



Commodification and Fiction: A Marxist Critique of Hawthorne's Selected Works

*Sabahat Rafique

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Lahore, Gujrat Campus, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 05.3.2022
Accepted: 05.4.2022
Final Version: 25. 6.2022

*Corresponding Author:

sabahatrafique0@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This present research has suggested the updated transition of Marx's human commodity form as modified rather than transmogrified as commodification, an effort to give a new look to the same old Marxian concept. The selected works are an analysis of the Marxian commodity form of human beings in fiction. Hawthorne displays in his selected works the mechanical creation of the instincts of people which become reflexive of the commodity accumulator's desired ideas and set of values to live in the society. The mechanism of the commodity producing system pre-plans the social life and makes people go along with them unconsciously and willingly as the political economy's social construction makes it intrinsic and admissible with the help of its exercise of power, which appears to dependents as an indispensable part of their lives. The intentional and deliberate planning of the economic base has been followed unintentionally where they become involuntary and unconsciously a tool or commodity which can be used and sacrificed for the pleasure of their masters. The superstructure and cultural hegemony make them self-directing and spontaneous followers of commodity accumulating society's orders rather the economically dependents start taking them as their obligations. Hawthorne unveils this power play of the commodity producing society with the help of his stories and characters where dependents are unbidden followers of their social masters' commands.

Keywords: Commodification, Mechanical creation, Social construction, Superstructure, Cultural hegemony

Introduction

Marxism is considered to be a political as well as social theory which insists that social conditions and changes are subject to economic conditions. German theorists Marx along with Engels together develop this theory during 19th century. Marxist theory tries to examine the impacts and outcomes of materialism, transforming human beings and their labor into commodity, economic development and society. Marxists believe that basically economic conditions are the only factors which effect on individual's every aspect of life. Marxist theory or criticism starts with an understanding of the world in materialistic background. It is a method which analyses the history by materialistic interpretation and comes to be known as historical materialism. Marx prefers the material understanding of the past with the help of concrete and practical activities in place of unrolling abstract ideas. Marx has been the first one after Hegel who puts in application the dialectics to material philosophy and locates the modern commodity producing system. Marx puts forward Hegel's dialectic further generally with the help of his book (1999a) and ultimately provides the base of modern sociology. Marxism acknowledges the links between opposites, a dialectic which does not try to focus on mistakes rather a way to unfold the process. This dialectic method has power to suspect the things which are taken for granted or made abstract. It is a deep approach towards

history and unravels the secrets of the swinging power of commodity economy which entangles social relations as well as social construction. Marx stresses to find out the social phenomenon of any society by its economic corporations and ways of productions which entirely influence the whole social system. In a brief interpretation Marxian materialism always gives preference to economy while in a wider sense it encompasses the entire social network which includes every major as well as minor aspect of human life. Marxism thus relates the underneath reasons of progression and changes in human's life in the perspective of his living and survival. Marx and Engels (2010a) relate that in Marxian economy it is explained that the whole life history of human beings is a continuous struggle between the groups which contradict each other and this struggle remains existent either open or hidden form. Marx explains that people who possess the wealth and ways of commodity production have an edge on the every possible scenario of the social life. We observe from the history that the social life seems to be made up of interdependence of those apparently opposite or contradictory communities of people. Marx (2015) relates it in a way that society is not just made up of individuals rather demonstrates the quantity of interrelations. These are the relations which show the real place within which all those individuals stand. He describes that society of commodity production is easily understood in the form of dialectics of subject and object.

When we try to delve deep into the concept selected for the research we find Marx's commodity in the book selected as framework (1999b) where he explains human being as well as his whole life activity as a commodity. The framework of this research shows the commodity accumulator's hidden politics of dealing human beings as well as their whole life activities as things or commodities. They are given values and commodified for human needs and desires. Marx (1999a) further explains the same concept. He elaborates within detail about a subject becoming as an object and things becoming subjects in the society of commodity production. He expresses the condition of a person is attached to the accumulation of commodities in his possession or his capacity to produce commodities. The relationship among people are actually because of or by means of those commodities in a society of commodity production thus the interaction and relationship of people get mystified and obscured. The concept of commodity by Marx is multi-dimensional as it shows his analysis of social structure along with the people's consciousness of it. He explains the inter-action of both levels. He describes that commodifying factor of social existence has been made as an abstract factor. Marx further explains the social labor as value creating capacity which is called as the labor in abstract or abstract labor. Further he develops a commodity money theory as it is said by Smith that commodity accumulation is not only the power on labor rather it is necessarily the command on particularly unpaid labor. It includes every kind of surplus value in what so ever specific type. In the perspective of detail of value we observe in commodity social construction that economic power exercises means to trivialize as well as make the lives of socio-relational dependents as abstract. It is always the relative value of an individual which is used through exchange of social relations. All these human relations seem to be at first relations among commodities or objects and their true value is taken by means of relations among things. In commodity economy social relations of people become subordinate of relations among commodities in the context of their use or exchange value which is made normal by manufacture of consent of the people through cultural hegemony.

The nucleus of commodity formation is a connection among people which gets the persona of a thing. The commodity producing society altogether is subordinate to the economic values and reflects the human relations into the forms of objects and commodities possessing use as well as exchange value. Here the part of ruling economy as the social ideology comes into action and mystifies the basic nature of commodity. This concealed nature of commodity becomes self-governing and ultimately holds a kind of phantom objectivity. Marx gives two concepts of commodity one as an object and the other as human being. Lukács (1967) in his essay in an effort to make Marx's concept more vivid and clear and divides

commodity fetishism in two parts, first as objective world where the relation between commodities becomes alive or kind of relations among living beings. The second as subjective world which becomes predominantly developed by economy which makes human beings estranged from their human relations and turns them into commodities under the natural rules and laws of social system which is made through superstructure. The social system and its laws are actually the laws made by the ruling people or commodity accumulators.

Here we come across two situations, one of social relations from objective perspective and second at the same time subjective understanding of those relations in the social system influenced and commanded by commodity producing system. In such societies the interrelation of the individuals are indirect. They are connected through the interchange of commodities. Here the description of the social character of the people's life activity or labor is made obscured. The relationships among commodities become veiled behind the human relations. In this context we find since the beginning of life all social relations as relations recognized because of their natural qualities as kind of physical objects. Thus in society of commodity production the natural properties turn human beings into objects possessing specified values and become a source of reproduction of social relations. Marx (1999b) highlights the concept of making human beings as commodity then further relates (1999a) it as commodity fetishism which by means of unstoppable process of progression of language keeps adopting reification, fictitious commodity and now this research is going to apply it as commodification. The way the concept of use and exchange value is given by Aristotle (2009) while nominated by Smith (2009) similarly, the concept about human being and his whole life activity as a commodity is given by Marx, further developed by Lukács as reification and explained in great detail as fictitious commodity by Marxist critique Polanyi (1944). This researcher is going to make an effort of giving a fresh look to the old concept of Marxian commodity to the commodification of human social relations. Here man becomes a part of that commodity accumulating system which develops its own social factory of human relations which are exchanged and sold as just the units and not human beings. This research takes its essence from Marx's (1999b) theory of converting man as well as his whole life activity into commodity which has always been under command and control of commodity accumulators. The researcher is going to make an effort to work on commodification. Marx never uses this particular term. It is added recently in lexicon of the Marxist as well as the economic discourses. Although it is the recent coinage found in modern Marxist terminology yet it belongs to and rooted in Marx's commodity. Marx himself explains his concepts of historical materialism and proves the core concepts always retain their merit and worth for their application above and beyond their particular age or geographical concepts. This research is going to try the same practice by giving an understanding of Marxian human commodity idea expanding and broadening by taking account of social emotional relations into account with the help of Hawthorne's fiction.

Commodification is a term used in communities where wealth is taken as of the supreme importance. This terminology exposes not only the human condition in the present world rather it reveals all the tactics of commodity producing economy from the very dawn of human existence. Marx (1999b) a German socialist, economist, philosopher and revolutionist digs out the roots of the process of commodification by defining the conditions and situations of human beings. He (1999a) thoroughly describes the social phenomenon of commodification of socially and economically dependents by the hands of socio-relational commodity accumulators and unravels the exploitation. He starts by demystifying the originality of a commodity, a thing or service which possesses the value of exchange or sale in the market. Commodification is an act of changing or transforming nature, ideas, emotions, services or human beings into things or commodities for someone else's desire or need. Commodification is taken as a relationship of domination of one person on the other and commodifier imposes his will on the behalf of some need or desire to the needy one. Commodified persons lose their

human value as well as characteristics and in this way they are transformed into the world of commodities. Their human emotions as sympathy, tenderness, interpersonal warmth are replaced by passivity and shallowness and as a result their body and mind are used and taken like an item that maybe hurt, torn and contravened as a thing. They feel dehumanized and humiliated as Haslam (2006) relates that brutal management of people is a common practice of the society. Thus a human being becomes a commodity when he is under the control of someone else. The commodification of human beings means in general is to put price label on someone and transforming him into something which can easily be commercialized. Thus commodification also means to transform people into properties for exchanging and transforming them to others. Marx and Engels (2010a) relate this process as, things and objects are given to other people because of their benefit for exchange. In Marxist theory we find a dialectical relationship of human being's social existence and his consciousness of the same existence. The social consciousness is explained as a kind of amnesia where man is made to forget his real and original existence in the world of commodities. The phenomena of existing social order is made as situations and conditions above and beyond human control which is presented as natural laws of universe or divine orders. This idea has been explained by Engels (2000) in his letter to Mehring where he calls it as false consciousness. In the world of commodity the human existence is conceived as culturally translated. This social construction of commodity production is an ideological mystification in form of human relations which are social and cultural. They are explained by Marx and Engels (2010b) that all the details of the history are actually the details which already exist. One observes a lot willful distortions while interpreting social consciousness by the social institutions to give all those factors an objective perspective. Campbell and Gregor (2002) relate it as a moment when one feels that something is chafing. They call it a conversation of disjuncture where one finds different versions of coming to know from leading and ruling perspective which is opposed to their personal experiential perspective. This very statement further takes the researcher towards another aspect which is Smith's concept. Smith (1987) describes that establishing the societal organization and resolutions of day to day world informs of problematic which is a way of counseling as well as focusing into enquiry and to spotlight such kind of questions which have not been previously asked but they are 'latent' in the world of realities in form of actual experiences. She further explains that true understanding of these very problematic guides the inquiry or to the opaque that means something which is present but somehow either it is partially or completely hidden in commodity producing society.

It is this very idea of disjuncture as well as the problematic which draws the researcher's attention towards making an effort to ponder over carefully and try to unfold the layers of superstructure. These layers surround the people in codes of laws, principles and politics which frame the social phenomenon. This is the point of disjuncture to recognize the problematic and acknowledge the opacity with the help of personal experiential perspective. The research problem becomes vivid and clear as Graham (1998) says that it is standpoint which is outside the institutional discourses. Campbell and Gregor (2002) call it viewpoints about those people who are actually being ruled. This research focuses on the understanding of the interconnectedness of all opaque aspects of social relations in commodity producing society. The writers of any age can never remain unaffected by the trends and values of that age. Walby (2005) illuminates this idea as this is the chain and progression of texts which interrelates the activities, consciousness and types of organization which are pretty local. One finds the texts, fiction and literature of any age the way to know the age. It attracts the researcher to take Hawthorne's fiction more than just literary pieces of work and means to peep into that time's social system and social relations. Here the researcher finds the stories of Hawthorne as much more than whatever is written with interpretive method, went through beneath the surface and finds out the oppression and commodification done through social relation's commodity collectors. Smith (1999) verifies the material of any kind of text

creates a specific ground where one can observe with the help of language, social set up, culture, thoughts and the people living in that age along with their actualities. Thus these are the texts which enable us to become familiar with or to know the living experiences of the people of that era. Smith further strengthens the point by describing that the text's power gains the mark and authority when it is acknowledged in the public after its launch. This researcher finds Marxist commodification as the most relevant theory which is expressed by Cole (2003) as it allows the people to go beyond outward form and underneath the surface.

This research will be trying to focus on the short stories of Hawthorne (July 4, 1804 -May 19, 1864) who is a well-known novelist of America with his expertise in romanticism and particularly in dark romanticism. He shows his skills in portraying physical realities around him in a novel way. Marxists at first place are interested in power specifically as capacities than exercise of power in direct ways. They practically are interested in the actualization of these capacities. We find in selected stories, the dominating characters, economically better as commodity accumulators. The framework (1999b) of this research correlates with interpretive methodology of Hawthorne's fiction which reflects clearly this point of disjuncture and reader can easily feel the opacity with an understanding of problematic in commodity producing social system. Hawthorne shows his skill by drawing a clear line by depicting the commodification of economically dependent social relations. The commodity collectors show their care for their social relations while the difference is exposed in their experiential actualities. Smith (1987) explains that one does not need to lose sight of actual living experience. When one tries to delve deep into the social set up of our existing world he can very well see the hidden or invisible and thus one can expose all the underlying schemes. Hawthorne seems to be the one who does not ignore the actualities of experiential world. He is not only capable of recognizing problematic, opaque, and invisible as well as made hidden by commodity hoarders but also shows this point of disjuncture to his readers with the help of his fictional characters. We observe in Hawthorne's selected stories Marxist commodification of social relation which is made acceptable to not only commodifiers but also by the ones who are commodified. Hawthorne portrays the Marxist commodification fiction quite artistically and draws through his characters the multi layers of power relations. He shows that commodity producers are anxious about the links which include continuation and discontinuation between power of money and social relational domination. He shows how are Georgiana, Beatrice, Mrs. Wakefield and Mr. Bullfrog fallen prey to the structured society. Their labor is made invisible and abstract as Marx (1999a) explains that we make useful aspect of different types of labors invisible and ultimately no specification is left except something familiar to all of them and thus all of them are decreased to the similar types of labor rather the only one form and that is human labor which is taken as abstract labor.

The members who are economically dominant in the family are Mrs. Bullfrog, Mr. Wakefield, Dr. Rappaccini and Mr. Aylmer while Georgiana, Beatrice, Mrs. Wakefield and Mr. Bullfrog are depicted as economically dependents. They sacrifice their whole life activities to the social relation's masters for getting the basic means of subsistence. We find Aylmer, Dr. Rappaccini, Wakefield and Mrs Bullfrog utilizing and manipulating the socially available capacities from the social structure. These commodity accumulators of social relations exercise their accord and power under the umbrella of hegemonic culture. These capacities are deeply rooted in the structure of society and social relations. Marx (1999b) describes this situation as the only asset the economically dependent has in his possession is his labor power in action which is his work activity. He explains that his labor is the only active pronouncement of his life. This is the life activity of the worker which he actually sells to the commodity gleaner for his survival. Thus his whole life and all of its activities he sells for getting his unavoidable means of living. He has to do it for securing his life and existence because for him labor is not the part of his life rather it is the whole life which becomes a commodity, auctioned off for keeping himself alive. We find in the

same way Georgiana, Beatrice, Mrs. Wakefield and Mr. Bullfrog playing as obedient servants. They do not have any concept of refusing to their economically powerful guardians. Their behaviors show the social domination of commodity hoarder and unrecognized hegemonic subordination. Their actions are true reflections of the concept of Gramsci's hegemony. His belief that social community never achieves a primary influence and control by overt means. We find rather it is the group which is spreading successfully its ideological views as an outcome of which the dependent groups unintentionally and willingly accept and take part in their own maltreatment. Gramsci's views can be simplified as ideology comes into being as the continuation of hegemony. It is the art of hegemony that individuals forget their personal desires and accept dominant norms and values as their own. Thus it is a kind of deception as Gramsci calls it manufacture of consent.

Hawthorne shows through fiction deep insight and genius by highlighting hegemonic ideology of the commodity producers. He shows that how do social relations play their power politics and exploit the economically dependents. Their worth is not more than commodities to them. They commodify their existence, emotions and services for their desires and satisfaction. In these short stories Hawthorne presents the analysis of power relations. The commodity domination of such specific type which is more of purely interpersonal phenomenon rather than any manifestation of power relation. Thus writer depicts aptly that commodity domination implies all forms of power through social identities and relations. We find the idea here as commodity producers are only fascinated in the exercise of social power by casual interconnection and ultimately reproduce and transform them all into the commodity producers' domination.

Background of Study

When we think of comprehending effects as well as outcomes of the Marxist commodification on the commodity accumulating society and its social relations it is very important that we should try to know the roots of this commodification, its effects on man's social or emotional life and its ultimate results. The researcher thinks that since the dawn of humanity the life observes the commodity hoarders manoeuvre the social system and have their monopoly over the whole life circle with the help of superstructure. It was mid-19th century that Marx and Engels introduce the theory and explain in detail the way commodity gatherers commodify not only economically dependents but make their whole lives abstract. This research is going to focus on the commodification of man as well as his life activity through social emotional relations. It is the superstructure that is actually made by commodity economy which mystifies the commodification under the veils and names of social emotional relations. They take strength and help from cultural hegemony to make their cruelties a normal phenomenon and as a result the dependents not only accept their emotional and physical slavery but also offer their whole lives and life activities to the commodity gleaners themselves.

