

MASS MEDIA AND THE ARCHIVING OF THE REVOLUTION

Daryl Y. Mendoza
University of San Carlos
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies

INTRODUCTION

Marx's critical project reveals an optimistic future for the emancipation of humanity from the heartless and soulless conditions of capitalism. His revolutionary spirit, motivated by the hope of realizing a society free from oppression and alienation, has been carried from his time to the present. However, as this spirit passes through history, abounding changes in society have occurred, changes that allow neo-Marxists like Ernest Mandel to differentiate early from late capitalism and Antonio Gramsci to demarcate between the Fordist and the Post-Fordist models. These significant changes, particularly within the capitalist mode of production, have allowed for diverse variables to occur that were unforeseen by Marx. Among these important variables is the rise of mass media. The importance of mass media in the contemporary times cannot be underestimated since it is, following McLuhan's thesis, solely responsible for the creation of the globalized present. Coming from this, how does the revolutionary spirit of Marx come to terms with mass media in contemporary society? Is mass media purely an ideological apparatus? Can it actually be utilized for the mobilization of the masses?

This paper discusses the role of mass media in relation to the revolutionary spirit of Marx. In doing so, it centers on Jean Baudrillard's media theory, an elusive topic, which is scattered

throughout his oeuvre, but most explicit in his works “Requiem for the Media” (1981) and “The Implosion of Meaning in the Media” (2007). This paper offers an alternative to the disjunction between mass media being an ideological apparatus or a potential tool for emancipation. This neutral alternative, literally *ne-uter*, hopes to reveal the apathetic maliciousness of mass media. But by doing so, this paper will also show the obsolescence of Marx’ analysis of production as a framework to understand the role of mass media in contemporary society. Marx’s critique of materialist production must be replaced by a critique that considers the structures of communication in the global village, structures that were absent in Marx’s social context and analysis. The critique of materialist production in political economy, therefore, must give way for a critique that goes far more radical than Marx’s analysis. It must pave the way for the critique of the political economy of the sign. It is the analysis of the sign in political economy that can hopefully articulate the role of mass media in contemporary capitalist societies.

This paper further shows that the destiny of an apathetic mass media is to reduce the social into a mesmerized silence before the spectacle. What then becomes of the spirit of Marx? In the end, this paper wagers that mass media, understood from this perspective, reduces events into archival footage and materials, sterilizing their contents, revolutionary or otherwise, for the viewing pleasure of the general public; thus, effectively relegating the revolution to the archives. Not so that it is forgotten, but on the contrary, that it is continually remembered as a spectacle, an appearance, in the terms of Boorstin, a pseudo-event. For Baudrillard, this is the real power of mass media.

MARX AND THE REVOLUTION

The French Revolutions, started in 1798 and inspired by the *Encyclopédistes*, sought to establish a society that is free from bondage, oppression and corruption and recognizes the importance of human rights, regardless of social status. Its motto, *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*, aptly captures the principle behind the French Revolutions. Though its intentions were noble, the French Revolutions, in its intention, did not prosper, and instead of transforming the *Ancien*

Regime into a society that sees its individuals as free, equal, and living in fraternal communion with each other, it has been replaced by institutional powers that continue to perpetuate the same oppression as the overthrown monarchy. The French revolution brought to fore the Reign of Terror which culminated with the 18th Brumaire that saw the end of the French Directory and the birth of Napoleon's French Consulate, but had to eventually give way to the return of the Bourbons, which in the end became a bourgeois republic.

The defeats of the French Revolutions served as the inspiration for the critical project of Marx. According to Berlin (1959), Marx sought to answer one of the heated questions in his days, "What ultimately was responsible for the failure of the French Revolution?" (Ibid., 85). Through a thorough investigation of the historical facts and the contemporary economic principles surrounding the revolution (Ibid.), Marx realized that the failure of the French Revolution was due to its inability to conceive of reality in a historical context, i.e., for its inability to account for the logic of social change, because, as Marx writes about the French revolutions, "every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the State power stands out in bolder and bolder relief" (Marx 2000, 585).¹

Cognizant of this problem, Marx presents a theory that accounts for the dynamics of social change. Indebted to Hegel, Marx's historical materialism contextualizes the logic of social change as an unfolding of history in a dialectical manner, a manner simplified as the unfolding relation of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis. Unlike Hegel, this dialectical unfolding is not the unfolding of consciousness or spirit, but rather, this unfolding is based on matter. Hence, it is materialist, a position which he followed from Feuerbach. Marx is also influenced by Saint-Simon, the first to conceive of economic relationships as the determining force of history (Berlin 1959, 89). Marx combined these novel ideas together with the ideas that came to be described by Engels as Historical Materialism. Thus, for Marx, the original concern of the failure of the revolution became a concern of the structure of a materialistic conception of history.

