

‘ARCHE-WRITING’ and ‘DIFFÉRANCE’ and THEIR CRITICISM of the POLITICAL ECONOMY of WRITING

[‘Arche-writing’ ve ‘Différance’ ve Yazının Politik Ekonomisini Eleştirileri]

Çağrı Barış Kasap (Yrd. Doç. Dr.)

Okan University, Department of Visual Communication Design, Istanbul, Turkey

cagribkasap@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There has been a lot of debate as well as furious criticism of Deconstruction’s ‘untying relationship’ with radical politics, hence Marxism. I use the term ‘untying relationship’ on purpose in order to better designate and underline Derrida’s declaration of deconstruction’s inherent relationship with Marxism. Unrelated with any ‘ethical turn’ in his thought and work, certain concepts Derrida has integrated into our current lexicon of the criticism of everyday critical life and theory always had a permanent inherence and inspiration driven from Marxism. Rather than choosing to lay out the traces of this relationship through a reading of ‘*The Specters of Marx*’, I choose to carry out the inspirational sources of ‘différance’, ‘arche-writing’ and ‘spacing’ or the overturning of the hierarchy between speech and writing from Derrida’s early works and try to demonstrate the inheritance these concepts owe to Marx’s works. Thus with this claim, it will be purported that the required explanation from deconstruction about its relationship with radicalism in late nineties was futile since the very originary concepts of deconstruction is always already inherited from a Marxist conception of the world.

Keywords: Deconstruction, marxism, différance, ‘arche-writing’, ‘spacing’, political economy of writing.

ÖZET

Yapısökümün, radikal politiklik yani Marxism ile olan ‘çözmeci ilişkisi’ne dair çok fazla şey yazıldı ve söylendi. Hatta bu konuda yapısöküme karşı acımasız eleştirilerde de bulunuldu. ‘Çözme’ci ilişki

deyimini, Derrida'nın yapısökümün Marxism ile doğasında var olan ilişkisini daha iyi açıklamak ve altını çizmek için kasten kullanıyorum. Bu makalenin amacı, çalışmalarında herhangi bir 'ahlaki dönüşüm' olmadığı gibi, Derrida'nın üretmiş olduğu kavramların direkt olarak Marxizm'den doğmuş ve etkilenmiş olduğunu göstermektir. Biraz daha açıklayacak olursak, makalenin asıl amacı, bu ilişkinin izlerini '*Marx'ın Hayaletleri*'ni yakinen okumak yerine 'différance', 'archi-writing' ve 'spacing' kavramlarının ya da Derrida'nın ilk çalışmalarındaki yazı ve konuşma arasındaki hiyerarşinin altüst edilmesinin esinlenilen kaynaklarını göstermek ve bu iddiaların doğaları gereği nasıl Marx'tan esinlenilmiş olduklarını göstermektir. Dolayısıyla, Yapısöküm'den doksanlı yıllarda istenilen radikalizm ile olan ilişkisini açıklaması gereğinin oldukça beyhude olduğu çünkü yapısökümün temel kavramlarının zaten dünyanın Marksist kavranışından esinlenilmiş olduğu gösterilmiş olacaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yapısöküm, marksizm, différance, 'arche-writing', 'spacing', yazının politik ekonomisi.

The Realm of Values

For Marx, the difference between use and exchange value are available to intuition, use-value and exchange-value are the same form – the value form. To put something in the value form means to abstract it in order to measure it. The same principle applies to the exchange-value as well. When we use something up, since use-value is not a fiction for capital, we do not measure it. Capital consumes measure by measure. In other terms, capital is labor-power, not the labor itself. It is the use of the use-value of labor but not the use of the labor itself. This is why the capitalist pays back less value in the money form than what he borrowed in the labor-power form. When labor-power is used, it produces more value than what its concrete pre-measurable personal base requires to reproduce itself potentially as measurable into the use-value for capital: labor-power. The project of socialism was to keep the use of labor-power undistributed in form but equitable in fact and save the difference for the redistribution.

The ownership of the means of production as a critique of reification is anchored in this binary opposition; it cannot confront the self-determination of the capital. This inability can be defined as the current situation of the capital in the process of globalization in which the global finance is interrupted by the world commerce. However, if both use and exchange value are in the value form, then the capital-labor relationship occurs when capital uses the abstract labor, in other terms, the socialist grabbling of saving the difference between the surplus and the interest for redistribution might create the difference between crisis-driven and strategy-driven global capital.