Significance of Study

The findings of the research are expected to be useful. Theoretically this can be used as a reference to Marxist commoditization's relation to literature and fiction. It will specifically be helpful for providing information about Marxist commodification in Hawthorne's stories. The reader will be in a better position to understand the social and relational economic domination in the stories. Marxism is understood as a philosophy of the history. It is an effort to formulate a theory of human societies. Marx and Engels do not directly relate their economic and political theories to the issue of aesthetics. However, since the time immemorial attempts have been made to depict the social and political conditions of the age through literary works. The researcher takes Marx's book (1999b) as its framework to highlight the idea with the help of Hawthorne's selected stories.

In an effort to acknowledge Marxist vision of writings its important that we will be able to understand the link among fiction, human life as well as political and economic conditions. In this regard, term like, foundation and super structure, doctrines, social realism as well as hegemony assist us for demystifying the relationship between Marxism and fiction. Marx believes that the social relations between men are determined by the way they produce their material lives. Marx and Engels (2010a) say that the basic ideas of anyone for leading and understanding life springs from his social set up which is basically an outcome of the commodity accumulating community ,who are the owners of all properties and means of productions. The commodity gleaners device strategies for making their ideas and benefits as governing laws of that age which seem to the rest of people as very normal and natural while they are all pre-conceived and pre-planned as it is the economy which is taking state as well as all institutions completely under its control. In the specific category of superstructure Gramsci gives the explanation in the division of political and civil society. He refers to political society as organised networks of police and military while civil society is a consensus creating agency. Similarly, Althusser (1971) gives further concept and explains how commodity producers play an essential function to legitimate their power as social group with the help of RSA and ISA. They make it clear that state which seems to be an impartial and neutral part protects as well as helps and supports the very ideas of ruling group which is commodity producer.

Delimitation of the Study

The researcher is humbly trying to identify the role of social as well as economic commodification of the economically dependents by commodity producers of social relations. In the present age people are aware of social setup which knows the relativity of value given to the objects and people. Hawthorne in his fiction depicts the same theory with all its possible aspects in his works. This research tries to unravel veils of social emotional as well as relational exercise of power on the basis of socioeconomic reasons. The effort is made to demystify the commodification of interdependence within the roots of Marxist social basis. Although there is a range of authors' stereotype writings which have horror, suspense, psychological and Marxist dimensions but with different perspective than the selected one. Hawthorne's selected works have previously been considered as highlighters of Marxist alienation, materialism and secular calling while this research's focus is to elucidate the Marxist commodification of social relations.

Research Objectives

The research aims at examining the nature of Marxist Commodification in Hawthorne's fictional stories, *Wakefield*, *The birth mark*, *Mrs. Bullfrog* and *Rappaccini's daughter*. The researcher will try to throw light on the web of social relations in form of concerning values, set norms and cultural practices, fabricated by commodity gleaners to commodify the dependents. The researcher will try to point out the stratagems of commodity producing society's tactics of seeping through their social places in social relations and exercising their economic dominance by exploiting as well as wasting and finishing their whole lives. The study aims at analyzing the material interdependence and commodity producer's conspiracy of manoeuvring the capacities in the social structure rather than exercising their power directly with the help of Hawthorne's fiction.

Research Questions

- Q1.** How do Hawthorne's fictional characters appear to be victims of commodification with respect to Marxist social/political background?
- Q2.** How is the superstructure involved as a coercive factor in leading the fictional characters towards Marxist commodification/ behind social structure in the stories?

- Q3.** How do Hawthorne's selected works of fiction fall in category of Marxist idea of commodification in social relations?
- Q4.** Why do Hawthorne's fictional characters not revolt against their commodification by their respective commodity gleaners?

Research Methodology and Framework

The researcher has tried to opt for a significant effort for overlapping the conceptual as well as methodological aspects for giving clear understanding of the topic selected. It has been an iterative procedure to develop theoretical framework along with the development of specified methodology which can be a guide for my analysis. Both these tools remain in collaboration with each other for getting the required results. These two theoretical and methodological frameworks have to be entwined so they are grouped together in this research for an effort to give clear comprehension. The research requires a suitable theoretical perspective and one needs to follow a set procedure to reach to the conclusion. This research applies qualitative and interpretive study which uses Marxism as a literary theory to find out social, emotional as well as relational commodification in fiction with the help of Hawthorne's selected stories in the light of this research's framework (1999b). The research tries to accentuate on underscoring the invisible, disguised, obscure and mystified power relations of commodity gleaners which keep acquiring their strength from superstructure with the help of cultural hegemony. This research in particular tries to spotlight the camouflaged and shrouded strategic manoeuvre of social emotional relations. The researcher applies interpretive and qualitative tools and tries to investigate Marxist commodification in Hawthorne's selected stories which is done by social relational commodity hoarders.

Literature Review

Marx gets birth on 5th May, Trier in the province of Rhine of Prussia of state of German and dies on 14th of March, 1883 in London city of England. He is a sociologist, economist, historian and revolutionary. He is the son of a lawyer, an enlightened man who studies Kant and Voltaire. His mother belongs to Holland and his parents are from Jewish background, descended from rabbis. His father gets baptized as he probably requires this for his professional career just a year before his birth. He does his high school from Tier and goes to Bonn University where he studies humanities and takes subjects as Roman and Greek Mythology. He gets introduced with Hegel's philosophy and gets training of becoming a philosopher but in his mid-twenties he turns away from philosophy and shows his inclination towards economics along with politics. It is observed that his early writings show his philosophical tendency while his later works show his contacts with debates of contemporary philosophy, social sciences and philosophy of history along with moral as well as political philosophy. His theory of history, known as historical materialism shows and revolves around the idea of rise and fall of societies and the factors behind the progress of man's potential of production. Marx along with Engels strongly influences the world as founder of Marxism which criticizes capitalism strongly. They try to give fundamental and theoretical conception of human history especially in the context of economy, social inequality, social change, conflict and labor. They try to find out the root cause of man's commodification and exploitation on the grounds of economic helplessness in commodity economy. They try and aim to watch a new world emerging in front of them with the help of their radical thoughts and ideas. They try to disclose the secret forces and hidden dimensions of the social system. They work for knowing the world along with critiquing and improving it with the help of revolutionary changes.

Marx focuses the way commodity producing society's exploitative system causes social unrest and oppression. He makes it clear that accumulation of commodities in form of commodity producing system plays havoc in society as well as in social relations. He perceives and proves a definite structural agency at the back of commodity accumulating society. He explains that how does structure make society accept the ideology as natural which is in fact devised by the commodity producers with the help of economy which basically is the base and foundation of the structure. He explores and defines the ways in which people affluence with commodities, oppress, commodify, victimize and exploit the needy in general and dependents of social relations in particular. This very relation of oppressor and oppressed has been highlighted by social inequalities and oppressive ideology.

Marxism comes from the works of Marx and to lesser level from Engels in nineteenth century. Marxism is considered to be the method of social, economic and political analysis of the history. Marxism uses material interpretation of development of the history and provides basic theoretical concepts particularly with regard to extensive human history. McGuire (2006) writes that it's the perspective of knowing, criticizing and ultimately changing the existent world. Marxism is a theory which focuses on the commodification. The division of the people shows the reason of separation or division on the basis of economy. This is an obvious and concrete fact of life that human beings are unable to survive without food, cloth and shelter. These basic necessities of life cannot be in access without money. Marx relates the history of people who keep living on bartering as man has never been self-sufficient. His needs make him either inter-dependent or dependent on others. Gradually people with access to means extra than their needs start accumulation of commodities and cause exploitation and commodification of people with lesser or no means. In this way commodification starts with the origin of human society. He adopts both dialectic and material methods. He brings under consideration all the factors which cause changes as well as inter-actions in social relations of production and their effects on human beings. He can never neglect any economic or social event, happening or change in history and its link or connection with the present socio-economic lives of the people. All the changes are observed by Marx as a result or outcome of opposite forces. He is primarily concerned with material life of the people. He strongly believes that it is the economic life of the people which is effecting people's physical, mental lives and devising their day to day conditions. These are the means of production and accumulation of commodities which are making and effecting man's relations to man. The owners of the wealth are commodifying the needy ones while the ones who need the means of survival get on the disposal of the commodity accumulators and as a result they become physically exhausted, mentally tired, confused and ultimately isolated as a powerless community. Those who possess commodities or wealth devise methods of making more and more wealth on the cost of workers' health and lives. They exploit them apparently as well as in hidden and mystified ways. Marxism tries to demystify all those actual tactics of exploitation with detailed explanation of secrets behind commodity, value, use-value, exchange-value, sign-exchange value, base, superstructure and commodification. When we try to find the Marxist economy we find out its roots in old British classical economy. We find Ricardo who has been a great British economist develops and explains (1817) labor theory of value. He realizes that article's worth depends on time required for making that object. Second step in this regard has been means of production which are tools, machinery and equipment for making commodity. When a commodity collector brings a new machine he becomes in a position to make two things in the same time he uses to make one thing previously and thus that particular one commodity falls to half. The profit which is made because of more products goes straight into the pocket of the owner of the means of the production. Here comes another valuable point of making difference between complete surplus value as well as correlative surplus value and another tool of exploitation of commodity accumulators. In absolute value those working hours are counted for which commodity accumulator pays nothing at all. In relative surplus commodity accumulators have to find out

tactics and ways to make labor work to the maximum capacity at the cost of his physical and mental health. As a result of either of the practice the profit goes to the commodity accumulator as in the first form they exploit time while in the second they need fewer workers. When we start studying Marx it gets important to find out relation of Marx and Hegel. Marx points towards Hegelian dialectics in his works. Thus Hegel's dialectic gets an unavoidable importance in Marx's understanding. Hegel (1830) says that every theory or explanation is either short or there becomes ultimately something wrong with it. Some of its parts will be either incomplete or false. As a result of this some new or another idea will arise from the same idea or in Hegelian terminology negate the previous idea. This contradiction between two ideas will keep increasing until a new, third idea will come up which embraces the good parts of previous both ideas leaving incomplete and false part of them. Hegel relates three laws by which he operates the dialectics. Marx and Engels accept all three laws happily. The first of them is law of transforming quantity into quality. It explains that things keep changing with the passage of time quantitatively for most of the times but sometimes they take sudden jump to an altogether different state. This is a qualitative change that can just happen after a quantitative period. The second law is the law of opposite's unity. Most of the things in the world exist in opposition. Day, night, near, far, good, bad and hot and cold. All of these opposite elements are not away from one another. These oppositions form unions and they cannot be able to exist without one another. Day seems to have no meaning with the absence of night similarly good without bad and so on. This shows that identity of one thing depends on the existence of the other or may be opposite of it. The last and third law of the negation of the negation. Every idea, theory or thesis contains problems and troubles, kind of contradictions which ultimately cause the downfall of it. This failure happens because of the antithesis which reveals those contradictions. In this process thesis gets negated. Here comes the point when negation gets negated itself. Marxists believe these laws have always been there and operating the history and the social systems keep changing from one kind to the other when some kind of major or technical changes occur to the forces of production of existing relations of productions. This kind of change brings about sudden and rapid changes in the method of producing commodities along with qualitative changes in the interrelations of human beings. For understanding such major changes in social conversion is thought of by Marx as transformation from commodity accumulation to socialism.

Marx (2010b) further elaborates his feelings by referring to Kantian categorical imperative. This is among the basic moral values which unfold the essential principle of morality that one human being should not use the other humans being for his profit and gain. He believes that one person should be taken as an end in himself and not as a means to something. Commodity accumulation has been an economic system where people are used to make use of one another. In a commodity producing society this comes true not only for the commodity accumulator but also for the working community as they keep using people for their gains. Marx holds the idea that commodity economy is an alienated form of system though it has been regarded as unavoidable and natural by classical economists. He says that under this system economically dependents are forced to sell their labor which is basically the essence of their existence. Commodity accumulator uses labor to stockpile more and more commodities which become the source of increasing his power and wealth over the workers. The benefit of this entire endeavor goes to the commodity accumulator while worker is kept to the minimum wages just to make his survival. The need of survival for the dependent makes him as well as his labor power to sell the commodity accumulator which opens doors for commodification. The term commodification is used in the world of economy especially for the goods, emotions and things which previously have not been given economic worth. Commodification thus explains the process of transformation of human services, ideas, goods, emotions, nature, animals, and every possible one or thing into commodities or objects which can be bought and sold. Commodification in this context explains the procedure that something

gets an economic worth or merit which it does not have previously and finishes social ties and sentimental values attached to it.

In commodification we find that it affects and modifies relationships which are not in the past corrupted and exploited by commerce. Commodification makes relations commercial in day to day life. The very concept is sufficient enough to help to investigate human history of economically divided society. The commodity in general is an object to be exchanged. When we refer towards human commodification it means slavery, organ trade, surrogacy and human trafficking. We observe from the history that people have been divided into groups, the ones with affluence of commodities and deprived ones who are dependents for their needs and survival. The group with commodity accumulation has been in a position to exploit and commodify the deprived ones. The workers or poor people have been under compulsion to be commodified for their survival and basic living. Their necessities for their subsistence pressurize them to get commodified and sell their labor as well as themselves to the commodity accumulators. Commodification of the dependents has been made a normal phenomenon in the history. It is the false consciousness which is involved in making people fail to understand things actually as they are in true form. It happens because the superstructure conceals the true base of the society. The legal freedom of the laborer to choose his commodity accumulator for selling his labor does not save him from exploitation which has previously been done by feudal lord. It is the social consciousness which proves that commodity accumulator has a moral right to hire workers and take the fruits of it. This situation is elaborated by Leitch et, al. (2018) as true essence of ideology is that it hides facts and truths of the tussle of groups from us. Thus it gets natural that dependent accepts and absorbs the commodity accumulator's values unconsciously and without true acknowledgement and understanding so he carries along with him the false consciousness. For the understanding of this false consciousness one needs to understand the concepts which enable to comprehend the economic structure of the society which ultimately leads towards the commodification of the dependents and deprived ones. A rigorous and comprehensive study of the social structure gets fundamental as it is the only way in which we will be able to understand all other levels of society. The economic structure of the society has been explained as base by Marx and Engels while the superstructure for the state, law, institution and political system. All these factors lead individuals towards the social consciousness which communicates to the determined infrastructure. Engels (1996) says that the superstructure of any society relies on the economic base. He concludes that after a detailed analysis one understands the ultimate fact that the whole social set up and all of its institutions like religion, legal, educational, political as well as its conception of the previous historic eras depends on its economic base. Marx and Engels combine infra and structure and try to relate the relationship between economic level of the society as well as of political and ideological level which they define as forms of social consciousness.

This is the same manner as a building is constructed on the foundation similarly the economy is the foundation or base on which the whole structure of the society rests. The greatest contribution of Marx is the discovery that one should not study society as someone thinks or imagines. These are the economic or material conditions of the people and the process by which they used to produce commodities or goods they need for their livelihood. Marx (1999a) relates that these are the direct relations of commodity accumulators and workers which naturally correspond to the progress of procedures of work and the social productivity which basically can reveal the most hidden; secret that is the inner most invisible base of the entire society which has been politically connected with each other. In shape of state he explains that there has been a variety of variations in a society like race, the effects of history or natural environment. The effects and inter-relations of economy and superstructure can only be observed empirically. The conception of the superstructure delegates, therefore, society in two levels, political structure and ideological state while the latter is the forms of social consciousness. It is considered to be

the historical moment when Marx is composing the details of social history and its accounts, it is the time when there has been a strong current of idealists who attribute the reason of social happenings or phenomenon to man's will and thinking and deprecate the contribution of the material forces in it. Almost all prominent and most advanced philosophers as well as thinkers of seventeenth and eighteenth century from French and English background maintain idealistic conception and principles to explain the existence of social phenomenon as well as the history of man and his commodification. People from almost every part of community as philosophers, theologians, socialists, commodity accumulators, historians and economically deprived ones in short every possible person from that age has the belief in consciousness as the basic determinant force of the development of society.