Marx's project, from his early to his late writings, can be considered as an articulation of Historical Materialism. Though not explicit of the term, he describes Historical Materialism as:

the 'history of humanity' must always be studied and treated in relation to the history of industry and exchange...our conception of history depends on our ability to expound the real process of production, starting out from the simple material production of life, and to comprehend the form of intercourse connected with this and created by this (i.e., civil society in its various stages), as the basis of all history... (Marx 1963, 18 & 28)

Marx's historical materialism is based on production. Further radicalizing this, the basis of historical materialism is the human being who produces in order to satisfy his needs. In *The German Ideology*, he writes, "The first historical act, is thus the production of the means to satisfy those needs, the production of material life itself... a fundamental condition of all history... must daily and hourly be fulfilled merely in order to sustain human life" (Marx 1963. 16).

Human history begins with this act, the production of material needs. As this production becomes more complex, that is, as human societies develop both in sophistication and in numbers, it becomes imperative, for reasons of efficiency and social organization, that this production of needs or labor, be divided. This division of labor is, for Marx, the starting point of oppression and domination because it marks the moment in history that sees the birth of private property, that is, there are those who own the mode of production, while the others, in order to subsist, have to work for those who own the mode of production. For Marx, division of labor is "just so many different forms of ownership" (Ibid., 9). This is the pattern that Marx saw in human history, from agricultural (to some extent, even some pre-agricultural societies) to industrial societies.

Marx calls this oppression and bondage, created by private property, alienation. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, he describes four types of alienations. These are: 1) object of his production, 2) act of production, 3) species-being, and 4) fellow-men (Marx 1988, 75). The gist of alienation is summarized in his own words:

the more the worker produces, the less he has to consume; the more values he creates, the more valueless, the more unworthy he becomes; the better formed his product, the more deformed becomes the worker; the more civilized his object, the more barbarous becomes the worker, the mightier labor becomes, the more powerless becomes the worker, the more ingenious labor becomes, the duller becomes the worker and the more he becomes nature's bondsman (Ibid., 73).

Although Marx's project assumes the form of an analysis of a materialistic conception of history with its elementary principle located in production, it still has in it the same motivations that fueled the French revolutions. By radicalizing the revolutions through his analysis of the dynamics of social change, Marx saw that the main goal of a revolution, that is, to achieve what the French revolutionaries sought for, *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*, must be particularly focused on the emancipation of the proletariat from the bondage of the bourgeoisie. This explains why all the French revolutions failed because the root cause of oppression is not given attention. A glimpse of this is described by Marx in *The Class Struggle in France, 1848 to 1850*, which goes:

Just as the workers in the July days had fought for and won the *bourgeois* monarchy, so in the February days they fought for and won the bourgeois republic. Just as the July monarchy had to proclaim itself a *monarchy surrounded by republican institutions*, so the February republic was forced to proclaim itself a *republic surrounded by social institutions*. The Paris proletariat compelled this too (Marx 1989, 289).

In other words, what was fought against only became stronger and stronger. This is because the French revolutionaries were not cognizant of the real struggle against the classes, bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Marx writes that "all struggles within the State, the struggle between democracy, aristocracy are merely the illusory forms in which the real struggles of the different classes are fought out among one another" (1963. 18 & 23).

This is why Marx is, indeed, an heir to the French revolutions. An heir because he knows how to achieve the goals of the French revolutions, and this is through the understanding of history, a history which conceives of “all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx 1967, 79). To achieve *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*, a real revolution not based on illusions must be waged. This can already be done, since the real goal of the revolution has been made visible by Marx.

