in the field itself.

Social progression depends on a critical dialectic. That is the task of critical theory. The power of this implication is witnessed historically through labor movements and social uprisings. The critical paradigm is not absent from history, but lacks attention in the current discussion. Maintaining the critical paradigm, we must continue to apply this complex view of the world, reinforcing the significance of Marx. We cannot ignore the social organization of people. We must continue to call into question the values and principles of the social. The internalization and normalization of these elements must be accounted for in the critical sense. We cannot ignore the revolutionary implications of the application of Marx on the symbolic reproduction of social relations.

REFERENCES

- Craig, R.T. (1999). *Communication Theory as a Field*. International Communication Association.
- Craig, R.T. & H.L. Muller (2007). *Theorizing Communication*. United States: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fuchs, C. (2009). Information and Communication Technologies and Society. *European Journal of Communication*, 24, 1, 69-87.
- Fuchs, C. (2010). Grounding Critical Communication Studies: An Inquiry Into the Communication Theory of Karl Marx. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 34, 1, 15-41.
- Fuchs, C. (2013). *Why and How to Read Marx's "Capital"? Reflections on Johan Fornäs' book "Capitalism. A Companion to Marx's Economy Critique."* London: Routledge, 2013.
- Hardt, H. (1992). *Critical Communication Studies: Essays on Communication, History and Theory in America*. New York: Routledge.
- Hardt, H. (2001). *Social theories of the press: Constituents of communication research, 1840s to 1920s*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Harrington, M. (1981). *The other America: Poverty in the United States*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1972). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- James, B. (2006). Teaching Marcuse. *Javnost - the Public*, 13, 3, 17-28.
- Littlejohn, S.W. & Foss, K. A. (2005). *Theories of human Communication*. (8th edition) United States: Thomson Wadsworth.

- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marx, K. (1858). *The Grundrisse*. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, K & Engels, F. (1845). *The German ideology (exerpts)*. Marx/Engels Internet Archive (Marxist.org)
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). *The communist manifesto*. Waiheke Island: Floating Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1958ff). *Werke*. Berlin, Germany: Dietz.
- Marx, K., Engels, F. & La Haye, Y. (1979). *Marx & Engels on the means of communication*. New York: International General.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The power elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Piketty, Thomas. (2014) *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press
- Simpson, Christopher. (1994). *Science of coercion: communication research and psychological warfare, 1945-1960*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Veblen, T. (1965). *The theory of the leisure class: 1899*. New York: A.M. Kelley, Bookseller.
- Zinn, H. (2005). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. Originally published: New York.
- Žižek, S. (2012). *Mapping ideology*. London: Verso.