When we exchange, the common factor in the exchange relation is the value. We must consider value independent of this form of appearance. A use-value or a good has value only because abstract human labor is objectified in it. In the use form of appearance, value does not become intuitively manifest to us because we do not engage in exchange. Marx's clear implication is that if we do not understand the relationship between the capital and the worker, then the commodity will remain as a fetish. Thus it is the role of the abstract – the spectral as Derrida is trying to show in *Specters of Marx* (2006) – that has to be grasped. Marx is clearly undoing the binary opposition between the use-value and exchange-value and the semantics that usually haunts our common sense.

When labor is abstracted into labor-power, the capitalist uses it for capital accumulation; only if it is still abstracted into labor-power can it thus be used by associated workers as socialism suggests. By

undoing the binary opposition between use and exchange value, Marx consigns the very origins of value to Nature in which any possibility of measure would exist as incommensurable because no human labor has gone into its making. Then he offers three other counter-examples in which the binary opposition would be undone: i) use-value produced with labor but producing no commodity, ii) use-value for others in which abstraction must surely be thought, although the value is not deployed within general commodity exchange, iii) the need to accept the sheer usefulness in use as well as exchange value so that this usefulness cannot be kept separate for use-value only (Marx 1977, p. 98).

Realm of Values and Language

In Western metaphysics, language is conceived as a set of signs of exchange. Whether in its communicative or expressive aspects or more subtly, in the choice of the translatability as the characteristic of all language, sign is always seen as an element of an economical transaction. In that transaction, the emphasis is on the exchange-value of signs and their function in the process of circulation.

As I contended above, what must be comprehended by the use-value of a product is not just that it can be put to use as an object of consumption but additionally the acknowledgment that it serves as a means of production. In the event that each product is a means for creating other products, signs shape the means of production of different signs exclusively or their combination altogether. This is the motivation behind the reason why misrecognition of the use-value of signs adds up to nothing less than the occultation of their productive value by hiding the work or play of signs upon and with other signs. The functional value, the effectiveness of signs in the production of meaning, the figuring or simply the combinatory occasion with proper vagueness or the fabric of the text (labor or structure, fabrication and fashioning) is effaced or quelled underneath debatable straightforwardness of meaning.

On the premise of the opposition, obtained from political economy, between use-value and exchange-value as a major qualification ensnaring the whole field of language and writing, one that ought to demonstrate its significance through the extensions and rapprochements, it appears to permit the occasion of economy – the exchange relation of commodities – and is described correctly by its reflection from their use-value and thus is decreased to an expression out of its obvious form surprisingly. On the off chance that the material constituents and structures create the result of labor

as use-value vanishes, at the same stroke, in a twofold effacement, the distinctive solid structures that recognize one type of labor from another vanish likewise. What is involved, during the process of exchange, then, is just the buildup of residue of products of labor. There is nothing left of these results of work for every situation except the same apparition like objectivity. To the extent the space of course is concerned, each result of work is transformed into an indistinguishable "sublimation" (Marx 1977, p. 127).

The opposition between signifier and signified is not exactly the division between use-value and exchange-value. What stays after an interpretation as a process in which a chain of signifiers is exchanged is the meaning. The signified is comprehended in a general sense as that which stays in place and unaltered, regardless of the distinctive forms of its appearance. The substance is in a perfect world considered as distinct from structure. On the off chance that the exchange of products, either as social osmosis or dissimulation, is affected through a formal transformation that uncovers the double character of the product which has both use-value and exchange-value, the exchange of the signs is affected through a formal transformation uncovering the double character of the sign, the clearly irreducible dichotomy of the signifier and the signified.

Whatever the structure and the substance of the action and the commodity is, in an economic space, what is managed is the subject of value. In the linguistic domain, what is managed is the other "ghostly sublimation" named as "meaning". In the event that the body of the commodity and the diverse solid structures that separate one type of labor from another are disconnected during the time spent in capitalist production ruled by value, the body of the letter and everything else that is irreducible to interpretation is illusionary and diminished into the component of meaning. On the establishment of this parallel administration of linguistic meaning and the exchange-value of commodities, what is in question is the rule behind the pecking order of the signifier, signified and referent which makes the destruction of the writing itself a procedure insolubly bound up with the occultation and exploitation of labor.

In the first volume of *Capital*, there is one general accentuation by any stretch of the imagination. Assuming initially, the arrangement of products frame a diverse mosaic of unique and detached articulations of quality, little by little the estimations of these items discover expression through a solitary sort of commodity set apart from the rest. One product is turned into the general articulation of quality as the general proportional. 'All different items express their value in the same identical' as

Marx attests (Marx 1977, p. 156). The particular sort of commodity with whose characteristic the comparable structure is framed and socially joined turns into the money product or serves as money. It turns into its particular social capacity and subsequently its socially imposing business model, to fill the role of the all-inclusive equal inside the universe of commodities. In the economic area, 'the type of immediate and all inclusive exchangeability, in other words, the universal equivalent form, has now by social custom finally become entwined with the specific natural form of the commodity gold' (Marx 1977, p. 162), while in the area of the signs, it is laced with and recognized by the type of discourse of signs. Its call to attention the use of signs does not in some special way mean the utilization of linguistic signs. Be they motions, signs or manifestations or just protests, nothing limits the thought of the use of signs. It creates the impression that among these signs, a certain and extremely specific sort secures an advantaged importance: the signs of discourse. These signs have put their resources into an exceptionally specific route with the ability to hold meaning. They can stand proportionate to some other sign.