The defeat of the French revolutions becomes the very catalysts for Marx’s project. Marx writes:

Thus only the June defeat has created all the conditions under which France can seize the *initiative* of the European revolution. Only after baptism in the blood of the *June insurgents* did the tricolor become the flag of the European revolution – the *red flag*. And we exclaim: “*The revolution is dead! Long live the revolution.*” (Marx 1989. 307)

THE RISE OF MASS MEDIA

Arguably, mass media was born in the 15th century with the invention of the movable type by Johannes Gutenberg. Because of the nature of the movable type system, being “the first uniformly repeatable commodity, the first assembly-line, and the first mass-production” (McLuhan 1969. 153), It is now possible to disseminate information in a faster and more massive scale, incomparable to the copying and recording methods done before. Because of this nature, print technology allows for the circulation of information that created the environment called the “public” (Ibid., 8). Gutenberg’s mechanical contraption can be considered as a catalyst that brought Europe to the Modern age.

The importance of communication technology (in this case, mass media) in its relation to socio-cultural changes is explained by McLuhan. He writes that “when technology extends one of our senses, a new translation of culture occurs as swiftly as the new technology is interiorized” (1969, 54). McLuhan shows the importance of the medium of the message in the transformation of human societies.

This importance, however, was not taken into consideration by Marx. For Marx, the printing press or mass media can be seen merely as a part of the domain of productive forces and relations of production. It is never seen as a system of communication. Being a historical materialist, Marx's radical philosophy locates its atomic unity in material production and thus cannot conceive of intangible variables such as signs and communication systems. Thus, as Baudrillard paraphrases McLuhan, Marx has

virtually circumscribed productive forces as a privileged domain from which language, signs and communication in general found themselves excluded" Baudrillard continues "Marx does not even provide for a genuine theory of railroads as 'media', as modes of communication: they hardly enter into consideration" (Baudrillard 1981, 164).

TWO POSSIBILITIES FOR MASS MEDIA AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

This lacuna in historical materialism leaves one to speculate of the niche of mass media in Marx's discourse. Baudrillard presents two possibilities here. Either 1) Marx's theory must be expanded to account for mass media, or 2) Marx's theory is irredeemably obsolete and must be scuttled, in the same way as Marx once claimed that the critique of religion was completed in Feuerbach, absorbed by a higher level logic, a critique of the political economy and no longer of religion must be in order (Ibid.).

For Baudrillard, the first alternative "can do little more than try to vitiate the immense retardation of classical Marxist theory. It is only radical in the eyes of official Marxism, which is totally submerged in the dominant model and would risk its survival if it went even that far" (Ibid., 165). The second alternative, however, is for him the more radical choice because it does not comprehend the power of communication within the level of either the base or super structure, that is, either as production forces and relations or as ideology and propaganda, but in the level of the code of communication.

The optimism of extending Marx to account for mass media is brought to fruition by the German poet, Hans Magnus Enzensberger. In his *Constituents of a Theory of the Media* (1970), Enzensberger

argues that mass media has been conceived poorly by the Left of his time, to the point of being mystical. Thus, they conceive it merely as an ideological apparatus, that is, “false consciousness.”² Enzensberger alleviates this mystical shroud surrounding the mass media by arguing that mass media can work as both against and for the oppressed masses. As an ideological apparatus, it uses, among other things, commercial advertisements, to manipulate the audience. However, it can also be used on the contrary, as an emancipative tool in educating the audience of the real conditions of existence. In another way of saying, mass media serves not only an ideological purpose, but it can also be emancipative. For Enzensberger, mass media is, therefore, neutral.

The neutrality of the mass media is because Enzensberger considers it as a “gigantic potential of productive forces” (Baudrillard 1981, 167) that influence social relations. He holds that, mass media, being a “gigantic potential of productive forces”, cannot merely be ideological. As a potential of productive forces, mass media belongs to the base structure, and is, therefore, “fundamentally egalitarian.”

The social strategy of Enzensberger is to take from the dominant class, the capitalist, the control of mass media. By doing so, mass media can be an important aid towards emancipation. Enzensberger remarks that “[f]or the first time in history, the media make possible the participation of the masses in a collective process that is social and socialized, participation in which the practical means are in the hands of the masses themselves” (Ibid., 168).