Gradually Marx starts going against the prevalent trend of authentic philosophers and gives his own concepts which are a kind of extremely opposite and lately come to be known as historical materialism. Historical materialism is an effort to explain the history of the world from its origin and human development in materialistic terms. Materialism is considered to be a foundational and basic tenet of modern social sciences. Material here is just material in true sense which means something concrete and observable in physical form as objective. Marx tells material as perceptible by human senses and possesses objective actuality unrestrained from spirit and mind. He never denies the existence of spiritual and mental realities but prefers and believes in material facts and forces at the back of human development. Thus we find a kind of interplay of both materiality and abstraction in a modern commodity producing society. The society and superstructure emerge as an assemblage of materialism and abstraction which are called as social abstraction as well. The social actors of the commodity producing society constitute the social fabric with the help of abstraction. The social phenomenon is thus composed of abstract and concrete assemblage. Marx picks out and highlights the material forces which have always been the main cause of commodification of the deprived people. Materialism is closely attached and related to the fact and theory that all that exists is some way or the other is material. He brings to light all those aspects and factors which are a reason of commodity accumulator's rule in the form of commodity producer-democracy. He observes the commodification of economically dependent community and their contemplation towards the commodity accumulators. He reduces the whole phenomenon of society into its economic structure. These are the adversaries of the commodified people which lead Marx and Engels concentrate on economic factors of the society. They put their focus on the process which has been neglected by their contemporaries as well as previous thinkers. The political projects of Marx as well as Engels are proof of other aspects about social information involved in the commodification along with economy. In this respect Marx as well as Engels (2010b) says following as that in the last overview the economic construction of any society keeps shaping the real base which complicates the whole superstructure encircling its political, religious, philosophical as well as legal conception of all historical ages. They further explain it as they believe that economic conditions are the basic and final-determinant conditions for the commodification but they strongly believe other aspects of the society also play their respective roles, if someone crumples while explaining that economic aspect is just a solitary aspect of determining the facts then he changes the argument into incomprehensible, non-realistic and insensible phrase. All these elements of the superstructure are inter-linked directly or indirectly. They have their respective dynamics and through them they contribute to unfold the history of societies. Marx is a man of letters. He has an extensive study of the history as well as literature. Eagleton (1976) writes that the commodification of people and its history is visible through art, fiction as well as literature of that time as he says that the writings of Marx are interwoven with literary conceptions as well as allusions.

He believes literature or fiction as the part of the superstructure and manifestation of specific age and in that context he always expresses his opinions about the artistic freedom of expression and true depiction

of the age. Eagleton further explains the inter-relation of art and economy that has been one reason for what Marxist criticism elaborates lot more than just rephrasing the occurrences set forth by the creators of Marxism that it also jumbles a lot more than the concepts which are known in the West as sociology of literature. The term itself is concerned mainly with what can be called the mode of literary manufacturing, issuances, swapping and in a specific society the way books are produced, diffused, the social construction of the writers, public, degree of literacy, the social considerations and factors for the taste of that time. This also analyses literary works for their social connection. These details give obvious reasons to believe that there are certain ideological factors which are always at the service and an instrument of economic forces. The writer ahead of the given remark expresses his opinion that it is not just about sociology of literature in economic terms rather it focuses on the style and subject matter. These particularities help to peep into the contemporary conditions and situations. We find a lot of thinkers before Marx who believe that literary works are representation of that specific time and age. One of the prominent names is Hegel who is a German idealist. He leaves a deep impact on Marx's aesthetical views. The innovativeness of Marxist criticism lies not being an access to the history rather being a means of understanding the history. Marx and Engels (2010b) elucidate it as constructions about plans, motions, awareness is primarily and directly intermingled with the physical relationships of man, the language of the actual life. The process of man's thinking, pondering, and non-material relationship of people here appear as a straight reflection of man's material actions and we cannot move further from what people say, conceive, assume in the existing age and similarly from part as men have been portrayed, conceived, thought of, expected for coming to the corporeal man. It is not consciousness which governs life rather it is life which controls consciousness. Marx and Engels mutually analyze literature, fiction and art from social perspective. They always have a social purpose in criticizing literature. They analyze Shakespeare, in the context of his social background. In their criticism they highlight contemporary social and economic norms which are reflected through those works. Marx (1999a) makes some projects of literature as mirror of those societies, a kind of historical documents. Hatlen (1980) says that statement in this regard is that prominent historian's like Tawney and Hill indicate as great or an extreme kind of revolution is emerging in economic, communal and cultural context of UK through time of Shakespeare. Thus from writer's plays he shares economic and social aspects of his age. His works have traces of historical materialism. Commodification of the dependent and poor community is clearly observed in his works. Shakespeare depicts commodity accumulator's behavior as described by Ferber (1990) that it is Shakespeare's age when one can observe new trends of mercantile ventures are emerging which Shakespeare shares in his writings. Marx considers that Humanism should be part of literature and well-being of people must be a part of it along with realism. We find the research by Royanian and Omrani (2016) verifies this point. In this work they explain the Marxist perspective of social oppression and commodification of people has been a part of human history and Marxist commodity accumulators are shrewd enough to seep into the ideology through social structure and keep using humans as commodities. The researchers show that literature of Shakespeare shows the economic and social trends of that age. The commodity collector of the society commodifies people from the same as well as of the lower class. In *Hamlet* Claudius first kills his own brother king Hamlet for throne and marries his widow, Queen Gertrude soon after the death. The new king and queen commodify prince Hamlet's school friends, Ophelia, Polonius and Laertes and cause the death of all of them and they are not bothered at all. Similarly, in *Merchant of Venice* it has been shown from the perspective of Marxist theory. The play shows that people from the lower community are commodified and ignored by the commodity gleaners. Launcelot, old Gobbo, Balthazar, Stephano, Leonardo are shown as servants serving their lords and ladies while their masters use them as commodities and oppress them in every possible way. Bassanio from the rich group commodifies Antonio and uses his sign

exchange value for getting money. Bassanio commodifies Portia as when he goes to ask her hand for marriage and claims to be in love with her, he in fact has been under debt and wants to use her money. Shakespeare depicts the situation between a usurer and a merchant which shows the economic situations of the society as well as its relations. Thus this commodification about unprivileged and poverty stricken is depicted with the help of *Hamlet* and *Merchant of Venice*.

In short, we observe that in agreement with Marx the worldly social relations of men are closely involved with their material conditions. The productive forces keep changing along with the passage of time in forms of feudalism and commodity accumulation but the economy always remains the base of the social life of the people. We find different names of the same situation in the epochs of history of commodity collectors and economically dependents. Marx believes that economy has been the base of the society as well as of the infrastructure and it is the base which forms the ideology or superstructure in every period of human history. When he mentions the superstructure he defines some established types of laws and public affairs as a particular kind of state. The necessary responsibility of the superstructure is to legitimize and make righteousness to the strength of social class which is the keeper and holders of the means of production. Marxist philosophy believes that art is the part of superstructure of society. He is strongly convinced that a person requires comprehending the material forces of a particular age to understand the nature of literature, fiction and art of that age. If we do not understand the material life of that time we will not be able of perceiving intellectual creations of that time. He argues that these are forces of productions which generally shape social, intellectual and political life and literature of the historical period which are deeply concerned with the economic development of that age. The concepts of commodification are elaborated in the book (1999a) along with beginning of commodity accumulation and detailed description of historical materialism. He collects the material from government publications and prints reports of horrific nature of factory work inspectors. Marx explains in a full length detail in the very first chapter of the book. He gives his concepts a detailed kind of clarity in the final sections of the book as commodity's fetishism and the secret thereof. Here Marx describes intriguingly ferocious aspect of commodity producing society which turns everything and everyone into commodity. The process of commodification of things along with human beings and their social emotional relations. He gives the details of commodity that commodity appears to be a very strange and odd object, plainly for the reason that within it the social temperament of people's work takes shape in front of them like an impartial persona which cruelly links the outcome of the worker's labor. He relates that the association of the maker with the grand aggregate of workers' toil is introduced like some link which is existent not among one another rather it is among their labor's products. Commodification expansion engulfs every aspect of human life with an invisible power play of commodity. Marx and Engels (2010b) relate that commodity mysteriously hides and takes away the social aspect of human labor. They further illustrate this commodification as a social relation of human beings and value of commodity as at the end of the day that commodity is independent and free from human labor invested in it. Similarly, when we exchange our commodities with other people, we in fact exchange the labor power invested in them. This whole process of exchange in social life is a kind hidden as they keep it under 'mystical veil'. In the history economists like Smith and Ricardo try to lift the veil to a great extent but that tends to show it as a law of nature or a necessary truth which is self-evident. Marx and Engels on the contrary say that it is on daily basis that abstraction is created in the procedure and actions of social construction. This makes process of production a mystery over and beyond the understanding of common man instead of getting under control of him. They rip this mystical veil aside from the life procedure of modern society. The whole society and social relation altogether depend on value and thus are commodified in that context. The magnitude and enormosity of the utility of an object is straightforwardly connected to as well as dependent on the conception of work which is composed of innumerable person's labors and expressive

of the benefit of that object or thing. Human labor in this way is manifested not only in the object but also in the declaration of the person's investment of work and moreover as which is considered to be needed importantly for the manufacturing from social point of view.

Marx and Engels unfold social commodification by delving deep in the roots of social and economic commodification and while doing this they start with giving details of commodity with its relation of use value and exchange value. They further relate that commodity value is judged by the labor time spent on it. They make toiling time like the measurement about that commodity's worth and define labor as commodity which has always been purchased and vended in market. The exchange value pertaining to commodities is decided by the time division served on them. They say, labor or work itself is considered to be an object or commodity which is just counted and taken as that specific time span which is necessarily needed for the production of an object. Further they say what is required for the production of this object? It is an adequate labor time for the making of that particular object, unavoidable for the persistent continuity of labor which is just to sustain laborer's life as well as circumstances for breeding his generation. They further relate that it is time which is everything while man is nothing in fact the man is nothing else than the carcase of time. He says that in new order quality is nothing and it does not matter a lot. It is quantity all alone which decides everything, moment by moment and day by day. Murdoc (2006) explains that it is exactly the time and age when one finds Marx writing *The Poverty of Philosophy* and finds that Marx elaborates idea of commodity as he writes that it is commodification which is main and primary incentive as well as motivation which is setting in motion the expansion of commodity producing society. Group stratification has always been a reason of commodification existing in various forms in every era. Marx (2015) explains that workers sell their labor as, objectified labor which shows that their labor is already objectified as one day's labor is predetermined with specific amount of money is decided before hand by commodity gatherer. The commodification comes into action when commodity accumulator forces worker to create maximum of commodities during that fixed time. The exchange values of the goods remain same along with the pre decided income of the worker but the production is increased to the maximum. The worker gets just enough to live as Marx (1999a) explains this as living labor as worker gets only the fixed money irrespective the profit which commodity producer draws out of it. This process of commodification of laborer as well as labor power is explained as surplus-value. This is the way commodity accumulator extracts surplus value from exchange worth related to worker's power thus makes his working time as objectified commodity. In this process of commodification commodity accumulator gives the workers only to the extent that they keep on living and must not die as even the death of unprivileged ones will be loss of the commodities by losing their objectified workers. They explain that labor power becomes a selling commodity or takes a shape of an object to be offered in the market in the sense or form when the worker personally wants to sell his labor as an object or commodity. The worker can be able to offer or sell his labor power just in one condition if he finds his time and labor at his personal disposal. This is the process which is explained by Marx and Engels as exploitation of workers and supremacy of commodity accumulators over workers.

Marx realizes that there have been many factors at the back of commodification and for understanding of these reasons one needs to know commodity and its value. In primitive ages the concept of value exists in the economy although the people do not acknowledge it as a separate unit. They go on for the simple exchange of commodities of same worth, such trade is done in a customary manner rather than exact value or worth of the exchanging goods. The variation of commodities is demonstrated in different ways. The economy and all its aspects are existed though they do not have exact kind of measurements to express labor, time, energy and effort. The people of primitive ages do have the concept that their commodities have worth and value as they take things of their need and requirement in return and exchange and at the end of the day they always get valued products in return of their labor and time. They

are not in practice of giving those products free of exchange or on any kind of unfavorable terms. In old time people used to take their goods to distant lands for getting the value appropriate in return. It takes a lot of effort, investment and labor along with productivity for making clothing, food, shelter as well as weapons. Whatever the custom and tradition of business is that must have been compatible with the living and survival of the people otherwise the tradition of exchange must have gone obsolete.

Thus we realize that from the beginning of life people have objects which they keep using for bartering and trading especially whatever they need for themselves. They value those objects directly and are aware of their usefulness. They have a system of balanced trade and business. Marx explains the value and cost of a thing is not the value relationship of that particular commodity independently rather it is an acceptance of a relationship between people and commodity as well. They produce things for their need and gradually start making beyond their need and thus start accumulating objects and things in form of commodities. The values of the objects have been abstract, which is based on assumption. When this process of accumulation begins society starts getting divided into commodity accumulators and dependents. The ones in need of survival start offering their time, services and themselves to the rich people so that they can get basic needs and necessities of life. This accumulation of wealth divides the society into groups. According to Marx man's worth is assessed by his possessions and this is the very reason to commodify everyone who does not own them so he clarifies that all things which contain utilities like iron, paper etc. are taken in two kinds of backgrounds either as quality or as quantity. The variance of manufacture importantly surrenders multiple ways of usage and somehow it is the assignment of the past to recognize the different ways of its use as well as those standards of society along with their usage is estimated. Consequently, the identification of use value is explained in the following way as usefulness of anything or commodity makes its use value. He relates that this very usefulness of anything is nothing abstract. Commodity gets limited and specified on the grounds of its physical possessions and it gets limited to them as it does not have any existence away from that very thing. There are things and commodities which are material things like diamonds, corn and iron since they have some kind of utility so they have their use value. This quality of any object is self-reliant and free from any labor which can be needed to make it an object of utility because of its independent qualities. The use value can just be a fact only by usage or utilization of the commodity. They also possess the element of wealth, no matter what is the social shape of that riches. Marx explains human history and world as struggle of two communities where one has been using and commodifying the other to increase its commodities. The whole story is about use value and exchange value irrespective human beings or articles. What is particularly important to perceive from the given initial definition of Marx's use value is the next reality that use value only gets importance by its demand or consumption. In simple words it is the benefit of product or object that is never thoroughly acknowledged till the time the very thing personally enters the system and becomes capable of exchange. Use value in this way is intrinsically connected and dependent on its exchange value. Furthermore it is the benefit eventually bartering worth cannot be described neither in quality nor in quantity but rather resides in between the realms of quality and quantity. The contradiction here is aptly identified by Marx and in simple words he explains that exchange value is not fixed criteria rather it goes with commodity itself. Rather we find that exchange value as previously has been explained makes the use value of the commodity a reality which has to be productive in some way and this productivity has to have both elements separate from as well as common to the commodity. Marx elaborates it as, however, the first point is that any specified thing or object shows its exchange-value by something which is equal to the thing it is going to be exchanged. Secondly he expresses the definition of exchange-value that it is a medium of declaration, an exceptional shape or anything which it carries in itself, something specific which makes it different from the rest of the things. The criteria for exchange-value is that all the things which are supposed to be exchanged should have some characteristic

in common and should have a quality and measurement of expressing the lesser or greater amount. This something which is specific and present in all articles is not supposed to be geometrical, synthetic or anything else which contains natural qualities of the objects. Those very qualities are important just in a sense if they have some kind of utility for us and thus possess the use-value. But the barter of things is altogether a different phenomenon as it obviously is an action done by abstraction from their natural properties which is use-value.

When we relate the exchange value as phenomenal form having capacity of describing what does it have inside and outside capacity of the object? He necessarily seems to implicate as something that holds some kind of usage and of which special usage must be recognizable by society. That very usage of the commodity is highlighted in a way of bartering worth which appears as a practice which manifests different and free form any beneficial value. We observe that commodification of laborer becomes sometimes visible and sometimes hidden. One needs to find out the basic elements behind it to understand the complete phenomenon of economy which moves around commodity and causes commodification. We observe that commodity at the first place is the product of the labor and the worker. It contains and inherent within it the character of human's labor as Marx writes that all the details perceived till now inform us that the labor power of the human beings are spent in the process of production and thus man's work is included inside. He relates necessary value of worker's power as important from society's perspective. In this way the true worth of any object is estimated in context of whatever society requires, in a way that merit of any single thing in comparison of any second item is thought out by the way of calculating socially required labor time spent on each of them, approximately it is said that the more manufacturing is done, the time for producing an article will be required comparatively less and proportion of the labor done is crystallized in that commodity ultimately the value of the commodity will be less. On the other way round if there is less productiveness of work the more time will be required for the manufacturing of a commodity and thus the commodity will have greater value. Therefore, it is concluded that value of a thing or article differs directly as the total amount vice versa the economic growth of the labor included and absorbed in it. However, it is noteworthy that distinction of labor finds its expression in value which is subject to the utility and prescribed by the society. In the same way as use merit and actual labor's worth are materialized and may be commodified at time when the outcome of that item gets utility. Marx writes that in this display of utility value of work is therefore bound to same kinds of evaluation as thing can be any commodity but for that purpose it needs to get transferred to something else where it will be serving as something which contains use value by the way of bartering. Lastly there cannot be anything which possesses value if it does not come up to the criteria of useful thing. If something is not useful from social point of view so the labor and time which are invested in it become useless and thus the time and energy go wasted resulting in something which does not create value. The work of which usefulness is shown by the way of usage of the value of the product, or which represents itself in the form of making its creation with use value becomes a useful labor. In this regard we just find its useful impact in this form. The beneficial products become commodities just for the reason that they are products of personal as well as individual labor which are separate from the collective social set up. Marx writes down that we find background of utility comparatively direct concept as, an object for instance seems to be something insignificant and minor which can be easily recognized and acknowledged. When we try to analyze and examine it we come to know that in fact it is something very complex and complicated which contains and abounds in metaphysical delicacies and ecclesiastical refinements. As for as usefulness of value is concerned we find nothing queer and weird about it, in this we either take it in form of its capacities and potentials for satisfaction of human needs or from the context of those capabilities which are in the form of a product of a worker's labor.