Subsequently, if the money-form is simply the reflection tossed upon a solitary commodity by the relations between all different commodities, sign-system is tossed upon a solitary kind of sign as the connection between every single other sign. For the economy, it is fundamental that value, rather than the diverse objects of the universe of commodities ought to form into this structure as a material and non-mental one, additionally as a straightforward social structure as money. This is conceivable regardless of the way that in monetary sobriquets all hints of the connection to value vanishes pretty much as the name of a thing is completely external to its inclination. From the simple look of a bit of money, it cannot be told what type of product has been changed into it. In their money forms, all commodities resemble the other alike. So toward the end of a procedure that makes discourse what might as well be called every other sign, there is no connection between linguistic signs and what they speak to. On the off chance that the money type of items is, similar to their type of quality by and large, unmistakable from their obvious and genuine substantial structure, the discourse type of the signs is likewise a perfect structure, however, it is particularly from their non-linguistic form yet and it is, at the same time, reflected in their cooperation.

Marx's investigation concerning the relationship of discourse with writing reproves all the etymological and political bewilderments behind the chain of command of the signifier, signified and the referent. Since the 'money-form' is just the reflection tossed upon a solitary item by the relations

between all commodities, discourse as the main reflection tossed upon a solitary kind of sign by the relations between every single other sign ought to likewise be mulled over. Money and discourse have the benefit of having merged in them the whole arrangement of all signs. But, in a general sense, if there is no resistance between cash (either as silver or gold) and different commodities, then there is no restriction between words (as realistic or phonic material) and different signs (as different things). It is just under these conditions then that the arrangement of quality gives the deception that silver or gold is in truth only indications of value. The part of gold or silver gets to be uprooted. From being the material and advantaged incarnation of quality, they get to be insignificant indications of this value, which from there on rises above them as unimportant representation. As Marx writes, since 'money can, in certain functions, be replaced by mere signs of itself,' one could surmise that 'it is itself a mere sign' (Marx 1977, p. 185). However as he proceeds, on the off chance that it is pronounced that the social attributes accepted by material articles or the material qualities expected by the social determinations of labor on the premise of a distinct method of creation are minor signs, then it is likewise proclaimed while these attributes are the subjective result of human reflection.

The same motion frames the arrangement of the linguistic signs. Scriptural or phonic materials are given as negligible signifiers while their practical character and their character as aftereffect of a capacity are both denied. This hides the way that meaning is just a result of work of signs or the consequence of the manufacture of a content, pretty much as the character of money as product is covered as a mere sign. As Saussure additionally writes,

It is impossible or sound alone, a material element, to belong to language. It is only a secondary thing, substance to be put to use. All our conventional values have the characteristic of not being confused with the tangible element, which supports them (1986, p. 118).

At the point when perused through the monetary ideology, it is not the metal in a bit of cash that fixes its value; its value will fluctuate as per the sum stamped upon it and as indicated by its use inside or outside a political limit. At the point when connected through the same ideological position, silver is constituted as a perfect value and constitutes the signifier in connection to the signified. Regardless, there are just items with no value unless a profitable labor is disguised. The development that recognizes cash from different commodities and makes of it a fixation past the

domain of creation is homologous to the development that recognizes discourse from different signs or isolates discourse from the arrangement of every single social sign with a specific end goal to constitute these signs as things outside to the arrangement of signs as referents. The triple structure of signifier, signified and the referent uncovered a radical complicity with the financial philosophy that isolates money from quality or value itself from different commodities. In any case, money itself does not have an otherworldly presence nor does it truly identify with a characteristic commodity. Values relate just to a product of labor. Also, meaning is not otherworldly to the signs that show it; nor does it identify with a referent in itself in its normal presence, it just identifies with different signs and the writing of the totality of all the social signs. The flow of money itself parts the ostensible substance of the coins far from their genuine substance by isolating their metallic presence from their utilitarian presence. Furthermore, this suggests the inert plausibility of supplanting metallic money with tokens made of some other material as symbols.

Furthermore Marx adds that,
in this process which continually makes money pass from hand to hand, it only needs to lead a symbolic existence. Its functional existence so to speak absorbs its material existence. Since it is a transiently objectified reflection of the prices of commodities, it serves only as a sign of itself and can therefore be replaced by another sign (1977, p. 226).