This first alternative shows how Marx’s historical materialism can be extended to account for the phenomenon of mass media. In this alternative, Enzensberger shows that mass media can actually be liberated from the capitalists for the emancipative purposes of the oppressed masses. His strategy to account for the possibility of integrating the phenomenon of mass media in Marx is seen in its isomorphic structure to the classical Marxist structure of political economy. Whereas classical Marxism sees the relation of dominant class/ dominated class, producer-entrepreneur/ consumer, in Enzensberger this is illustrated in the same relationship in the context of the mass media as transmitter-broadcaster/ receiver (Ibid.,166).

BAUDRILLARD'S CRITIQUE OF THE SOCIALIST STRATEGY

Baudrillard, however, critiques this optimistic socialist strategy of Enzensberger. According to Baudrillard, Enzensberger's socialist strategy of liberating mass media from the dominant class to "make possible a mass participation in a productive social process" is really no different from someone owning a television or a camera, a refrigerator or a toaster. For Baudrillard, "there is no response to a functional object: its function is already there, an integrated speech to which it has already responded, leaving no room for play or reciprocal *putting in play*" (Ibid.,171). The function of mass media is pure information. This is because mass media is a closed system, that is, anything that enters into the circulation of the mass media must assume its code. As McLuhan writes, "the price we pay for special technological tools, whether the wheel or the alphabet or radio is that these massive extensions of sense constitute closed systems" (1969, 14).

How is this? The attempt to communicate, to make an exchange, through or with mass media is immediately "transformed into models, neutralized into signs, they are eviscerated of their meaning" (Baudrillard 1981, 173). Following Roman Jakobson's scientific communication chain, all forms of communication always follow the context of a code. Hence, "[e]ach communication process is thus vectorized into a single meaning, from the transmitter to the receiver: the latter can become transmitter in its turn, and the same schema is reproduced" (Ibid.,178). Mass media follows this chain; thus, it is subservient not to the political economy but to the code. For without the code, the entire communication chain collapses and the transmission of a message becomes impossible. Hence, any form of response is already integrated in the structure of the message, that is, it is already a prefabricated response. In the final analysis, there really is no real response, no exchange. The prefabricated response becomes a "function of its (mass media) reproducibility" (Ibid.,174).³

Mass Media, according to Baudrillard, is "anti-mediatory and intransitive. [It] fabricate[s] non-communication" (Ibid., 169). Baudrillard qualifies "communication as an exchange, as a reciprocal space of speech and a response, and thus a *responsibility*" (Ibid). For Baudrillard, this era of total instantaneous communication through

mass media, is an era of irresponsibility, that is, an era of non-response. Media prevents response except through the responses integrated in the message itself, e.g., referendum, polls, surveys and etc.

For Baudrillard, this is the root of social control and power of mass media which cannot be apprehended by Marxists whose views are limited to the narrow structure of the political economy. The root of media's social control is found nowhere within the political economy, for it lies in the very process of mass media itself, irresponsibility. Thus, the only way to analyze this cannot be within purely Marxist terms. In the same way as Feuerbach is considered to have completed the critique of religion, Marx is considered to have completed the critique of political economy. The analysis of mass media cannot operate in Marxist terms, it must be analyzed from the standpoint of semio-linguistics, that is, from a critique of the political economy of the sign, a critique of the code in communication. This is the second alternative, a radical alternative for a theory of media. This is Baudrillard's requiem to a Marxist media theory.

RADICALIZING MCLUHAN

The giant system of mass media through "electro-magnetic discoveries have," as McLuhan once prophesized, "recreated the simultaneous 'field' in all human affairs so that the human family now exists under conditions of a 'global village' (McLuhan 1969, 43)." This is McLuhan's optimism.

This global village, brought about by mass media, allows a "global embrace, abolishing both space and time as far as our planet is concerned" (1994, 3). And unlike the previous era of mass communication which can be described as an explosion that extends our "bodies in space," this global village is an era of implosion (Ibid.). With this era of implosion, McLuhan writes, this "alters the position of the Negro, the teen-ager, and some other groups. They can no longer be *contained*, in the political sense of limited association. They are now *involved* in our lives, as we in theirs, thanks to the electric media" (Ibid., 5).