What basically complicates and shapes mysterious conviction of commodity is the very reason that individual labor is converted into social form. Marx explains that inclusion of social form makes the quantification and assessment of the individual labor as a difficult one. The process of assessment of how do we determine the quantitative value becomes vague and ambiguous like expenditures of human brain, muscles and nerves etc. These issues naturally come under question. Although we find individual labor with specific nature which is inherent and subjective kind yet still it is considered as objective labor so it creates the mysterious nature of the outcome of the work. Finally the merit of things or people are decided by the socially acceptable standard as they say that when one tries to find out the very origin of the commodities one realizes that the previous research has made it clear that commodities have their very beginning in social needs and the workers who made them.

In feudal system workers are under exploitation as they are just kind of machines for the landlord to produce goods and are just granted a sum of portion mere enough for their survival. They are just bound to the farms of their master. In Medieval times farmers grow vegetables, fruits and livestock mainly for their personal use. They grow according to their own needs and their goods are mostly consumed by themselves or for their masters or feudal lords. Gradually life style starts changing and states go into commodity accumulation set up. The institutions of the states do the same practice of commodification. A lot of services which have been provided free of cost in the past, get transformed as user-pay system. Education, water supply public transport, health care were previously financed from the government, from the tax but now people directly have to pay them. In the present time the process of privatization also comes under commodification. It's not just about families and state's institutions which are commodifying but private enterprises are also a part of it. The latest example of leasing is another example in this regard as one finds a lot of extra payment for the services getting before the ownership. Thus one finds the world around full of exploitation in commodity economy. In twenty first century we observe the situation pretty opposite as now farmers grow all goods mainly for the market while just a small amount of those products are kept back for themselves. This is not just the department of farming that output is thoroughly transformed into mere commodities, work is also getting commodified. Marcuse (1972) explains that the alienation of any laborer in his personally made commodity does not only mean that his work has been changed into an object which has its personal and independent existence which is outside of him rather it becomes like alien for him and being outer of him and as an independent entity it gets a capability of confronting him on its own. It simply shows that one sells his all life spent in the making of that thing starts confronting that worker as antagonistic and strange thing. We find commodity gatherers busy in commodification and making efforts in legitimizing their money making theories. These kinds of activities can be observed from the society when it is getting transferred from feudal to commodity collecting mode. It needs fictitious commodities for their successful working after transformation. We observe that commodity has colonized the whole society including all spheres of human life. Commodity has not just incorporated culture, creativity and public places rather social symbols have also been taken under the vicious cycle of accumulation of commodity. They have made a complete industry out of human creativity and competence. These are not just the social symbols which fall victim to commodity rather it is knowledge and information which get entangled in accumulation cycle of commodity. Knowledge and information technology have been commodified as raw material along with being a labor instrument. Thus knowledge becomes a commodity as other things in the market are bought and sold. Schiller (1989) says it as consciousness industry, while indicating that utility and profit seeking attitude in every possible living and non-living object is wide spreading in the present age. This is entirely a new private industry among those industries which are having powerful, quick and vast influence. This kind of commodification is causing monopolies in the knowledge sphere.

Han (2008) has explained the same views that knowledge as a human ability is commodified and he describes how does every possible competence of the human has been commodified in the commodity driven society. He further explains knowledge as a new commodity gathering system. He applies Marx's critical theory to elucidate the ways in which proficiency as a human capability is given a monetary worth and becomes a source of accumulating commodities through commodification of this ability. He investigates the latest universal learning as economy and explains the way learning capacities and capabilities are converting into commodities. The commodity gatherers now produce competence in learning as well as knowledge and apply it to new academic excellence. The knowledge has been made a new commodity in the global market and is emerging as new commodity and replacing the school subject based curriculum with competency based syllabus. Marxist analysis of history as social sets' struggle or historical materialism is clearly observed in the present social set up as well where economy is base of superstructure as these are the commodity accumulators who are commodifying knowledge and learning along with human competencies in the global market. In commodity producing society people keep trying to make as more money as possible and for achieving their purposes they go to every possible extent. They commodify human beings for their desires. We observe that commodity collectors have novel and innovative methods of commodifying people for the purpose of their accumulation of wealth as more as possible. They make their products and commodities charming and develop the culture of commodity consumption as matter of prestige. Their only obsession becomes the accumulation of commodities for the improvement of social status. When we try to observe the role of this tiny and mysterious commodity form in the modern scenario we feel that the whole society has been submerged in the spectacle of it and has become the most powerful force over the people. The domination of the commodity is so forceful over people that they are mesmerized. Commodity seems controlling the totality of man's livings. This superiority of commodity presents a kind of opium war where commodities are feeding people with a strategy to be in need and demand more and more. The world of commodity is incorporated as world market of political economy where everything is changed as per the desires and needs of consumers and buyers. Commodity is independent so it rules over the economy as well as the whole world. The social life of the people has completely been colonized. This is described by Debord (1978) as the crucial time when we find that the whole life and social set up have gone under the occupation of commodity. It's not just that the commodity has dominated the whole world rather one finds this world to be the world of commodity. He further explains that society has fallen a victim of this commodity and under its powerful influence people are ready to commodify everything and everyone to consume them as more as possible. This is the reason that Debord points out and says that there is nothing new but our familiar staunch enemy, the very same old commodity.

The powerful influence of commodity and consumerism has been explained in research done by Omrani (2016). The researcher explains that the writer of the novel has been from a poor family and a part of deprived social community so he depicts the financial insecurities and poverty in the story. He describes class distinction, social insecurities, and oppressive ideologies by depicting commodity accumulators as well as consumerist society. His novels are a good example of depicting the social trends and group division along with negative affects which commodity producing society is leaving on individual's character. The novel portrays urban commodity gatherer social set up of late nineteenth century of America. The paper is a work on consumerism, commodification and oppression. The characters of the novel are a true depiction of commodity accumulating system's nature as they are ever ready to commodify, exploit and oppress others for achieving their purposes and goals. The characters victimize one another, use for their convenience and after getting the maximum benefit throw or leave them in misery. The difficulties and poverty of the lower community are depicted in contrast of the comfortable and luxurious life style of the higher class. The writer elucidates the way the commodity gleaners

fabricate false ideologies which remain beneficial for them while poor people are governed by them through the politics of superstructure. The novel discloses the ideology's character in community as well as Marxist view of describing its purpose in the society of that specific era. In modern era trends get changed while output remains same as laborers are kept separate from ways of producing things. They are free for selling their work as this is only commodity they have to auction or sell. This commodification becomes visible in every walk of life and in all ages of human history. This process of division causes complexities and opportunity to take profit out of it. We observe in the history that every commodity crisis ultimately prophesizes the end of commodity producing society. The world cries and people with great wisdom like economists and theorists come up with new arguments and theories for solving the developmental problems along with easing up the poor while history proves that commodity collectors just twist and turn those issues to benefit them. The process of reducing causes of pains for the world has always been resolved the way fixing value of the individual labor is done, complex and manipulating. Every crisis of the economic history is resolved for bringing new opportunities for the commodity accumulators or the issues are resolved the way powerful people want them to be done. The economic politics works with the help of different institutions as they contact churches for their respective purposes and with the help of Government machinery as politicians make them done. They go to any extent and by terrible deals and with new ideas and techniques of controlling and manipulating people are convinced to be developed which ultimately go to the mainstream of increasing wealth of commodity gleaners. This new war of theories and techniques, all the workers, nations and states new method of governing are devised where new commodity collectors take the front seat with the old commodity gatherers at their back. The beginning of new era has always been just the transition of a new type of commodity economy, a novel kind of commodity regime which at the end of the day comes up as the old one but just a few people can think of it before it makes its appearance.

Tyson expresses (2006) that when one tries to recognize the circumstances of the world around one has to know the monetary situations of that age. Marx explains it as it is the division of commodities and properties which actually draws dividing line among various communities. Nordstrom (2012) clarifies it. The researcher explains that novel is written in cyberpunk genre. He explains the commodity accumulator's dystopia of *Neuromancer* where one finds profit and loss above everything else. The contrast of machines and humans is drawn with the only difference of free will which is blurred by commodity collector's hold on ideology. All the characters in the novel represent selfish nature of the commodity producing society. Commodity accumulators are trying to collect as more wealth as possible with all fair and foul means and people who are poor even seem doing the same practice. The state commodifies people as Armitage is in army and when he becomes disabled during performing state's duty that very state disowns him. Case and Molly are thieves and they are not ashamed of it at all. They are commodifying everyone around them. The researcher has mentioned that commodification emerges from Marxism while ideology's analysis has been utilized mainly from Althusser's interpellation and Gramsci's hegemony. Human beings are commodified as tools of the ruling people and mega-corporations. Government protects the interests of ruling people and disregards needs of poor community. The agencies like police and welfare organizations are repressed so that they cannot be in a position to threaten the state and corporations. The writer presents the nature of the human being and makes an effort to show distinction of commodified humans from machines. *Neuromancer* concludes that even human's free will is an outcome of commodity producing society's ideology. Man and machines are commodifying every possible living and non-living organism. Marx believes that social relations among members of community are interrelated with the way they live their material life and cause commodification. Commodification seems existing in the form of forces of production and shows immense growth in feudal form of society. In the past we observe gradual change of mode of productive

forces as lords in feudalism and then with the development of new modes of production resulting as commodity accumulators and deprived ones and dependents, the oppressors and oppressed ones. The commodity hoarders bring the services of the deprived ones for their commodity collection and the poor sell for their means of living. Thus serf has been slave of lord as his work is not divided along the hours rather it is whole of his life activity during that time period. Marx believes these forces of productions make the economic structure of the society. The system changes from feudalism to commodity collection but the deprived community remains in the same condition and position. The worker of the commodity accumulator exists in the same situation of the serf. The only difference between the two is that in feudalism the nature of forced labor in form of commodification is apparent while in commodity producing society it is under disguise. The Marxist theory and philosophy recognize economy as the base of infrastructure on which rests the superstructure. Marx elucidates that human beings are not in proper relationship with one another as well as the key parts and sides of our lives, activities, things and people. This process occurs due to a hidden and obscure force running underneath the social system which basically is product of the commodity accumulators who require a superstructure of ideas which contorts and enshrouds the natural and cooperative form of dealing and living together. Commodity collectors always make workers feel inferior to them for commanding them as well as feeling superior to them. They also even put workers of the same economic condition opposite to one another by making them realize that they are in a competition with one another.

Mr. Seturaman (1989) writes it as the old Marxists used to refer towards the word base as monetary issues of a society at some specific time similarly superstructure to refer to its political, philosophical as well as religious aspects. Eagleton (1976) further elaborates it as superstructure has much more than this. It contains almost all forms of 'social consciousness' which consists of all important institutions around him. These are religious, political, ethical along with aesthetic and a lot more than the mentioned ones. All these institutions and their various functions in the society are taken as ideology. Eagleton relates it as the main responsibility of the ideology is to legitimize all their functions which is in fact a way to legalize the power of the commodity community in a society. At the end when one tries to observe keenly one finds that all dominant ideas are basically the very ideas of the wealthy ones which is ruling group. People have been commodified for their needs under the web of base and superstructure. Their freedom requires resources and money to survive independently. When someone is dependent and unable to survive without the help of other obviously becomes servant or slave of the other. In the social relations we find this position. We observe like base and superstructure, the exercise of power among social and emotional relations are hidden and in the forms of concealed links of power. There have been many people who try to contribute their share for the progress of Marxist theory of superstructure and inter-connection between the relation of base and superstructure. The first and noteworthy person is Gramsci. His works are undertaken as first and great upsurge of the struggle of dependent group in Italy soon after the post-World-War one period. He continues his struggle and works under the worst conditions in imprisonments. He is caught in situations in real life which makes him think deep and long about Marxism and its political practices of commodification. His bad conditions under the Italian rule of his age force him to think and understand the true nature of commodity accumulator's rule in its normal as well as exceptional forms. He has been in the prison because of those exceptional situations created by Mussolini. It is all because of his Coercion training in his early age that he thinks of a state performing ethical functions which he ultimately translates into Marxian terms and discloses the secret ways of commodity collectors to commodify structure as well as superstructure. He becomes as one of the most prominent figure among Marxists militants on international scenario. Gramsci has worked on enormous level on the concept of base, superstructure, state and commodification of people and institutions which is impossible to recapitulate. This researcher can just make a humble effort to point towards the direction

of specific domain of Gramsci's ideas about commodification of commodity accumulators in every sphere of life. His most of the works are a critique of economic theories which constitute superstructure. In his writings he explains in detail about the relation of base with the superstructure. He elaborates that fundamental relations of the groups are always dependent upon the conditions of growth of commodity's relations which ultimately become the cause of commodification of the deprived ones. They extend themselves through hidden and concealed aspects of the superstructure. They apply such strategies with the help of which they can be able to reproduce commodity's social relations. They have been shrewd enough to device civil, political as well as social and cultural life in harmony with commodity gleaner's needs and desires. This strategy of commodity producing formation of society is altogether oscillated back and forth and enlarged itself to be dominant force on civil society and state.

Gramsci is a great observer and pays keen attention towards the state's ethical function. He points out that state establishes new laws and levels of civilization on commodity's behalf. The state puts forward a new type of appropriation for social individual, new material necessities which are altogether dependent on commodity producing society's base. It is done through state that implementation of its laws and principles for family, education and religion are devised. It is a new kind of intelligentsia which is achieved through cultural apparatus of church, political parties and ultimately is transformed into public opinion. It is the multiplex domain of the superstructure that commodity accumulation's exercise of reproduction constructs a complete new form of society and social life confirming every move with its own personal accord and gain. This is the basic extension of Gramsci's base and superstructure where he unfolds the commodification of the commodity collector. His second contribution is the ways in which he brings to light those middle elements and forces which enable one to understand the power tactics of superstructure. This is the point where Gramsci explains the gradual development of political and critical concepts which take part in relations of power and hegemony; class fractions and historical bloc. He explains in hegemony one discovers the ways society's dividing concepts start developing and the ways that commodity accumulators make an alliance with the help of commodity and commodify everyone and everything. He concludes that these are the production's relations which fundamentally provide social authorities along with political sway resulting into the cultural sway.

Gramsci's third and the most notable contribution is the idea of commodity producing state and its part in generating the ideological consent where the economic dependents offer themselves for commodification with their own approval. This is the basic and main tool which secures commodity accumulators' power, an abstract way of the commodity gatherer's power seeps through social set up as well as relations, a journey from the sphere of the structure to the zone of superstructure. Gramsci tries and successfully shows the cement that is the welding force for social formation along with and under hegemonic influence of the fundamental community which has always been the commodity accumulators. He explains that in this situation state plays the role of an educator which tries to create a new level of society and civilization. Here he defines that one group is acting necessarily on economic grounds and tries to develop the recognized and better apparatus for economic production for the creation of new structure, a tool for commodification. Gramsci points out that it is the point when things do not develop haphazardly for the reason that state plays its part. The whole process is developed with planning thus state gets commodified and becomes an instrument which is used by commodity collectors rationally. The commodity accumulator and state mutually commodify, plan, incite, urge, request and punish at the end. They devise together all the ways in which life can be possible including crimes and moral implications. As a result the law of the state also becomes a way of implementing commodity producing system and its interests. The law becomes repressive as well as negative factor of whole positive and civilized activity taken up by the state.

Gramsci makes it systematically clear the ways hegemony through ideology maintains the control of power without any violence or opposition. Marx says that ruling community is the one who dominates the economic means of productions so they can generate and regulate the ideas in society. It can easily be seen in the history of the world from the dawn of it, in Greeks, Romans, Middle-Ages and every single time as lords and their slaves. In the world today we explain in form of commodity collectors and deprived ones. He writes that when change occurs in the base which depends on the economy the enormous superstructure overturns very quickly. When someone has to observe such kind of upheavals he is required to make difference between financial and material down fall of all objects and commodities produced economically. These ups and downs are tried to find out by means of natural science along with juridical, religious, aesthetic, political as well as philosophical form. When you try to explain the whole phenomenon in one word that is an ideological form. This is the ground on which people get conscious of this conflict and resolve it.

Gramsci has been distinctive in his thoughtful approach of understanding the phenomenon in between the base and the superstructure. He moves systematically and step by step to unravel the conspiracy of commodity accumulators and state together for maintaining their hold through ideology and hegemony. The ideology shows its subtle and perceptive thinking in the form of ready consent. Hegemonic culture is the blend of all ingredients which is supporting force of commodity gatherers' needs and desires for commodification. They make their perspective with tactics and strategies. The role of this culture is to propagate and make all the desired factors of the commodity accumulators to look common and natural. He describes that ideology and cultural hegemony are the devices which are the tools of the commodity collectors rather than the exercise of the force and power. Cultural hegemony develops the consent of public according to the will of the commodity accumulators. The political institutions, civil society and laws are considered to be normally private or kind of non-state institutions which are mediators between state and people. Gramsci elaborates that they are inter related and the concept of being separate is altogether conceptual. He describes two societies, political with force while civil with consent.