In any case this entry from gold or silver to scriptural money is not immaterial. It clarifies the second-degree nature and the bastard life of writing in connection to speech as Derrida has tried to show (1976). The cash is a simple illustrative of the gold cash it replaces, writing is considered as an unimportant arrangement of substitution which has value just to see that it is secured by money. The admonishing and mental way to deal with writing, which asks into the genuineness of the author, alludes particularly to the issue of credit and expansion. Does the author's stock/gold relate to his written work? Do his assets cover his structure? The connection of substance to form evoked by the readings comes down to the apprehension of the counterfeit money. The outcomes of the financial dream are striking. They isolate money from value and value from the commodities. This triple pecking order is its own particular capacity in the essential dissimulation that it makes conceivable: the dissimulation of concrete production.

The means by which the sign is produced is completely unimportant, for it does not affect the system... Whether I make the letter in white or black, raised or engraved, with pen or chisel – all of this is no consequence with respect to their signification (Saussure, 1977, p. 120).

Critical Criticism of Language and Deconstruction

The arrangement of meaning is unrelated with the creation of meaning. The working trace, as productive use, is not, in that capacity, part of the area of meaning. This same effacement of the trace by value happens in the creation and circulation of commodities. Marx writes strikingly: 'When they thus assume the shape of values, commodities strip off every trace of their natural and original use-value and of the particular kind of labor to which they owe their creation.' (Marx, 1977: 204). In any case, it is not just productive labor that is effaced when meaning is solidified in speech; it is additionally the relations of production.

Since every commodity disappears when it becomes money it is impossible to tell from the money how it got into the hands of its possessor or what article has been changed into it. *Non olet* [it has no smell] from whatever source it may come from (Marx, 1977, p. 205).

As Goux asserts, “meaning, similar to money, has no scent. It is difficult to follow its trace” (1998, 57). Labor (of writing) and the modalities of the exchange-process vanish in the straightforwardness of meaning. This effacement of the trace is in the meantime the destruction of contrasts, subsequent to this procedure, 'different products of labor are in fact equated with each other' (Marx 1977, p.181). Value is shown only as equalization, a leveling, a homogenization, a wearing out. As Marx writes; 'Capital is by its nature a leveler' (1977, p. 270).

The leveling happens at the level of labor itself, at the base of production. Value is the expression not of concrete labor but rather of abstract labor. The procedure is that of the decreasing of all commodities into a specific amount of abstract labor. This is the rule of general exchangeability of products. Furthermore, the same figure can be found in admiration to language. Abstract labor constitutes the normal measure of various commodities since the determination of the size of value by labor-time is a mystery covered up under the clear developments in the relative estimations of products. As Goux asserts, ‘...similarly, Derrida’s *archi-trace* or *archi-writing*, constituting the schema uniting form to any graphic or other substance, is what makes possible a signifying system

indifferent to the substance of expression – and is what remains as the invariant in all substitutions between different types of sign’ (1998, 57). 'Arche-writing' cannot give itself a chance to be decreased to the type of presence yet is dependably at work not just in the structure or in the substance of the graphic expression, additionally in those of nongraphic expressions and it likewise constitutes not just the example of joining the structure to substance, graphic or something else, yet the development of sign-capacity connecting substance to an expression to make a meaning, whether graphic or not.

It is because arche-writing, movement of difference, irreducible arche-synthesis, opening in one and the same possibility, temporalisation as well as relationship with the other and language, cannot, as the condition of all linguistic systems, form a part of the linguistic system itself and be situated as an object in its field. (This does not mean it has a real field elsewhere, another assignable site.) Its concept could in no way enrich the scientific, positive and “immanent” description of the system itself.

(original quotations and parenthesis)

(Derrida 1976, p. 60)

In this manner Derrida thinks about writing independent from anything else to be short-of and beyond transcendental criticism and everyday critical criticism. With the goal of the beyond not to return within, Derrida proposes to perceive the need of the pathway, which must leave a track in the text. Without that track, the transcendental text will likewise take after the pre-basic content. In this way, for Derrida, difference ought to be viewed as the formation of form.

Saussure has held the concept for the signified and the sound-image for the signifier. The sound-image is not quite the same as objective sound; it is what is heard; not the sound itself but rather the being heard of the sound. Being-heard is sensational and has a place with a request that is not at all like the sound in the world. Saussure knows the organized appearance of the sound, as tangible matter, lived and educated by difference as the ‘psychic image’. The word psychic is by all rights a reduction towards being in the world, denoting the subject's place well in the refinement between the internal and external lived experience. The possibility of psychic imprint alludes to the possibility of enunciation. Without the difference between the tangible showing-up and its lived appearance, the temporalizing synthesis, the chain of significations could not work. The irreducibility of the imprint additionally alludes to its lack of involvement, which is likewise a relationship to an absolute past. That is the thing that approves Derrida to call trace not giving itself a chance to be summed up to any

effortlessness of the present and obliges us to think about a past that can never be lived in the present, as present-past.