Repeating what has been mentioned in an earlier paragraph, the social, economic, and cultural transformations in society can be

explained as a product of the disturbances, of the human sensorium brought about by new forms of communication technology. As mentioned, McLuhan argues that “when technology extends one of our senses, a new translation of culture occurs as swiftly as the new technology is interiorized” (1969, 54). This is McLuhan famous formula, “The Medium is the Message.” For him, the real message is not in the content but in the form or the medium. He explains that “the medium...shapes and controls the scale and form of human association and action.” He further writes that “the content or uses of such media are as diverse as they are ineffectual in shaping the form of human association” (McLuhan 1994, 9).

Baudrillard radicalizes this position. This global village, an image created by the mass media, is described with less optimism by Baudrillard. With the mass media that allows only pre-fabricated replies that function also as its reproduction, society has become a “universe where there is more and more information and less and less meaning” (Baudrillard 1983, 95). Mass media slowly churns out the real as a reproduction of its own self, that is, the real is transformed as information, as a message, which ultimately, is the medium; it becomes a part of the mass media itself.

Contemporary mass media is a complex tautological system that absorbs the real to be virtualized and codified, to become pure information. Baudrillard writes that “information dissolves meaning and the social into a sort of nebulous state leading not at all to a surfeit of innovation but to the very contrary, to total entropy” (Ibid., 100).

Baudrillard radicalizes McLuhan’s position because McLuhan conceives of implosion merely as an “abolishing of space and time,” that is, putting the world together to form the global village through mass media, while for Baudrillard this global village is actually a universe produced by mass media itself. The implosion of Baudrillard actually means a collapse, entropy, to a world of pure information, a world that is “more real than the real.”

For McLuhan, the formula “The Medium is the Message” shows that the real meaning of any form of mass media is located not in the content but in its form. Baudrillard stretches this to show that with the current mass media that devours everything to become a part of

it, everything becomes a product of mass media itself. Contemporary mass media, therefore, is not only the medium but also the message; it is also the “real.” Everything is circulated by mass media as pure information. To summarize using Baudrillard own words:

the medium is the message signifies not only the end of the message, but also the end of the medium. There are no longer media in the literal sense of the term (I am talking above all about the electronic mass media) - that is to say, a power mediating between one reality and another, between one state of the real and another - neither in content nor in form. Strictly speaking, this is what implosion signifies: the absorption of one pole into another, the short circuit between poles of every differential system of meaning, the effacement of terms and of distinct oppositions, and thus that of the medium and the real. (Ibid., 102-103)

THE FUTURE OF THE REVOLUTION

What then becomes of the revolutionary spirit? With the rise of more complex and integrated forms of mass media, the revolutionary spirit of Marx becomes absorbed by these “networks of communication”, thus, losing its content, its message, and becomes nothing more than a reproduction of mass media itself. Baudrillard writes: “the message has already ceased to exist; it is the medium which imposes itself in its pure circulation... Ecstasy is all functions abolished into one dimension, the dimension of communication” (Baudrillard 1988, 23-24).

As the revolution passes through a series of codification and decodification to be mechanically reproduced or printed, to be broadcasted in the airwaves, and to be pulverized into electrons in front of the screen, it has not only reached a massive audience but it has also become reproduced into something that is stripped of what Benjamin similarly calls in the work of art, the “aura” (See Benjamin 2007, 217-252). The revolution, of the past, of the present, and of the future, becomes what Boorstin calls a pseudo-event, “a world of events, history, culture and ideas not produced from shifting, contradictory, real experience, but *produced as artifacts from*

elements of the code and the technical manipulation of the medium” (Baudrillard 1999, 125).

With mass media, the masses, what Baudrillard describes as “drifting somewhere between passivity and wild spontaneity, but always as a potential energy, a reservoir of the social and of social energy” maybe running out to the streets because of an impending tidal wave, an imagery which can only be referenced from news reels and Hollywood movies, or they may be sedated at home enjoying a live political-satire about an impeachment trial (Baudrillard 1983, 2). What is clear is that mass media is slowly absorbing reality, reducing the raw events into a series of *montage* which becomes “more real than the real.” Like a soap opera, it drags us to become be a part of the story, to become part of the system.

Historical events disappear to become better, they become digitalized and re-mastered. The EDSA Revolution passed through this initiation. It has been reproduced in countless of ways, distorting its status as an event, to become remembered as an image of, at times, Philippine democracy. For instance, a photo exhibit at the University of San Carlos Museum Lobby entitled “Revolution Revisited” last November 23, 2011 is an example of this codification of an event to become mass media (See http://www.usc.edu.ph/news_and_announcements/?news=505). The EDSA revolution has become a mere image or a series of images that show Philippine democracy in the roaring ‘80s. It is now an image, a pseudo-event, life-less, without aura, a spectacle. It is simply, entertaining.