Thus we find that commodity accumulator manipulates the culture of the society and perception, beliefs, values and explanations and they are made acceptable and normal. Gramsci (2000) uses to call it manufacture of consent. He explains about the intellectuals of both commodity accumulators and dependents as there are various classifications. The conventional learned people (manager, intellectual, researcher, philosopher, thinker, non-ecclesiastical etc.) are ones who make themselves apart from the majority of the community and put themselves ahead of the rest of the people. They get their experience from unbroken and constant progression of the past. This independent and impartial self-administration is not without repercussion in the fields of politics and ideology, the results which are with broad spectrum import. The entire idealistic philosophy can easily be related to such kind of position. The intellectuals of our society who try to assume idealistic impression can be defined as, social utopia as it is the expression with which all these kinds of intellectuals think themselves independent, self-sufficient, they are blessed with their own individual character. *The same state apparatus has been used and explained in the research article by Fleissner (2016) and the same kind of strategies have been unfolded.* This research explains the growing global economy where every useful article has become a commodity. These things have begun the career of being commodities to be bought and sold. Marx gives the detailed ideas of utility and bartering worth and in the world today people are aware of these values of the objects and the social construction of economy based world. Despite knowing all the facts commodification of things and humans is still an ongoing process and part of everyday life. This paper gives details of commodification and de-commodification of goods and services of communication technologies. He represents idea of frozen intellect in form of videos, tapes and recordings which are made once and used lifelong. The commodity accumulators seem making restriction to free access to information for their

interests. He discusses decommodification as some advantages to the public as Google free information resource as assembling of furniture at home, baking of bread just with the ingredients and recipes. The paper explains Marx's contradiction of power as well as relations of miniaturization in contemporary society of digital media and digital devices. The research shows the groupstruggle in form of commodity accumulator's struggle and desire to control the digital world for his profit and gain.

We find further explanation of the commodity accumulator's political economic play and commodification of the dependent people by Althusser, a French philosopher. He has contributed a lot in elaborating base and superstructure of Marxism where commodification has been done in a systematic way. He gives diverse and detailed explanation but here the focus will be specified towards the details about superstructure. The first point he expresses is his thoughts of social formation where commodity accumulator is the commodifier of the system as well as the economically dependents. He (1971) discusses this topic to a great extent in his essay. He gives his opinions about the relationships of base and superstructure as a composition of different practices for social formation. He discusses economy, politics and ideology as all those elements which are required for the cycle of production as well as reproduction of commodity relations. All these factors possess their own constitution, their very specificity and dynamics from others. Althusser has been creator of the most effective passages particularly in the context of base and superstructure. He relates that society exists on the forces and relations of productions. The commodity gleaners commodify and pay minimum to the workers for their labor power. In this cycle the commodity collectors will always have the availability of the labor power while the workers will offer themselves for commodification almost every next day for their survival. He further says that he will like to call ISA like the facts which become visible there and then as a type of specialized and well-defined institutions. This is ISA of religion under which falls the system of different churches then comes the educational ISA which is a setup of different public as well as private schools then comes in order family and legal while the political ISA which contains different political parties, the ISA of the trade union, ISA of communication which carries along television, press and radio, and at the end the cultural ISA which is represented by literature, art and sports.

He elucidates that ruling people dominate the economically dependents with the help of Repressive State Apparatus, which includes government, police, court and armed forces. All these institutions of the state work in favor of the commodity accumulators and control the power in form of politics as well as legislation and army. Althusser further elaborates and enhances Marxist theory by differentiating RSA and ISA. He reveals that RSA has also been the entity of the same unit as ISA, but it is multiple in natures while plural in function. Althusser explains the state uses ideological and repressive ways to make its system function properly as he writes that someone must question him that with which authority he thinks that ideological state apparatuses institutions which normally are not public rather they are private institutions. Gramsci who is a conscious Marxist has already this summed up in one single sentence. This difference of public and private is actually internal law of the commodity accumulators. These are the private domains where the commodity collector can be able to exercise his powers in a valid way. Where commodity power's exercise starts, state tries to escape it as the state which is neither on the side of public nor on the private basically the state of the ruling people which again is commodity accumulator. This very situation has been explained in the start of the state ideological apparatuses. This gets unimportant that which is the category if the institutions where they get acknowledged either these are public or private what actually matters is the way these institutions work. He explains that both ISA and RSA perform dual functions of ideology as well as violence. Both types have same assignments of double functions as ISA performs circulation of ideology along with repression as well as political violence. Similarly RSA works for society along with administration of the spread of ideology. He believes in the application of the different ways despite physical violence for the achievements of their

respective objectives and goals of commodification. This may include educational system, churches, media, family and social clubs etc. These all are part of civil society and do not show themselves as formal part of the state. These methods are more an expression of social relations rather than violent repression. ISA circulates the ideologies of the commodity collectors for the sake of commodification. People keep cooperating in the fear of getting rejected from the society which is under the influences and clutches of commodity accumulator's control. He highlights the role of the educational system which plays a dominant role to conceal the ideology of the commodity gleaners which basically is formed for the commodification of the institutions and people for their business and profit. The dominant community has its hidden agendas which it keeps implementing by exploiting relation of production and training the students to become workers and offer their labor power for the commodity accumulators.

He elaborates the commodification and the hidden political play of the superstructure in the form of ideology by saying that the people who believe in ideology are those who take themselves that they are out of the boundaries of the ideology. This is one of the aspects of the ideology that its believers always remain in the denegation of it. He gives a clear example by saying that he is ideological.

Marx explains (1999a) that commodification relevant to humans is done in various ways specifically by making their lives and works invisible and abstract. What is the worth of an object as well as its utility shows itself as representation of the work of a human being in an abstract form which is basically man's labor's expenditures in general form. The exact and precise disbursement of man's work particularly their energies invested into that thing is the representation of them, the straight aim of product and abstract human labor. Thus we find the expenses of labor particularly in the context of abstract characters allocated to man's work. It is in fact the hard work which creates and gives value to these objects. When we need to know the beneficial aspect of any commodity money becomes the source of prescribing its benefit. Ultimately it is found that value of a commodity is interlinked. We at one side find it as worker's collaborative effort which seems to the aspect of its benefit and importance from present community's requirement which leads to a further complicated understanding of the very idea of commodity. When one tries to fix the object in the background of the community, the conception of worker's labor gets as an abstraction. It works to show whatever the contemporary community takes as advantageous. This commodity has a complete process of commodification in it as it is pre-planned that in a commodity producing society the products are not manufactured as something innocent objects with utility which reach the market. In this cycle we observe that every procedure of manufacture is pre-planned and directed to increase the commodities in an organized way. The commodities are made objects of enchantment for the community of commodity producing society's benefit. This whole process shows that commodities are already fabricated in fetishist way. Their only goal is to show and prove the abstract aspect of the labor time which is utilized rather exploited in the form of value.

When we try go deep into the Marxist analysis of commodification after the explanation of Gramsci and Althusser we observe Lukács statement correct when he mentions that Marx's elaboration of commodity is not just a coincident. He thinks that Marx with the description of characteristics of commodity unfolds the whole web of society along with social exploitations and commodification. Lukács (1962) relates that commodity should be taken as the main constructional issue of commodity producing society in its all possible features. The commodity form is not supposed to be observed in separation as Marx refers to it as the product of abstract human labor. This element of abstract has been described by Toscano (2008) points out the factor of abstraction of Paci, an Italian Marxist. He explains in *Paci's Marx in dialogue with Whitehead* and says that the basic and main role of commodity accumulation is unraveled in its inclination to produce abstract categorization alive and thus gives them a concrete shape. These very categorizing takes the shape of the subjects or maybe even as people. Here one can mention person in Latin language which means mask, thus the meaning of the commodity collector becomes a person who

is transformed into the mask which means a person of commodity producing society. He becomes a place where commodity produces more commodity. We find in commodity producing society where the abstract takes the shape of concrete and it works concretely. The critical function of this commodity can very easily be observed from initial works of Marx. Marx (1999a) elaborates complex nature of commodity as a commodity or an object is a curious object as it represents the social aspect of worker's labor which becomes as an objective part. This is a situation where the whole of their labor shows the relation as a link which does not exist among themselves rather it is a relation of the objects of their labor. Commodification of the economically dependent gets worse as he does labor and gives all his time, energy and labor power and in return does not get the sufficient amount to live a good life. Bressler (2007) writes that such kind of atrocities make workers conscious of alienation and thus group consciousness gets worst. This shows the humanitarian side of Marx's theory. He believes that working community has always been alienated from commodity accumulators without consciousness of it. Marx (2000) has discussed these elements of alienation in detail. He explains that alienation means to be estranged, away, in an improper or distanced relation with something.

Marx explains that people have been living in stratified societies where commodity accumulator has been the one who owns the means of production while economically dependents, in the form of a community of workers, who can be able to survive only till the time they can get something to support their survival. The worker's effort to make themselves alive results into the increase of commodities. The economically deprived has to work for living in commodity producing society. The workers offer their time and energy as they cannot survive without it. The commodity collectors are always aware of the fact that the economically deprived and dependents are helpless enough to be exploited easily so they use them like commodities and machines as Marx relates that as a result all changes of the competition get uncovered in respect of all swings of market, the wickedness, the work keeps increasing while the payments keep dropping. Thus the load of the work grows similarly as the employment of machines or break up of work. Hence it is observed that the economically deprived one has always been exploited as he has to perform wearisome works while he cannot get wages compatible with his labor and ultimately the commodity accumulator becomes the only beneficiary. Marx writes that the worker cannot gain the profit when the owner has it while he is bound to lose when the owner loses. This commodification causes alienation of human beings as their own creations in form of commodities become alien for them. They feel helpless and their creations get out of control for them. Marx shows his better understanding of economy than previous economists and clarifies all possible concepts of economy hidden or relevant. Marx explains the commodification and alienation of the worker that commodity accumulator uses machine and makes two coats from the same time he uses to make one and gets all profit of double commodities with him while worker stays on the same fixed rate. Thus we find the politics of economy that worker has to give increased form of performance means more use-value while he does not get any exchange value of it as an output. This is the way commodity producing society enslaves its workers with the help of machinery and division of labor. Under this political economy small producers are compelled to join wage labor level as they become unable to compete commodity gatherers. Commodity accumulators always try to reduce the wages to the extent that they barely remain on the level of survival only. Marx (1999a) describes that commodity collecting society's body is dripping all along and its every pore is in blood and dirt of the commodified, economically deprived ones and further explains that commodity accumulation is the story of slavery, exploitation, degradation and oppression of the whole working community. Commodification of people has been a practice in human society. Marx explains that any period of the history in which people are unable to stay alive independently is a period of commodification. Marx says that only possibility of freedom for the working people is its freedom from dependence and availability of basic necessities of life.

In the politics of economy Marx explains alienation happens when things move opposite for laborer as when he invests more energy and produces more commodities his personal worth and value start decreasing, the more commodities are made by laborer the cheaper commodity he himself becomes. Thus the more production enriches the commodity collector and increases his accumulation of wealth while laborer gets estranged and alienated from the product he makes. This process makes the worker depressed and frustrated as his whole life seems to belong to alien objects while commodity gatherers enjoy the fruits of all the labor done by the economically dependent people. Marx believes the worker is neither made alienated only from his production but also from that activity which he does while producing that commodity. The fact that he will not be able to enjoy the profits of that work and this makes him disappointed. The dependent and needy feel that he gives his life, time and energy to that product and ruins his body and mind while the product remains of the commodity gleaner's so the labor becomes more a forced labor rather than voluntary one. This makes laborer estranged from his body as well as mind and spiritual aspect. This makes according to Marx loss of worker's identity and species being. Marx confirms the harsh reality that laborer not only gets estranged and departed from his upshot of labor rather is made detached from his species which makes man's estranged from the other man.

This activity of exploitation estranges worker from the commodity collector because he takes the fruit as well as credit of his work and as a result that the commodity does not belong to the producer anymore so the laborer feels hostile and alien. Elliot (2016) relates that Marx has been strong believer that estrangement gets flourished to the maximum limit in commodity producing society while drops in socialist system. Marx (2000) elaborates the condition of the workers that they feel their work as forced work because they make a lot of tiresome effort and at the end the beneficiary is the commodity accumulators. Further he says that when laborers work more and manufacture more products he respectively becomes weaker. Similarly, we observe the commodity collectors on the other hand keep commodifying the workers. They do not take them as human beings rather they are machines of accumulating commodities for them. They are not bothered with the condition and situation of the physical and mental condition of workers and tiresome working hours. Marx believes that commodity hoarding is a system which exploits and alienates the laborer from his own upshot as well as from other people which ultimately results in bad physical and mental health of the worker which makes him exhausted because of hard physical labor and continuous mental concentration. Marx verifies that in commodity producing society's tiresome overwork reduces worker just to be a machine which is mere a slave of commodity producing society. He further also explains that by performing this much of toilsome overwork the laborers become one of the most wretched kind of commodity.

In a commodity producing society we observe that commodity has swamped the whole world under its clutches. It runs under every aspect of human life from social relations to the state machinery, all human interactions exercise some sort of commodification. The institutions which seem to be non-economic are working at the back for economic system of commodity accumulation. All non-economic institutions of society as politics and social relations are tied to it. Apparently social relations seem to be above than all economic forces while nothing escapes the pervasive influence of economic force. This is the overwhelming effect of economy which has taken societal interactions as well as social relations under its influence. We practically observe that the whole set up of society is embedded in economic system. Marx and Engels (2010a) list morality, religion and law and believe that in every aspect of life there has always been some interest of commodity collectors. They realize that social set up and morality are part of ideology and superstructure and its foundation is determined by economy. Thus commodity gleaner propagates with the force of money power to exploit all the institutions of society. He creates a false kind of consciousness which makes people fail to see the things as they actually and really are materially. It happens because the superstructure conceals the real and actual base of society.

Marxist commodification is historical approach. Group stratification does not mean the data of different sets of human beings rather it is the exercise of power relations between seemingly contrastive social factions. These relations have been exercised in the history by communities of people. People have been living their lives under materially powerful people. The transformation of power from one faction or community to another has been done because of economic force or means of production. In primitive societies we find tribes which are led by females who have been a decisive factor in the society. Then these modes of productions get transferred to the men and they get those economic as well as decision power. These decision powers which come under the persons who have wealth or mode of production are the basic factors behind social formation. Marx (1999a) describes that man can never be free with his wants and desires to be dependent on others.

This research has tried to opt for working on commodification of social relations in Hawthorn's selected works as *Rappaccini's daughter*, *Birth mark*, *Wakefield*, and *Mrs. Bullfrog*. The short stories which are selected for the present research have previously been chosen for discussion under the umbrella of Marxism but with the perspectives other than selected for this research. In a lecture delivered by Professor Johnson (2000) explains in detail reasons and factors that these are the forefathers of Hawthorne who bring into light the main purpose and idea behind the conviction of secular calling along with protestant ethics which has a great influence on seventeenth century. These ideas have a great influence on Hawthorne's fiction. She relates that the works of the writer are a true study of his age and he reflects the human condition and trends of his time through his works. Professor Johnson explains in her lecture that the situation of a person in the background of his socio-economic condition is the standing of that person in the society and on the same grounds his gender's position is judged. She mentions in the lecture that it is the economic ground on which the gender as well as the social position of a person is specified. She refers that the female characters of that age are mentioned mostly as daughter, wife and mother of a man. She mentions on page number four, in the end of second paragraph that Dr. Rappaccini experiments on his daughter and he does not feel anything awkward as one's condition is subjected to his economic status in the society and in the capitalist system all are quiet rather soothed by such practices as they are in accordance with the social system of that particular age. Similarly, we find another aspect of research which is tried on Hawthorne's fiction, novels as well as short stories including selected for this research by Daigrepoint (1979). The researcher relates man's alienation from Hawthorne's point of view in the context of his deviation from medieval traditions as a result of Renaissance, materialism and individualism. He explains the rise of materialism and capitalism like a source of a person's estrangement from his fellow men as well as God. The researcher demonstrates with the help of historical development that how do people start getting away from the religion on the name of reformation, Renaissance and become the followers of materialism. The research proves that Hawthorne has a clear understanding of the history and the causes of man's alienation as a result of commodity producing society's trends and writer proves it by giving references from innumerable works of Hawthorne. The research focuses on the links among history, society and the man and discusses the alienation of the man in the context of development of capitalism and materialism which cause the alienation of the individual from society. The analyst discusses in details all factors which give rise to the feeling of alienation in an individual as powerlessness being economically inferior and resulting into self-estrangement. The researcher believes that literature has described alienation as social condition and proves the relationship between man's alienation and capitalism which has been a direct result of the growing industrialization. The researcher discusses the economy and the social trend of capitalism as a reason and source of man's alienation.