Since past has signified past-present, the absolute past that is retained in the trace no longer rigorously merits the name “past”. Another name to erase, especially since the strange movement of the trace proclaims as much as it recalls: difference defers-differs [*diffère*]. With the same precaution and under the same erasure, it may be said that its passivity is also its relationship with the “future”. The concepts of *present*, *past*, and *future*, everything in the concepts of time and history which implies evidence of them –the metaphysical concept of time in general- cannot adequately describe the structure of the trace.

(original quotations and italics)

(Derrida 1976, p. 67)

It is no chance that the transcendental phenomenology of the internal time-consciousness, so watchful to put cosmic-time inside brackets, lives during an era that is accessory to the time of the world. Perception, consciousness and the world are all on the same plane that does not permit a rupture encroach between them. 'It is in a certain "unheard" sense, then, that speech is in the world, rooted in that very passivity which metaphysics calls sensibility in general' (unique citations – Derrida 1976, p. 67), which keeps running as per logos is imprinted and that imprint is the writing-resource of language under the noncreative, unceasing and ceaseless full component of the divine word.

But it would mean a single step outside of metaphysics if nothing more than a new motif of “return to finitude”, of “God’s death” etc., were the result of this move. It is that conceptuality and that problematic that must be deconstructed. They belong to the onto-theology they fight against. Différance is also something other than finitude.

(original quotations)

(Derrida 1976, p. 68)

As indicated by Derrida, the lack of involvement of speech is additionally its association with language. Also, the relationship amongst passivity and difference cannot be thought without the relationship between unconscious of language (as the rootedness inside language) and the *spacing* (pause, blank, punctuation and so forth) as the source of meaning. Writing, then, is constantly other than the subject and ought to never be thought under its class. Whichever way it might be adjusted, whichever way it is blessed with consciousness or unconsciousness, 'it will refer, by the entire thread of history, to the substantiality of a presence unperturbed by accidents or to the identity of the selfsame

[le propre] in the presence of self-relationship. And the thread of that history clearly does not run within the borders of metaphysics' (Derrida 1967, p. 69).

On the off chance that the amount of abstract labor is the premise of the possibility of value and manages substitutions between commodities paying little mind to their substance, a specific *de jure* pre-built up systematicity is the precondition of that general translatability of signs which sets the premise of the possibility of meaning. Shapes which stamp products as commodities must be considered as prior to the circulation of commodities – pretty much as the *archi-trace* alludes to the possibility of a total system, open to every single conceivable venture of meaning. The homology is finished at each level, since speech is constituted in the destruction of this *arche-writing*, it can be said that abstract labor is the *arche-writing* which is the premise of value of commodities and destroyed by monetary writing (Derrida 1976, p. 47).

The complicity between logocentrism and the fetishism of money and of the commodity is therefore exposed. Circulation bursts through all the temporal, spatial and personal barriers imposed by the direct exchange of products and so makes possible the hypostasis of value, hypostatized meaning (Logos) results not only from the occultation of the productive value of signs but also from the bracketing of the relations of the signs' productions.

This division of labor into a useful thing and a thing possessing a clue appears in practice only when exchange has already acquired a sufficient extension and importance to allow useful things to be produced for the purpose of being exchanged, so that their character as values has already been taken into consideration during production (Marx, 1977, p. 166).

Subsequently when exchange has superseded the relations of production; likewise, logocentrism shows up when the use-value of signs is disguised by selective thought of their exchange-value. Logocentrism is the linguistic name of an all-inclusive and predominant guideline of dishonesty whose premise is the abstract labor. Along these lines the economic product is imagined because of the fact that it requires a specific abstract labor, whose scientific evaluation, communicated in units of time, supplies the "law" that manages the exchange of commodities. This law assumes the same part in appreciation of commodities as the transcendental synthesis of *archi-writing* summoned by the arbitrariness of the sign. The time of labor, as *archi-writing*, the administrative guideline of

general translatability does not include concrete labor whose utility is spoken to by the use-value of its product or by the way that its product is a use-value. Saussure dispenses with the means of production and the labor of production itself from the arrangement of language. Be that as it may, here as well, if labor is to be considered as unique as well as on its solid angle, so 'the immotivation of the trace ought now to be understood as an operation and not as a state, as an active movement, a demotivation, not as a given structure' (Derrida, 1976, p. 51). By the same token, the idea of difference comes in; 'différance, an economic concept designating the production of differing/deferring' (Derrida 1976, p. 23).