Can the spirit of Marx continue to lead us towards emancipation, if all attempts of revolution become nothing more but a spectacle that is shown, re-mastered, reviewed, to an audience in front of the screen? Perhaps, in the same way as the French revolutions failed because of its ineptness to consider the dynamics of social change, Marx, the heir to that revolutionary tradition, also fails because he is unable to conceive of an escape from the almost ubiquitous web of signs and references through the mass media complex.

For Baudrillard, the only way out from this labyrinth of mass media’s reproducibility, its power, is to transgress the system through symbolic action. Symbolic action is a transgression of the code in the

communication chain; it “consists in breaching the ‘univocality’ of the ‘message’, in restoring the ambivalence of meaning and in demolishing in the same stroke the agency of the code” (Baudrillard 1981, 183). In a later work, *The Spirit of Terrorism*, Baudrillard (2003, 17) shows that the only way to break this now ubiquitous code is to, inspired by Marcel Mauss, “[d]efy the system by a gift to which it cannot respond except by its own death and its own collapse.”

But is a revolution still possible? Perhaps this is no longer essential. What is essential, according to Baudrillard is:

to evaluate this double challenge - the defiance of meaning by the masses and their silence (which is not at all a passive resistance) - and the defiance of meaning which comes from the media and its fascination (1983, 104).

REFERENCES

- Althusser, Louis. 1998. Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*, ed. Anthony Easthope and Kate McGowan. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 2003. *The Spirit of Terrorism*. Translated by Chris Turner. London: Verso Books.
- _____. 1998. *The Consumer Society: Myth and Structure*. Translated by Chris Turner. London: Sage Publications.
- _____. 1988. *The Ecstasy of Communication*. Translated by Bernard and Caroline Schutze. Edited by Sylvere Lotringer. USA: Semiotext(e) Foreign Agent Series.
- _____. 1983. *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities... Or the End of the Social and Other Essays*. Translated by Paul Foss, Paul Patton and John Johnston. USA: Semiotext(e).
- _____. 1981. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. Translated and Introduced by Charles Levin. USA: Telos Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 2007. The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. In *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Translated by Harry Zohn. Edited and Introduced by Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken Books.

-
- Berlin, Isaiah. 1959. *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*. Oxford: Galaxy Books.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 2000. *The Reality of the Mass Media*. Translated by Kathleen Cross. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1988. *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Translated by Martin Milligan. New York: Prometheus Books.
- _____. 1989. *The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1950*. In *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*. Ed. Lewis S. Feuer. New York: Anchor Books.
- _____. 2000. *The Civil War in France*. In *Selected Writings*, ed. David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1963. *The German Ideology*. Edited and Introduced by R. Pascal. New York: International Publisher.
- _____. 1967. *The Communist Manifesto*. Introduced by AJP Taylor. Translated by Samuel Moore. London: Penguin Classics.
- McLuhan, Marshall 1994. *Understanding the Media: The Extensions of Man*. Intro. Lewis H. Lapham. London: MIT Press.
- _____. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

ENDNOTES

¹ His discussions regarding the defeat of the French Revolution can also be seen in his work, *The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1950*, where he writes that “[t]he first thing that the February republic had to do was rather to complete the rule of the bourgeoisie by allowing, beside the finance aristocracy, all the propertied classes to enter the orbit of political power” (Marx 1989, 289).

²Louis Althusser (1998, 52) describes ideology as a “representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.” Regarding the distributive and manipulative role of mass media as conceived by earlier Marxist thinkers, see Bertolt Brecht *The Radio as an Apparatus of Communication*.

³As a closed system, mass media alters the meaning through commutation with other signs within these “networks of communication.” Thus, its referential ability corresponds only to other signs within this network. Niklas Luhmann, in similar vein, writes that the correspondence of mass media to reality “can therefore only be an internal correlate of the system’s operations- and not, say, a characteristic which attaches to objects of knowledge additionally to that which distinguishes them in terms of individuality or kind. Reality, then, is nothing more than an indicator of successful tests for consistency in the system” (2000, 6-7).