Hawthorn's fiction has been a landmark in American literature and people find all possible shades of human life in his works as we find the research of Farris (2020) which is discussed from the perspective

of scientific materialism. In this research the increased tendencies of materialism in almost all fields of life and science, in particular have been discussed. The analyst describes that scientific world is dominated by men and their scientific methods. The study focuses on the materialism along with the plant studies. The research describes those men who are equipped with all material resources take women as their tools of experiments. The researcher relates the increasing trends of scientific materialism with the help of American literature and explains that the writers of that age acknowledge and resist against it. This researcher has tried to opt for a new dimension of the same stories by looking into themes with the lens of Marxist commodification of social relations. This research will make an effort to highlight Hawthorn's deep insight into the material facts and superstructure of his age in his fiction. The stories unravel the despotic and ruthless aspects of politics of economy which have disguised and camouflaged themselves as social and emotional relations with the help of cultural hegemony and superstructure. The owners of the means of productions, the commodity accumulators of the family relations exploit and commodify their economic dependents. They use them for the satisfaction of their desires and the social structure gives them authority of it. They spoil economically dependents' whole lives and ultimately cause to kill them either emotionally or physically and are not even blamed for that act. The politically made superstructure with a base of economy makes all such activities normal and natural. The role of the ideology is depicted in Hawthorne's fiction as all the dependent characters offer themselves for services of commodity accumulators of social and emotional relations under the influence of cultural hegemony. The characters themselves offer them for oppression and sacrifice with their consent and approval.

Research Methodology

This research operationalizes Marxist commodification as methodological tool to examine the institution of social and emotional relations. The research is qualitative study that uses Marxism, commodification literary theory which is touchstone for going in between the lines and by delving deep into Hawthorne's fiction. The research will be interpretive for recognizing its significance to the theme of the stories with the help of Marx's book (1999b) as its framework. There will be an effort to try and apply Marxist method for probing into the stories and fulfilling the research's aims as by reading specified stories until required material is achieved. The researcher has done the selected stories' textual analysis and interpreted the content. It tries to recognize the composition and message of short stories. This will recognize the human action and intentions in the short stories. Hawthorne is a novelist as well as the writer of short stories and has attention towards history, religion and morality. He has the capability of writing the truths of his age. The stories contain themes which centre on the commodification and exploitation of his characters under Marxist social structure and ideology. In this research, with the help of textual analysis the researcher will try to explore and describe the given messages in the stories. This will ultimately lead to the full understanding that how are Marxists of communal and emotional connections commodifying their social relations for their personal satisfactions in a hidden form under the protection of cultural hegemony of superstructure. The revelation and speculations of these ideas will serve the purpose of truly knowing Hawthorne's thoughts and perspective through his fiction on Marxist commodification of social relations. The researcher will try to highlight the text which confirms the researchers' analysis of selected stories employing literary lens of Marxist commodification of social relations and relates the finding in them. In this study we will have a short evaluation of drawbacks of commodity domination as a society's study of light and power. Hawthorne will unmask in selected short

stories, *the birth mark*, *Rappaccini's daughter*, *Wakefield* and *Mrs. Bullfrog* the hidden social domination which apparently does not seem to be directly connected to economic domination, rather an inclination to emphasize the unity of commodity collectors' domination. The word commodification has never been used by Marx. It is a new addition in the world of economy and Marxist discourses. Hawthorne aptly describes the continuous problem of economic theory in fiction particularly with its relation to the society; the super structure.

However one finds Marxist commodification as currency to this theory that offers the researcher an analytical tool which enables and helps to explore and expose the camouflaged abstractions and spaces in commodity economy. Althusser (1971) explains the distinction clearly in forms and relations of production. He elaborates that forms of production contain in them all relations of production. He relates the interconnection of the commodity produced superstructure which teaches and reinforces the interests of commodity hoarders by means of reinforcement with the help of education. Thus they prepare the next generations according to their needs and desires without its acknowledgement to the public in general. They undermine the whole web of social system and relations. Marx focuses on the analysis of the commodity economy and elucidates the idea that how does state promote and support the ideas of commodity collectors. The state becomes one of the most powerful actors who implant and inculcate commodity gleaner's interests in the form of cultural hegemony. Deonzelot (1979) states that it becomes self-governing in the social set up that how should be an ideal citizen. People merge in the family set up under the illusion that they are living in private domain. This shows clearly the tactics of the commodity accumulator's who exercise their power within the private domain. In every epoch of history we observe this subject and object kind of situations among every living being. In the past people make resources necessary for their living and then gradually start accumulating them. Marx (2010a) writes that an animal produces when he needs something for himself or for his children while men keep producing commodities without their need. This accumulation of wealth and commodities starts an era of commodity accumulation in social system as well as social relations where people get divided into two groups one with the affluence of commodities, commodity collectors and the second with nothing else than their life activities as labor power which is the only possession of the social dependents. We observe that commodity accumulators are very much like white mice which keep running with no end always for just moving more fast, so are the commodity hoarders accumulate to collect more wealth. The social relational commodity gatherers need dependents either to satisfy their needs and desires or to accumulate more wealth and maintain their position and in this procedure they need to have economically weak relations and thus both parties become interdependent on each other. Marx elaborates that human beings have indispensable needs to survive as food, clothing and shelter. These very needs for the survival make them helpless and provide opportunities to the social commodity accumulators to commodify their social relations. Marx takes the material from the practical activities done by the people in social relations as he relates (2015) that the social set up is not made up of single individuals rather it demonstrates summation of inter-connections and interrelations within which all single individuals exist. Habib (2005) says the same point that Marx and Engels make an effort to make an assessment of rich community which is constructed on a money oriented or material inception of history. Habib further examines the human history and tries to find out the major factors for ill treatment, commodification, injustice as well as oppression which he observes in the current world and its commodity collecting system. Ultimately he comes to the conclusion that the logical discussion of the past is stimulated by commodity accumulating forces. The process of commodification can only be possible in a commodity producing society. Marx gives the details of economy controlling the whole social phenomenon. He defines that in a commodity community it is the economy which rules over the rest of social life. He divides the society into two poles on which human social life consists of, as base

and the elegant but complex superstructure. Base points towards the ways and forces of production which generates all the goods and commodities which society needs while superstructure comes out of the base. Marx believes that it is the base which contains forces along with the production's relations. This formed relationship of social life as employer, employee, labor's division and property relations. It is base which is forming all the values, roles, beliefs, power structure, ideology and state. The base has always remained influential and keeps affecting the social life and all of its prospects.

In this research an effort is made to focus on Marx's book (1999b). It is immediately after 1844 that Marx makes his major literary efforts as *The holy family*, *The poverty of philosophy* and *The German ideology*. In reaction towards his opponents he develops the materialistic concept of history. His first effort to devise his theories in detail comes during 1847. It is the time when he starts delivering lectures on economics in the Workman's Club in Brussels. The lectures are received warmly, revised and then published as newspaper articles in 1849. These very lectures are printed later on as a book (1999b) which is the framework of this research. This is an unambiguous, understandable as well as intelligible work which contains various echoes of manuscripts of 1844 but it is altogether Marx's work without any terminology from Hegel or anyone else. The most prominent and worth analyzing factor is that its details and elaborations make the book (1999a) easy to understand. Marx starts the lectures by explaining labor first. He makes clear that the labor and laborer as,

“And this life activity he sells to another person in order to secure the necessary means of life. His life-activity, therefore, is but a means of securing his own existence. He works that he may keep alive. He does not count the labor itself as a part of his life; it is rather a sacrifice of his life. It is a commodity that he has auctioned off to another (p.9).”

Marx then gives detail of the way wages are determined and explains that price of labor is determined the same way as are of other commodities. It has to rise and fall with the fluctuations of the supply demand. Commodity gleaner has just one priority to minimize wages in some way or the other so that he just has to pay only the cost of production and keeps workers just in a position to keep them alive and capable of working for the commodity hoarders. Next Marx gives details of commodity. He states that according to the classical economists the commodity is consisted of raw material. Commodity collector uses all these things along with the labor as commodity has always been accumulated labor. In this book Marx discloses the secret that classical economists fail to notice is that it is true only under certain kind of social relations. He refers that a Negro is never a slave by birth rather he is made a slave under sociality of slave owing people. The same way classical economists are taking commodity as natural as they have been living in a commodity producing society. In a commodity economy they take it normal to produce commodity with raw material, tools and workers. They are used to take these things as commodities which can be exchanged for other goods. As one pound of sugar may be exchanged with three pounds potatoes. These material goods are also commodities and have exchange value which is one of the key elements in Marx's economic theory. Thus he explains that it contrasts with use-value. He mentions that one pound of sugar may have its use-value as it has power of satisfying people's need for sweet and it can have exchange value of three pounds of potatoes. Use-value exists independently from the market or any other system while exchange value does not have same position. The present research focuses on Marxist commodification. Commodification in social relations can only be recognized and understood with the lens of Marxism. Theoretical framework of the research focuses on actual sense of commodity. Marx shows his intellect and perception and understanding of the word in its present as well as past. The researcher takes Marx's key concept of changing human being into commodity and takes it further to commodification to detect the invisible, unrecognized and unintelligible gaps and spaces where

commodity holders find means to exercise their power over economically dependents relations. These ideas take along with them the terms like value, exchange or sign exchange value. The concepts of alienation, abstraction and mystification will be helpful elements to highlight commodification in social relations. Commodity is basically considered to be an altogether. Marx explains it as something to fulfill any human need or desire which can be exchanged and replaced.

Harvey (2010) relates commodity economy as considering to unravel vital connection between elements in a commodity producing system. He further describes by saying that one cannot discuss any of these concepts without mentioning about others. It means that for understanding the political power play of commodity economy one needs to look deeply into the interconnectedness of use and exchange values and every single element involved in commodity producing economy. Marx (1999b) explains commodity accumulation system in detail and writes that new setup is all about commodities, a system depending on exchange values. It is either in cotton, wool buildings or machines it remains only commodity accumulation. The riddle is that all commodities are an amount of exchange values but all quantity of exchange values are not the reason of accumulation. The sum of all these exchange values can only become the cause of accumulation if it is used to increase itself through exchange of labor. Thus Marx finds that commodity collector can neither exist without wage labor nor can workers survive without being hired by the commodity collector. This becomes main claim of the commodity gatherer economists that interests of workers and commodity gleaners remain same. Marx goes in details of the same interests of both communities and concludes that the case and situation is more favorable for commodity accumulators.

Marx gives reason for poverty and dissatisfaction that men are made of social nature. They are always concerned with the people and circumstances around. Our desires are produced from our lives in society. In this way increasing wages cannot satisfy if the demands of livings go higher and still out of reach of the worker. He remains in the same positions or may his life standard further go low. This is what mostly happens when growth in funds causes increase in wages. There is another basic contradiction between industrialists and workers. When wealth progresses the domination of commodities over worker expands and increases. Wage and labor generate the wealth which ultimately rules over it and tries to get its own means of survival from this hostile power with a condition that it will keep increasing the growth of money. Marx explains that commodity collectors commodify labor by increasing labor's division. The reason behind is that competition among the industrialists drives them to commodify and force labor to be more productive. They take him as a machine and forget his human aspect and make him to perform the work of ten people. Commodification in this regard has many affects as competition among workers is transforming laborers into machines, an inhuman kind of state and forcing people with less money become the part of commodified community. This book provides all these details and aspect of commodity producing society which commodify the needy, their labor power and lives.

When one tries to go under the apparent realities one finds that history of man's social life keeps moving around the notion of needs and necessities. They keep struggling for useful thing or commodities they require to use. The term useful has many attributes which has been explained in many ways, more or less free from the social structure they are in. This usefulness of things give them particular value which somehow satisfies some kind of human need or desire. In the past we find many examples of the process of commodification of goods as well as services. Marx addresses the matters of the working people and their exploitation as well as commodification by the commodity gleaners in the means of production and existent in system. He believes the commodity mode of production and historical materialism as the main reason of all miseries of the people. Some critics make a narrow definition of Marxist materialism as economy while in a broader context it encompasses the whole web of social practices. Marx as well as Engels are known for their study of the history as groups' struggle and summarize their thoughts in the

beginning lines of the book (2010a) that the history of all previous and existing communal groups is the record of social set stratification which can be observed in binary oppositions like free person and slave, aristocrat and servant, clan leader and craftsman, persecutor and ill-treated has been in persistent oppositions. These practices have been carried out openly as well as in a secret manner in continuation.

In Marxist political economy one finds the roots of commodification in form of details given for commodity as an indispensable part of the very commodity producing society. It can be taken as the blood running in body of accumulating system which makes it alive and working. Marx (1999a) starts his inspection about all social groups and their possessions with the context of and analysis of commodities. He clearly shows that it is the proposal of mysterious product that happens to be the ultimate structure through which the broader notion of commodity accumulation can be understood and assessed. He initiates his analysis of commodity accumulation system by describing as the very first considerable point is that commodity is something apart and away from human beings. It is an object or thing which possesses some qualities which has the potential of fulfilling some kind of human requirements or desires either from stomach or from his imagination, this does not make any kind of difference. He clearly explains that he is not even concerned with the issue that in which particular ways these commodities satisfy man's needs either directly in shape of ways of survivals or indirectly as ways of productions. In simple words he explains that a worker performs his labor and makes commodities in whatever form but despite his hard work means personal labor's investment the prepared object remains boss' property. Thus he changes the ready object into a commodity or merchandise. The boss who owns the means of production, for Marx the commodity gatherer is one who possesses the commodities and maintains his control over the workers as well as his work force and remains the master for usage of those commodities while the worker becomes the part of deprived group.

The researcher is conscious of Marx's theory of converting every possible living as well as non-living organism into commodity. The effort in this work is made to demystify the inattention to the Marxist commodification of social relations which has undeviating acceptance of people in the form of structures as some divine laws as these structures fix and display the difference as well as the dispersal of power in form of society and socio-political interrelations. This is the organization of that particular political power which always administers and occupies the means of production and the same commodity hoarders. They make their demands and benefits legal and legitimate by developing commodity economy as well as social set up. This formation is done with the intellectual establishment of social culture, the superstructure which always rests on the commodity economy. Rummel (1977) relates that one finds the socio-cultural norms as natural and normal while the commodity collectors exercise their power and control in the disguise of welfare and benevolence of their social relations. It is the main purpose of the base to make superstructure fair and just to the people although it is just a way of legitimizing and designing the benefit of the commodity producers. Marx says that while being existent in the society men enter unpreventable into social relations with free will which are basically and actually mystified as a result of material means of commodity productions. These are the totality of those particular relations of productions which compose the real and actual foundation of a society from where emerges legal as well as political superstructure which correlates with specific forms of consciousness. These are the forces of production which give directions to socio-political aspects as well as intellectual life. This becomes evident that it is not mere consciousness but the social existence which determines man's life. Thus verifying it Abrams (1981) writes that human history has witnessed that ideology reflects and shows the benefits and advantages of the community which is powerful because of its economy. Marxist critics believe that economic base of the society controls the interests as well as styles of its literature and fiction. The superstructure in the form of ideology is set of creeds that reflect theory of Marx. Abrams makes it clear as in the world of today we find ideology in the non-Marxist ways. It can range from a

diminishing name of a political thought which is emotionally and rigorously followed by a number of people which is specified to the ways they think and live in the context of a race, a group, gender or ethnic group. When we distinctively mention Marxist ways then we find dominant ideology of any age is basically and ultimately is the products of the economic structure, group stratification and interests. In a popular terminology we observe that Marx's representation of ideology bases on the superstructure. He further relates that these are the economic ways which take along all of socio-economic system with it. Engels relates the term ideology as false consciousness. The Marxists who come later in age believe that it is basically formed largely because of unconscious perceptions which are delusional or imaginary.

Literature and fiction reflect all possible shades of human endeavors of any age. It keeps uncovering the harsh and ugly facts of life directly or indirectly. The action of mirroring existing facts of power relations in terms of social relations can be easily perceived through Marxist perspective. Marxism is an ideology which has distinctive power in its approaches particularly focusing its relevance to commodity accumulators' sovereignty. Power is inter linked with the economic connections in almost every sphere including economics, politics and ideology. In recent times Marxist analysis aims at showing the dispersal of economic power in society. The study examines that Marxist commodification is running through the plots of Hawthorne's selected stories. We observe the ideology and hegemony are playing their respective roles. Hawthorne's stories relate Marxism as a body of theoretical foundation that further explain the complex nature and formation of the human beings in society. The given explanation verifies the inter relation of Marxism and Hawthorne's stories which can be properly understood under the framework of the commodification of the social relations. The appeal of Marxism is found in the whole world's literature and fiction generally while we find the same essence in Hawthorne's fiction particularly. His stories display that their themes get origin from the political economy. For Marxist philosophy, art is the part of the super structure. Marxists view the man as a social, economic and political being. Hawthorne's selected short stories essentially evolve out of writer's tendency to reflect economic and social experience. The hypothesis of Marxist commodification may assists this interpretation. We perceive that Marxism is not specifically designed for literature and fiction rather it is a body of theoretical foundation. The ideology of the complex structure of our social perception does not let us to see one social community having power over others and if we try to see, it looks natural. When we try to observe we find that social thinking of any age is strongly conditioned by the reflection of social relations of that particular era.