The product of use-value, according to Marx, has an immediate usefulness or else be consumed indirectly as a means of production.

Labor consumes products in order to create products or in other words consumes one set of products by turning them into means of production for another set. If we look at the whole process from the point of view of its result, the product, it is plain that both the instruments and the object of labor are means of production and that the labor itself is productive labor (Marx, 1977, p. 287).

As Goux explains, 'the means and the object of labour are thus caught in a *detour* and labour itself has a *detour* as its basis' (1998, p. 59). It speaks to a backhanded use and the means of production in themselves are the instruments of a detour of production. To put it plainly, labor defers. It concedes the utilization of products as means of subsistence with a specific end goal to devour them as a method for labor's operation. This, then, is the contrast between pleasure-principle and the reality-principle, 'the possibility, within life, of the detour, of deferral' (Derrida, 1978, p. 198). Concrete labor is the trace, reserve, and difference. As Goux asserts 'all labor is a detour; all *jouissance* is a short-cut.' (1998, p. 59). That which is reserved, in the distinction of communication, is unveiled to labor. Accentuated by Derrida, there is no life present at first, which would then come to secure, defer or hold itself in difference (1978, p. 198). It is the state of survival. The movement of *différance* is not the deferment of a conceivable pleasure but rather the shirking by a procedure of production, of an unavoidable demise. It is a deviation that rebates a long-term *jouissance* without which no *jouissance* would right then and there be conceivable. The resistance between the detour and the short-cut is neither the topic of sexuality nor that of labor yet the very premise of their foundation and of their partition. The prohibition is just an enactment of labor and the administration of this detour.

The motive of human society is in the last resort an economic one; since it does not possess enough provisions to keep its members alive unless they work, it *must* restrict the number of its members and *divert* their energies from sexual activity to work (Freud, 1953, p. 312).

Whether it is a machine-tool or a writing-machine, the profitability of the machine is measured by the extent in which it replaces man. This is the way traditional political economy characterizes the means of production in order to better hide the part of the power of work as a supply of a mediator and reproducible merchandise whose utilization through the detours of production permits the efficiency of work to increase. Concrete labor as the formation of the trace, *différance* and reserve is this 'violent encryption of a form, tracing of a difference in a nature or a matter which are conceivable as such only in their opposition to writing – to the concrete labor itself' (Derrida 1978, p. 246) and expressed by Marx, 'labor is, first of all, a process between man and nature' (Marx 1977, p. 283).

On the off chance that the trace is the supreme root of sense when all is said and done as adding up to say that there is no outright source of sense by and large, then, similarly, as Marx indicates that 'labor is substance and the immanent measure of value but it has no value itself' (1977, p. 677). The trace is *différance* which opens up the presence of signification, however this originary position puts the trace outside of each one of those originations that are controlled by the trace alone since it places it in an outside that only a transcendental set "under erasure" could, in a temporary moment, assign. Likewise, for Marx, the greatness of the value of commodity speaks to only the amount of labor exemplified in it, yet correctly, this value-creating property of labor recognizes it from all different products and blocks it, as developmental component of value, from the likelihood of having any value itself (1977, p. 287). The starting point of meaning of all signs in the development of *différance* rises above the universe of signs. In agreement with Goux, 'concrete labor, as the dynamic power in the detour of production, is the premise of the estimation of all commodities however it itself is not a commodity' (1998, p. 60).

In the event that the meaning or the starting point of the trace must be set "under erasure", if everything starts with the trace yet the trace having no significance in an indistinguishable path in the statement of 'value of labor', the value is totally stifled as well as altered, so it turns into its component in resistance. In view of this key 'non-having a place' with the arrangement of the meaning of the

'production of the trace' or of the 'labor of writing', the 'force of writing' requests to be researched all in all since it additionally opens up the topic of their non-signification and their non-value (Derrida, 1978, p. 75-144).

What Derrida persuasively underlines is that the force of writing as *spacing* is recorded in a material and in an untranslatable etching (1976, p. 68). The materiality of a word is exactly that which interpretation gives. It is similarly that solid work cannot be assessed without being refined. During the time spent making the value, the labor-process

... consists in the useful labor which produces use-values. Here the movement of production is viewed qualitatively with regard to the particular kind of article produced and in accordance with the purpose and content of the movement. But if it is viewed as a value-creating process, the same labor-process appears only quantitatively. Here it is a question merely of the time needed to do the work (Marx, 1977, p. 302).