This research tries to highlight the gaps which are normally ignored because of the political play of the social structure and its impacts on the social relations with the help of Hawthorne's fiction. The stories selected show Marx' theory of making human being and his life activity as commodified particular in relation to social relations. The mystification and obscurity of the superstructure draws me to Marxist commodification theory as my framework. When we try to observe the practical design of our social set up and try to think deeply over it we understand that how is the whole world arranged and organized together to help and promote the commodity economy. Marxist commodification's theoretical framework is applied to make an effort to give concrete form to the abstract and unintelligible power play of commodity accumulators of social relations as well as spot light the oppression of economically dependents in social relations. The study emphasizes Marxist commodification because of its impact on the history as well as in the social structure particularly highlighted in Hawthorne's short stories. The true understanding of Marxism's relational social impacts bridges the gaps between the stories and real life. Furthermore we find commodification as a pole to narrate our social relations. The stories shows how are the interactions and relations corrupted such easily in the materialistic commodity –driven society. A careful investigation has been done through reading of the stories for complimenting the essence of study in finding out all possible evidences of commodification. The short stories are chosen as the theme of

Marxist commodification of social and emotional relations which is clearly evident in the texts. The researcher has consolidated and examined that Marxist literary theory will be a tool to highlight commodification in the short stories. Here the effort is made to show that commodification or the ways commodification make work both are respectively an ideology and an apparatus of ideology. Hawthorne's fictional characters represent the whole web of social construction which shows how is the false consciousness developed and family unit of the social set up made self-governing with the help of cultural hegemony and superstructure. The selected stories disclose the concealment and tactics of commodity collector's utilizing his power in the private domain of social emotional relations as well as the manufacture of consent of the economically dependents. They do not only accept commodity hoarder's authority and control over them but also willingly offer themselves to be commodified.

Hawthorne's selected works show hegemonic construction of social relations in the form of market economy. One has to demystify all invisible ways and hidden elements to understand the concealment done by the commodity economy through superstructure. The researcher finds it gains currency as Marxist theory is the one which works through exploring contradictions particularly opaque or underneath the surface. Hawthorne's fiction reflects these contradictions and the researcher examines the texts and detects how do commodity gleaners operationalize the institution of relations by making idea of an ideal family relations and ultimately making them self-governing. This researcher uses qualitative as well as interpretative ways to utilize Marxist commodification theory to unveil and demystify where one finds the conspirational commodification of social relations and covert techniques and strategies of commodity collectors to rule through cultural hegemony. They devise the whole mechanism of social relations in such a denominational way that economically dependents not only accept their sovereignty and dominance but also capitulate rather sacrifice their lives as well as whole life activities as a result of manufacture of consent implanted in them.

Marxist Commodification of Hawthorne's Selected Works

Marxist literary criticism strongly believes that every aspect of human life and history is affected and determined by economic forces. We find in commodity producing societies that approaches of Marxists are towards power in relation to social relational stratification is distinctive. Power is the only objective of commodity accumulators and they propagate for maintaining their monopoly on the entire social structure. There are many different ways in which Marxists pursue power relations. Hawthorne's stories are true manifestations of exercises of commodity accumulators in covert ways. He portrays the characters who prove and clarify that superstructure is made of and dependent upon the base of economy. All of his fiction in general and selected works in particular are representation of Marx's view as Tyson (2006) relates that someone is actually known by means of goods he owns materially and a person's value is only as much of worth as of his belongings and possessions.

In all these selected stories we will find the social stratification and power in scattered form. We find Marx's analysis of power relation, distribution and dispersal throughout the social set up as well as relations. We find the concepts of base and superstructure working exactly the way they are defined by Marx. The state which overtly seems neutral and impartial is the main and major source of securing and protecting the conditions for commodity collectors' domination. Hawthorne's stories aptly and successfully represent sociological analysis with the help of his characters. Hawthorne clarifies the idea of Marx that fiction and art remain in relation to the social trends of that age. Marx along with Engels strongly believe that social life moves along and follows materialism. They express that the changing essence of the art needs the historical materialism to get decoded. They believe that no one can be able to

understand the intellectual creativity of any author unless the person gets to know the material productivity of that particular era. This is the way Marx inter-relates art and society. He clearly describes that these are the material forces which basically shape the society, politics, intellectual community and trends. He writes that history of literature and fiction is actually the history of social life and description of the mode of economy of the age.

In Hawthorne's stories we find the same kind of glimpses. We observe Marx correct that in a specified time one finds particular productive relationship and under those certain aspects and trends peculiar type of art emerges. Hawthorne shows the trends of fiction under commodity accumulation system. His stories show that under such selfish social structure the commodification goes to the maximum heights. Marx himself verifies his idea of fiction and art as a creation of superstructure and reflection of the age by quoting commodity accumulator's commodification of the rest of the people in the writings of Shakespeare. The same idea is further taken ahead by Solomon (1979) writes about consciousness altering essence of literature. He writes that Marx takes the writer as someone who has the potential and capabilities of educating people and disclosing the social truths. They are the people with exceptional sensibilities and sensitivities so they can observe underneath facts of the social system. They unfold the secret and hidden ideology and tear off the mask of false consciousness. They describe the tensions as well as contradictions of that time. They depict the social power relation and their link to commodity accumulator's conspiracies of achieving authority. Hawthorne through his fiction uncovers the hidden strategies of society. His stories show that fiction, art and literature are the records of the life. Similarly, Aristotle describes tragedy as an imitation of actions while those actions are actually the incidents and events from a hero's life which are the representation of that age when he is born and brought up. Thus it becomes the illustration of all possible social values of that age. Marx expresses that capabilities of people are dependent upon their economic conditions. He discovers and stresses upon the struggle between commodity gatherers and the deprived ones in the past as well as present. The same thoughts seem working in Hawthorne's stories. We observe people divided into two groups or communities. The commodity accumulators are the ones who own the financial means and are affluent enough to be self-sufficient. The economically deprived ones are dependent on them and they are unable to survive without them as Marx says that people need means to survive as edibles, clothing and houses. The dependents do not have these basic needs and for gaining them they make efforts and work under those commodity collectors otherwise they may have died. This kind of inter-dependence makes them their servants and slaves. In this we find that economy transforms people's relations with one another. The concept of social stratification has continuously been depicted in form of different literary genres.

Hawthorne's stories come up to the merit set by Marx for a good writer. He seems explaining the taste and socio-economic ways of his age. His characters are true depiction of his age and represent the social, political and economic conditions. All the characters depict that the ideology, the cultural practices and superstructure are made of and shaped by the economic base. The commodity accumulators constitute the ideas for living which are ideas of the ruling people. Hawthorne's fiction unfolds the neglected and hidden continuation of social power which is in fact an inclination to over-play the consistency and organization of economic domination. Although we find different Marxist thinkers explaining and applying Marxist theory differently still we find similarity of social stratification and commodification on the basis of economic domination. The common aspects which are indispensable are history's interpretation in materialistic way, dialectic materialism, base, superstructure and hegemony. Hawthorne's fictional characters in selected stories Mr. Bullfrog, Georgiana, Mrs. Wakefield and Beatrice show the proneness to the Marxist commodification as well as Marxist thinker Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony.

Mrs. Bullfrog: Conway (1890) writes that Hawthorne's fiction and writing style are purity in itself and he writes the stories which seem ahead of his time. Hawthorne proves this claim by showing his deep insight into the historical materialism and commodification of the economically dependents. He perceives the idea that the social structure is made of and dependent upon the economy and these are commodity accumulators who are taking the maximum benefit out of the social norms and values. His stories are describing Marxist literary theory and showing the reflection of his age through his themes as well as characters. He displays glimpses of his social life by means of his intellectual creativity. *Mrs. Bullfrog* (2013) has been an excellent example in this regard which calls attention towards Marx's book (1999b) where he defines human being as well as his whole life activity as a commodity. This story truly represents the commodity economy as well as commodity collector's politics. In this story Mrs. Bullfrog takes her husband and his whole life activity as a commodity. She falsifies and gives him exactly opposite from what he wants to have and so does Mr. Bullfrog. Thus both characters commodify each other. The characters of the story are true representatives of commodifiers who exploit the whole lives of the economically dependents. The writer aptly discloses the domination of economy over all the values, which proves the superiority of the commodity gleaners over the entire social phenomenon. Mrs Bullfrog demystifies all whims of values, norms and moralities. Hawthorne presents the eternal facts with the help of his fiction which have been described by Marx (1999b) where he relates that from the dawn of the human history and existence men are conditioned and evaluated by their personal properties, accumulation of wealth and material. The story verifies that humanity has been divided into two communities, the commodity hoarders and the deprived ones and in actual reality master and slave. We find people making their own history but they do not make it the way they please to do rather they have been making under the available circumstances which have been in a sequence from the past. The living people have been carrying along all the traditions of the previous, dead generations as they keep occupying their minds. We find even the previous generations repeating the same strategies for revolutionizing themselves. They also have been in practice of borrowing almost every possible thing as names, slogans, dresses for the sake of presenting themselves as new scene in the history of the world with disguised and borrowed language.

Hawthorne describes dialectical and historical materialism with the help of his fictional characters Mr. and Mrs. Bullfrog. Both the characters reveal the complete as well as hidden story of base and superstructure. Hawthorne illustrates in full length the way whole cloth of social structure is fabricated and woven. He acknowledges the dominance of money and wealth and portrays the entire social set up on micro level with the help of just two main characters. Hawthorne highlights Marx's thoughts by writing that every needy person has basically been a servant to the commodity gatherer. The commodity hoarder exploits him while he gets used for his means of subsistence. Hawthorne brings to light the details given in the book that although commodity seems to be very tiny and trivial thing yet it has entangled the whole social system and human life. The writer gives details of Marx's utility and bartering worth as in story the characters are very well aware of their use as well as exchange-value. The commodity collectors have taken away the honor of every possible profession which has been taken as respectable and honorable. They have changed all those once reputable people like scientists, doctors, lawyers, clergy men and poets into wage laborers. These commodity gatherers have taken away all emotional and sentimental values from family relations as well as life and reduce them to just relation of money. The story depicts the social relations living in private property and ownership are different ways of exploitation on the basis of economy. Here we find Adorno (1972) correct when he writes that no one has any value except his or her exchange value. Hawthorne regards these relations more the reason of

commodification rather than positive productive forces. In the story the writer describes Mr. Bullfrog as a man of delicacies and choices. He has been very clear to have an exceptional lady with all good qualities of head and heart rather delays his marriage for a very long time. He gets married after meeting the person of his choice. Hawthorne discusses the material conception of the society from two different angles. Mr. Bullfrog on the one hand exploits the situation for getting a better woman with far more qualities than he himself possesses while on the other he gets to have some sort of profit or gain if not in physical features or form then in monetary way.

Hawthorne illustrates that both the characters are commodity collectors in some form or the other. They make a free exchange between them as Mr. Thomas Bullfrog wants to have a wife with most civilized behavior, innocent at heart and pure “silken texture of mind, and, above all a virgin heart. In a word, if a young angel just from paradise” (Hawthorne, 2013, p. 2). He has a dream of every possible good thing in his future wife. Mr. Bullfrog presents the idea of a true commodity gleaner in a way that he is taking his future wife as a commodity or a thing which should be a creature from the heaven and possessing the heavenly characteristics while he himself has been an earthly person. After his long struggle and effort he ultimately finds the fairy queen of his heart from another town. She gets the appearance as Mr. Bullfrog describes that “each tooth appeared like an inestimable pearl....glossy curls which realized my daydreams of rich hair” (p. 3). She has every possible physical beauty as crystal white teeth as pearls and hair with beautiful curls. The social realities have been depicted in true and natural form. The writer unravels the moralities and standards of that age in the form of the expectations of both the characters. They have been materialistic and worldly people with a strong tendency of getting as more as possible in every walk of life. They appear to be commodity gatherers who are in the habit of accumulating all possible good things with zero investment as Mr. Bullfrog himself has been shown as a short man with hardly acceptable personality while his demands for his wife has been beyond human expectations. The story has been true picturization of the hold of economy on the social life as well as social relations. Hawthorne with the help of his themes and characters explains that human relations are in fact relations of production and the exchange is not done just of commodities but is of communal relationships and human beings. Hawthorne verifies the thought of Marx that for the commodity collector everything and everyone is a commodity to be exchanged and utilized for business’ purpose. Hawthorne relates all these events in the background of ideology which has been a product of the commodity hoarders. The writer alludes towards the cultural hegemony where people feel it normal and natural to use and get used for monetary benefits.

The write represents the facts as every commodity gatherer keeps searching for an opportunity for his profit and gain so does Mr. Bullfrog and gets the wife of his desire, a pure virgin. Similarly, Hawthorne shows that Mrs. Bullfrog has a good opportunity to find a young man of her choice who should be chaste and loving. Marx (2010b) describes such kind of situation that when people keep exchanging the commodities between them that has been the real and true relation which exists between them. This process of social exchange between free and independent individuals is a social relation between them in true sense. They start their journey back home and get lucky enough to be alone in the coach. Mr. Bullfrog seems happy and wants to touch the curls of Mrs. Bullfrog which she forbids softly for the first time and strictly for the second time. They commodify each other being commodity accumulators and the real situation is revealed by the writer with the help of a sudden accident as the coach gets collided with the heap of gravel and gets damaged with everything and everyone exactly in the opposite situation as up and down. Here comes the twist of the story as Mrs. Bullfrog comes out as exactly opposite of her apparent reality as the delicate angel suddenly, “cried a strange, hoarse voice”. It is the time when Mr. Bullfrog

comes to know the new facts about his wife as well as her life. He gets to know that in the social exchange of relations he had been deceived and cheated as he sees Mrs. Bullfrog as “with head almost bald and sunken cheeks.....there being no teeth to modulate the voice.” She knocks the driver down twice for being the reason of his secret personality disclosure. She makes him bleed from the nose and says with a heavy heart that she will never be the same Mrs. Bullfrog again. Mr. Bullfrog on the other hand has been so surprised and shocked to see the scene that he is unable to accept the reality as he says her as “Who could the phantom be.....for this ogre, or whatever was” (p. 5). Hawthorne portrays the whole situation in detail as he further relates that even after getting so many shocks of his wife as a person he tries to ignore and takes a piece of newspaper in which the edibles are covered. Here comes another hard stroke to Mr. Bullfrog as the newspaper contains the details of a woman who has been in love affair of a person and gets deceived. She consults the court and explains the whole story of love and deception and gets the alimony in the end. The cherry on the cake has been that it is about Laura, Mrs. Bullfrog, when the husband asks about it she apparently innocently replies that “I thought that the entire world knew that!” (p. 8). She has been a true commodity worshipper and knows how to turn the situation in her favor and says that “Ought a woman to disclose her frailties earlier than the wedding day?” (p.9). She does not consider that such kind of secrets should be disclosed before marriage. Hawthorne shows the commodification of a commodity collector when on the question of Mr. Bullfrog that why does she not keep her secrets to herself to avoid defame in the public. Mrs. Bullfrog at that point informs and exploits economically dependent by alluring him with the money got by that scandal to invest in his business as “but in that case, where would have been the five thousand dollars which are to stock your dry goods store?”(p. 10). Mr. Bullfrog has been the true representative of commodity producing system when he forgets all his demands for physical or moral beauty and welcomes her and wants to have her into his arms with love and suddenly declares all her previous scandals as well as her old age as frailties. He happily and eagerly forgives her minor mistakes and says “let me fold thee to my heart. The basis of matrimonial bliss is secure, and all thy little defects and frailties are forgiven. Nay, since the result has been so fortunate, I rejoice at the wrong which drove thee to this blessed lawsuit. Happy Bullfrog that I am!” (p. 10).

Marx (2000) gives Hawthorne’s theme by saying that money is something which proves to be a kind of bonding element for me to human life. This force has been binding me to the society and joining me with nature as well as man. He says that is it not just money which is the only binding force which surrounds all other bonds of life and at the same time it is the same money which has been the reason of separation on universal level. Thus we conclude that Marx’s human being as a commodity is portrayed in the story.