The basis of offering the force of the work is the foundation of a code of translation. The space of dissemination forces a code for the translation of labor. Flow translates the untranslatable. It transforms labor into wage-labor. From a linguistic viewpoint,

translation, a system of translation, is possible only of what a permanent code allows a substitution or transformation of signifiers while retaining the same signified, always present, despite the absence of any specific signifier. This fundamental possibility of substitution would thus be implied by the coupled concepts of signified/signifier and would consequently be implied by the concept of the sign itself (Derrida, 1978, p. 253).

An indistinguishable movement can be perceived at the economic level. The difference between labor, considered from one perspective as delivering utilities and then again as making value just shows up through constrained translation as the labor market determines itself into a qualification between two parts of the production process. The difference between use-value/exchange value is in this manner the standard of the same occultation as the difference between the signifier and the signified. In the space of the circulation, in order to interpret the non-transcriptive writing of labor as money-value

and on the other hand to convert over an entirety of money into the concrete labor, this exchange is taken as the capitalist profit and the assignation, the exploitation of the laborer. As Goux asserts that ‘to translate non-transcriptive writing (functional writing) into the business component of meaning and language is to benefit from the labor of writing by concealing it’ (1998, p. 62). The thought of the labor is superimposed on the establishing concept of labor by veiling it through the intermediation of money, as the notion of meaning is superimposed by concealing it through the intermediary of speech on the establishing notion of the production of the trace.

The meaning-effect is conceived in the hid crevice between laboring inscription and monetary or linguistic pseudo-transcription. Since capitalism arranges itself inside the contrast between the cost of laborer-poet and the value which his capacity makes, inside logocentric discourse, it gives the idea that the signified benefits from the signifier to appear, keeping in mind the end goal however the signified could manage without the signifier. As Goux identifies, ‘the signified is the *revenue* of the signifier, the surplus-value of the labor of signs’ (Goux, 1998, 63). The way that the ideals of the signifier lying in empowering the signified to go past the signifier is to call attention to, at the linguistic level, that the means of production have been changed over into commodities whose qualities surpass that of their segment parts. The labor of words is sublimated in the component of meaning. There is a substance that can get to be autonomous of the indication of structures, which is to know, as the industrialist definitely realizes that all commodities, however weary they may look or however severely “they may smell” are in fact and in truth money and likewise, is a superb means for profiting money out of more money.

This is why as Goux asserts that ‘all labor with words that envisages nothing more than a revenue of meaning detachable from its function (discursive, expressive language) corresponds to the value-giving movement of industrial capital (1998, p. 63). Writing is given something to deliver however much meaning as could reasonably be expected. We could include that inside the breaking points of idealist philosophy, the ingestion of all hints of work by the full presence of meaning compares precisely to the value-giving movement of usurers' capital or all the more, by and large, to the lack of awareness and use of all labor, of each medium between one labor and another. As Marx asserts, ‘in usurers' capital, the form M(oney)- C(ommodity)- M(oney) is reduced to the unmediated extremes M(oney)- M(oney), money which is exchanged for more money’ (1977, p. 267). The money-form,

confined from any hint of work, from any connection to commodities, empowers financial speculation, the hypostasis of the exchange-value of words empowers philosophical speculation.

Value therefore now becomes value in process, money in process and as such, capital. It comes out of circulation, enters into it again, preserves and multiplies itself within circulation, emerges from it with an increased size and starts the same cycle again and again. M-M, money which begets money (Marx, 1977, p. 256).

This "abridged" circulation, in its last result and with no middle of stage is the premise of speculative idealist philosophy that Marx basically criticizes and which short-circuits the use-value of signs as the labor of writing to arrange itself inside the Logos that reabsorbs, assesses, welcomes every one of the commodities since money does not uncover what has been changed into it on the grounds that what is changed into itself is not convertible into money.

Albeit nothing is safe from this alchemy, this alchemy does not in itself create value. It uproots and focuses and amasses value yet does not create it. On the off chance that non-written meaning, non-operative speculation stays void and ineffective, circulation and exchange make no value. Also, if meaning shows up in return, it is not by means of exchange that meaning is created; it is by means of operation of use, which stays remote from it. On the off chance that use-value cannot be framed unavailable for general use and amid its arrangement, something must happen out of sight which is not noticeable in the circulation itself, so language benefits from man's operation that is made imperceptible by the brightness of meaning.

According to Goux, 'the taxation of labor, the absorption of its product by value, is indistinguishable from the effacement of the trace by the Logos (law, reading, ligature)' (1968, p. 65). Plato's open hatred for writing means the open blackmail of surplus labor. The philosopher is straightforwardly apportioned from writing generally as the overwhelming class is administered from working (ibid.). Agreement from the detour of production supports political speech, which develop inside the quickness and self-proof of meaning and by return taxes, force them upon the productive labor. Similarly, the misrecognition of the particular use-value of writing and its dissimulation in the all-inclusive straightforwardness of exchange relates to the entrepreneur snippet of masking the blackmail of surplus labor in the appearance of the free contract influenced in the circle of exchange.

This is how, as interpreted by Goux, ‘that logocentrism situates itself within the short-cut effect produced by the detour it imposes’ (1998, p. 66). Subsequently the scriptural exchange between the short-cut and the detour of poetic writing disallowed by the scission between a work oblivious of the thing to which it is the detour of and a short-cut as an agreement uninformed of the detour from which it has gotten away. Hence logocentrism is the effect of the detour's deviation for the advantage of a class that expends without producing.

On the off chance that Derrida was irately reproachful of Heidegger's critique of humanism for including a supplanting of Man with the similarly essentialist and metaphysical Being, this was done on the grounds of accusing Heidegger that of attempting to escape to an "outside" of the humanist metaphysics, earnestly in light of the fact that metaphysics still works on ratios. In this manner Derrida was not just attempting to apportion the class of the subject but rather attempting to re-assess it in a non-essentialist classification that exists at its own utmost and accordingly gives a line of escape to a politics that has not been characterized until now. As I attempted to show above that difference, to be sure, alludes back to what Marx has characterized as *infrastructure*; as some kind of unity developed on the premise of its own disunity and constituted through its own particular points of confinement. This is the reason the legislative issues of *différance* is not taking into account an essential identity but instead developing through the rationale of supplementarity: 'It governs nothing, reigns over nothing and nowhere exercises any authority... Not only is there no kingdom of *différance* but *différance* instigates the subversion of every kingdom' (Derrida, 1982, p. 18) So against those who criticized Derrida for constructing his own academic kingdom, this conception clearly proves that he was chasing after none because at the focal point of that infrastructure is an absence that never sets up a *place of power*; however stays in a condition of undecidability between affirming identity and non-identity, because the political project of this system is to disregard both presence and absence and to rise above the parallel structures that limit them. This is the main condition in which every one of the requests could be uprooted, including that of deconstruction's own. This is the reason “archi-writing” is a type of critique that is neither entirely inside, nor entirely outside of all discourses however investigates the self-declared *closure* of all discourses and like proletariat, it remains an excess produced by the very structures it debilitates and by transgressing the limits of metaphysics, it likewise transgresses itself, re-assesses and reinscribes the limit it crosses and calls that limit into *question*.

Along these lines the ethical "outside" that Derrida has so immovably demanded by his basic perusing of Levinas opens up a substantially more radical probability of the transformation of politics in accordance with Marx. Very mindful of the way that this transformation is not a flat out dismissal of the existing order since it inevitably will prompt the establishment of another order, this ever-deteriorated "outside" is not isolated from inside by an unyielding line. In parallel with Marx, the line that this "outside" draws is consistently reinterpreted, risked and developed by relations of antagonism. This "outside" exists just in connection to and as detailed from inside, however, in the meantime, debilitates that inside too. Hence Derrida demonstrates to us that no identity is unadulterated and closed, it generally is polluted by what it excludes. This undermines antagonistic politics since identity is to a limited extent constituted by what it opposes. He likewise makes us obviously see the obstinate area of power since political activity must trace a *crack* between toppling the focal power or supplanting it with another focal point of power so it does not just reexamine any spots of power until the end of time. This is the way in which *différance* differs from Hegel's idea of interioration, which, as one form of colossal exigency explains the circle of hermeneutics sublating the adjusted binary oppositions of metaphysical philosophy and overlooks the possibility of distinct loss of meaning as being *disseminated*.

Since grammatology is not the psychoanalysis of logocentrism as one that would pivot the psychoanalytical designing of the historical backdrop of writing, deconstruction, then, constitutes a politico-ethical dimension of justice and emancipation which works at the limits of each law, strips its violence and destabilizes the institutions that depend on it and consequently addresses even its own particular establishments and as it were, compels us to re-assess the breaking points of our contemporary political reality ceaselessly, out of each epoch, all through the whole string of history - as Derrida's former teacher (Marx) has proposed.

KAYNAKLAR

- de Sassure, Ferdinand (1993) *The Course in General Linguistics*, London: Duckworth.
- Derrida, Jacques (1976) *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . (1982) *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . (1992) *Given Time: I, Counterfeit Money*, trans. by Peggy Kamuf, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . (1978) *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, in J Strachey (ed.) (1953) *Standard Edition*, vol XVI. London: Hogarth Press.
- Goux, Jean-Joseph (1968) 'Marx and the inscription of labor', in Ffrench, Patrick and Roland Francois Lack (eds.) (1998) *The Tel Quel Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl (1977) *Capital, Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy*, Intro. by Ernest Mandel and trans. by Ben Fowles, New York: Vintage Books.
- Plato (1992) *Republic*, Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co.