The Birth Mark: Hawthorne shows his expertise as a writer of symbolism and allegory that the story seems a sketch drawn on a Marxist canvas. He uses the Marxist perspective and highlights through his fiction that how does the superstructure made by the commodity producing system, commodify the social and emotional relations, the subordinate people. Hawthorne proves himself a social realist and unravels the socio-economic situations of his age by the medium of his intellectual activity. The story unravels the power play of commodity producing social system. We find that superstructure with the help of hidden and mystified cultural hegemony manufactures the consent of economically dependents for becoming a commodity for economically strong better emotional relations. This story shows that a commodity collector commodifies his economically weak relation to satisfy his scientific desire. He describes (1996) in *The birth mark* that the commodification of socially, emotionally as well as economically dependents. He has a deep

insight and highlighted the economic domination of social actors who get a veil of emotions and sentiments to hide their commodity accumulator's position and exercise of power. Their power is made normal and natural in the same way as economic base makes the cultural values and norms seem natural. Abrams (1981) relates it as we find that in almost every era of the history the basic work of the dominant ideology has been to serve, legitimate and sustain the interests of the community which is economically dominant. Commodity gleaners of the social system as well as relations have their power rooted in the organization of working procedure. They know it well that their maintenance of power can only sustain if they will keep the labor or the dependents just on the means of survival only. We observe Marx and Engels (2010b) alluding towards ideological domination in their book when they say that whatever has been the dominant creeds of any time are actually the beliefs of commodity hoarders. They explain this process in detail in their books that powerful economic community always makes its struggles to win the hearts of the people in the civil society. This mode of power relation has been made invisible and exercise of power is made as a normal phenomenon in every day social life of the people. The works of Gramsci in this perspective are remarkable to point out the form of politics which works to make acceptance with consent and willingness. He believes that it is hegemony which conspires in a way that the ideas of the commodity hoarders are presented in such a way that even the suppressed and commodified community accepts them without any objection. He believes that it is the work of hegemony to mobilize and reproduce successfully the active consent. The same idea has been applied by Hawthorne in his story where he depicts the economically dependent surrenders herself and she thinks it normal, being a product of commodity producing social structure which works through base, economy, superstructure, ideology and hegemony.

The commodity collectors control them by their economic means so tactfully that they willingly get enslaved. In this story Aylmer uses his power as a husband, the wealth as previously mentioned by Marx without which Georgiana will have starved. All these aspects are shown as domestic or family relation's conspirational recruitment. He keeps experimenting on her just to fulfil his desire. Aylmer is shown more a quack than an expert in the story as "We know not whether Aylmer possessed this degree of faith in man's ultimate control over Nature" (Hawthorne, 1996, p.47). Hawthorne shows that Georgiana has been aware of the inefficiencies of his husband as a doctor still she thinks herself to be at his command. Georgiana is exploited in the background of economically constructed ties of conventions under the institution of marriage. The story shows the thankless nature of the man as Aylmer wants to marry her being the most beautiful and soon after the marriage, the achievement, he starts getting bothered by her birth mark. He replies her about the mark as, "but never on yours.... shocks me, as being the visible mark of earthly imperfection"(p.49). Here writer shows the impulsive and ungrateful nature of man and its contradiction with the will of nature. She gets surprised as he marries her with great love. She becomes aware of his disgust and expresses that she feels helpless as, "Shocks you, my husband!" cried Georgiana..... bursting into tears. Then why did you take me from my mother's side? You cannot love what shocks you" (p.50). She seems to be aware of the fact that he has all the rights to commodify her as well as her life. Aylmer's ungratefulness is a clear indication of man's nature since he has achieved her and now being the master, he has started finding defects while she is the same for whom the young men of that time are ready to die for having her as she has been considered to be someone exceptional and the small hand is taken as some fairy's hand's mark who might have come to touch her in love of her beauty. We observe that Georgiana is without child and thus appears aimless and it seems easy to exploit her life. The writer shows, "Georgiana soon learned to shudder at his gaze" (p.52) and she feels his hatred towards her because of that mark. He

ultimately makes her to surrender and she herself asks to remove that tiny mark, "Cannot you remove this little, little mark, which I cover with the tips of two small fingers? Is this beyond your power, for the sake of your own peace, and to save your poor wife from madness?" (p.55). She behaves as dependent bearing an obedient attitude as a part of social set up which is constructed economically. Ritzer and Stepnisky (2011) discuss that commodity producing system is based on the exploitation of the economically deprived ones. Here comes the point when the commodity gatherer shows his original nature and Aylmer exhibits his commodity collector's aptitude by expressing openly to his wife and he says, "Georgiana, you had led me deeper than ever into the heart of science.....what will be my triumph when I shall have corrected what Nature left imperfect" (p.55). Georgina expresses her mind about Nature by telling clearly that, "She permits us, indeed, to mar, but seldom to mend" (p.57). She is considered to be on the side of deprived ones as she is economically dependent. Aminadab, the assistant is another example of the economically helpless who acts upon all of his master's commands good or evil as, "He executed all the details of his master's experiments" still disagrees with the master as, "If she were my wife, I'd never part with that birthmark" (p.58). He is surprised for his master's hatred towards that tiny mark and says that if she may have been his wife he will never go to remove that mark. He feels master's act as useless.

Hawthorne explains the exploitative commodity hoarder's nature where the economic dependents have the status of slaves while the master has all rights to use and commodify his slaves. Zanger (1983) writes it as Aylmer takes his wife as a scientific problem and it becomes an obsession to solve that problem. There is all set to commodify her. He shows the deadliest lotion and when she asks, "Is it with this lotion that you intend to bathe my cheek?" replied cruelly that, "Oh, no,... this is merely superficial. Your case demands a remedy that shall go deeper" (p.64). He says it very normally that the one he is intending to experiment on her cheek is deadliest than every other lotion. He takes her as scientists take rats. He takes her as a commodity and wants to check her physical energy he makes her touch the scientifically grown plant, a scientific formula which withers with a touch of her hand as, "There was too powerful a stimulus," said Aylmer, thoughtfully" (P.61). When she enters the laboratory she realizes with the smells in the laboratory that she has already been a subject to his scientific experiments. She reads all of her husband's experiments and comes to know that her husband is not an expert at all despite that she is ready to get sacrificed for his comfort as, "she could not but observe that his most splendid successes were almost invariably failures..... His brightest diamonds were the merest pebbles" (p.66).

Hawthorne has communicated that the very tale becomes a true medium for illustrating some historical social set up with its political as well as social ideology which depicts control over social practices and resistance in which Aylmer is shown as a representative of the intellectual paternal figure who seems to possess all authorities in home as well as outside. Georgian conveys the true spirit of social enslavement and exploitation when after knowing that her husband is nothing more than a failure in science still gets ready to be murdered by him just for his satisfaction and pleasure. Aylmer tells her that the risk is very high as, "too much or too little, it is all over". He is so obsessed with her mark that blames her for coming to laboratory and says as, "Would you throw the blight of that fatal birthmark over my labors?" (p. 69). He takes her mark as jinxed and he wants her to stay back from laboratory. The irony of hegemonic superstructure is visible when Aylmer grooms his wife psychologically to become an object of his experiment as she herself offered him, "I submit,"....Aylmer, I shall quaff whatever draught you bring me; but it will be on the same principle that would induce me to take a dose of poison if offered by your hand...Remove it, remove it, whatever be the cost, or we shall both go' and 'Heaven knows your words are too

true, said Aylmer, sadly” (p.71). She herself gets ready to drink even poison if he gives her that poison with his hands. She wants to remove that mark at the cost of her life to please her husband and for avoiding his hatred. She knows that she will die still she gets ready to take that risk. He clearly tells that he knows his experiment is most probably going to kill her and shows his power as a commodity accumulator and informs her about results irrespective of her emotions as workers have been exploited because the work they are performing is tiring and wearisome and the whole benefits just goes to the commodity gleaner. Aylmer is more concerned about his scientific results than his wife as he keeps making notes of her movements than worrying about her and Georgian ultimately falls a prey to her master and things go the way as both the commodity gatherer with means of subsistence and dependent know already as, “My poor Aylmer,” she repeated, with a more than human tenderness, “you have aimed loftily; you have done nobly. Do not repent that with so high and pure a feeling, you have rejected the best the earth could offer. Aylmer, dearest Aylmer, I am dying!” (p.76). She knows already and beforehand that her husband will kill her and tells him that he rejects what earth can offer him as the best and tries to correct the nature which is impossible so as a result he fails and she is losing her life. Hawthorne has described remarkably the Marxist commodification through social and emotional relations. He explains that how do commodity gleaners keep control over the economically dependents through economic means in social relations. They play the game of power through the politics of super structure, a game which makes the deprived ones, the dependents an ever ready toy in their hands. Their pleasures, their pursuits and satisfactions must be achieved at whatever cost. The commodity collectors keep maintaining their power through capacities available in social system and relations. They use the social relations the same way as industrialists exploit workers and both keep their servants just on the means of subsistence for being on the verge of existence. They use and commodify them while the dependents willingly offer themselves as a result of ready consent. Dr Aylmer kills his wife for his scientific obsession and thus proves his wife’s position as not more than that of an experimental rat, a commodity. Their situations are explained by Shakespeare (1988) that the way wandering boys play with the flies just pass their time in a good way and ultimately kill them during the play similarly gods do with the human beings. The writer depicts in thorough detail that people who have been the commodity hoarders have the same tendency of commodifying everyone around for their personal wish and desires. They do not take human beings more than commodities.

Rappaccini’s Daughter: Hawthorne has been a Marxist critic who pictures his age in his intellectual activities of fiction. He describes the ways the economic base of the society utilizes superstructure to main commodity producing power in social system as well as relations. The writer explains the autonomy of commodity which is exercised through its preprogramming for controlling the entire cycle of social life and putting the society into a circle or habit of following them involuntarily. This is his originality which shows the true depiction of his age. He explains with the help of his fictional artistic tools that how does Marxist school of thought sink deep into the roots of social structure and how do the commodity hoarders of social relations are commodifying and exploiting their subordinates. Hawthorne (1996) in *Rappaccini’s daughter* story shows aptly the hegemonic and ideological control of commodity collectors as the dependents are not only accepting their oppression rather seem grateful to their masters. In the story he applies symbolism and allegory. This story relates the Marx’s book (1999b) where commodification of commodity hoarder is depicted. The economically powerful characters turn the dependent into mere a commodity. Dr. Rappaccini and Giovanni are represented as commodity hoarders who commodify Beatrice for the satisfaction of their desires earlier for his scientific obsession and later

for his sensual desires. They do not only make her commodity and her whole life activity rather kills her for their benefit. He is very particular about every minute details of the story as he portrays Dr. Rappaccini and the details about his looks as true Marxist commodity gatherer who is more interested in his personal gains and profits than a normal human being. Rappaccini is a voracious commodity gleaner who is in very much love for his life. He has the selfish attitude as his own life is the most important one for him. "He avoided their actual touch or the direct inhaling of their odors with a caution... defended his hands with a pair of thick gloves (Hawthorne, 1996, pp. 131-132).

Hawthorne explains the social dependents' oppression which he shows by representing Rappaccini doing extra and over care of his life by putting on mask and gloves on. He calls Beatrice to do the same thing as he takes her daughter as a commodity or some machine. He thinks that the work should be done by a social slave as mentioned previously like Hegel's master-slave relationship. The story has shown Hawthorne's mastery of allegory as he showed the garden as the Eden of the present world. In the Garden of Eden we find the powerful, lucrative and seductive Lucifer who takes advantage of the weaker creature, Eve and plays his games and like ever again the Eve is shown and known to be the victim. In the story Hawthorne shows his skills by showing his mind under the surface of the story. Marxism is considered to be not only the criticism of the society but also a way to understand the world. When one tries to go deep into the theme one will realize that Marxism with the help of hegemony and ideology beguiles Beatrice, a social dependent, the deprived one economically. Beatrice is shown as an easy target for both male characters. Although Giovanni gets the negative signals from the very first look of Beatrice yet he is more interested to pass good time and goes for satisfaction of his basic instinct. He consciously ignores every detail which alludes towards reality. He listens to Beatrice saying that poisonous plant as, "Yes, my sister, my splendor, it shall be Beatrice's task to nurse and serve thee; and thou shalt reward her with thy kisses and perfumed breath, which to her is as the breath of life" (p.134). He is an opportunist and despite watching every detail about Rappaccini and Beatrice he is still happy to be in a position of remaining close to Beatrice. Professor Baglioni describes Rappaccini as the wisest in the science. It shows that he is the most learned among scientists exactly the way Lucifer has been among angels, the most capable as well as the most dangerous. Rappaccini is shown as commodity gleaner who despite having maximum wealth of knowledge still wants more and is a bottomless pit whose hunger is never satisfied. Booker (1996) relates it that it is the nature of commodity producing society's trend that it deals with economically dependents as commodities. We find that Dr. Rappaccini is least bothered with the importance of anything except his goals and is ready to take life of others for his needs as professor Baglioni informs Giovanni that "a man who might hereafter chance to hold your life and death in his hands. The truth is, our worshipful Dr. Rappaccini has as much science as any member of the faculty—with perhaps one single exception—in Padua, or all Italy". He further explains, "His patients are interesting to him only as subjects for some new experiment" (p.137). Further Baglioni gets his intention when he comes to know that Giovanni is interesting in Beatrice actually and tells him that, "So now our friend Giovanni's secret is out. You have heard of his daughter, whom all the young men in Padua are wild about" (p.139). Giovanni's self-centred nature is exposed when writer shows that he neither listens to professor Baglioni's advices nor takes care of his own observation of suspicious activities but ignores consciously for his personal interest. Hawthorne shows the predominance of economically independents as the owners of economic means and their power and exploitation when Giovanni gets an offer to enter the garden he ignores the facts which are not of his interest and gets interested after getting the very first opportunity as "Listen, signor! There is a private entrance into the garden!" (p.149). Here the

commodity hoarder uses his power as “Giovanni put a piece of gold into her hand”. He has gone blind after his desires as, “it seemed an absolute necessity of his existence to do so. It mattered not whether she were angel or demon” (p.150). Although Giovanni keeps getting clues about her but still wants to commodify and exploit her for his passion play like a true commodity gatherer and focuses on his ultimate profit and goal.

Hawthorne proves himself a true writer reflecting his society and shows the supremacy of commodity accumulators as the owners of economic means. He depicts Beatrice’s position that is commodified by her father as well as by Giovanni, both commodify her on behalf of economic supremacy. She has been portrayed as an innocent soul who just wants to have someone to talk to as Marx (2000) relates that man as a natural being who has been bestowed with powers of the nature as well as other valuable powers. These properties exist in him in the form of instincts and aptitudes. On the contrary he seems to be an impartial, natural, corporeal, delicate one and is found suffering, dependent and restricted one. The items of his basic instinct have been outside and independent but they are the objects of his need and requirement. She keeps informing indirectly about the facts to him as, “Touch it not! Exclaimed she, in a voice of agony. Not for thy life! It is fatal!” (p.157). She herself remains in constant contact with that plant even in his presence. Hawthorne explains commodity gatherer’s behavior of Giovanni as he keeps meeting her in the pursuit of his lust and the moment he realizes his being poisoned because of his own doings he abruptly starts hating Beatrice to the extent that he wants to kill her. It is highly ironic that the one who should be blamed is condemning Beatrice who is already exploited by the social structure made by these commodity collectors. He does not blame his evil intentions to access her made him poisonous rather says that the very first work he wants to perform after becoming aware of his poisonous breath is that he feels sorry that, “She is the only being whom my breath may not slay! Would that it might!” (p.169). Hawthorne relates exploitation of the economically dependent one when Beatrice expresses that “when I first drew breath, this plant sprang from the soil, the offspring of his science, of his intellect, while I was but his earthly child.” (p.171). Here the writer alludes towards human nature that when he gets a thing pretty there and then that very thing loses its value, the way manna, Eden’s food loses its importance. In the same way Giovanni blames Beatrice, an easy prey being a dependent and replies to her angrily as, “Yes, poisonous thing! ...Thou hast made me as hateful, as ugly, as loathsome and deadly creature as thyself” (p.172). She is just a poisonous commodity and not human being. She has been stopping him from any physical contact with purple plant as well as herself and always makes him realize that it is not possible rather dangerous but he remains consistent and now he is blaming her. She cries bitterly and says, “Holy Virgin, pity me... and he responds selfishly....Thy very prayers, as they come from thy lips, taint the atmosphere with death” (p.172). She has been brought up in a commodity producing society and easily surrenders in front of the commodity hoarders and as a victim of cultural hegemony. She accepts herself as just a commodity when she repeats the word thing by commodity hoarder Giovanni and says that, “it is true, am the horrible thing thou namest me”. When Giovanni shows an insect dying with his breath, she accepts but makes her situation clear by saying, “I see it! I see it!” shrieked Beatrice. “It is my father's fatal science...it was not I! Never! Never! I dreamed only to love thee and be with thee (p.173). She reflects her emotions after being denied and here Hawthorne’s presents the true politics of superstructure with the tool of cultural hegemony as she offers herself to satisfy his desire and asks Giovanni to, “spurn me, tread upon me, kill me! Oh, what is death after such words as thine?” (p.174). She explains that she prefers death over such horrible blames on her. Hawthorne shows his deep insight into the social structure of that time when manifests that Beatrice does not only accept his father’s social authority but also shows her

enslavement to the commodity gleaner of social and emotional state. Giovanni has been shown of the same level commodity collector as Rappaccini as when Beatrice asks for the antidote he commodifies her and willingly gives her to try first. He shows the same behavior which Rappaccini shows in the beginning by keeping himself safe from the plants and exposing Beatrice to them. Both the commodity gatherers keep experimenting on her. While dying she says to her father as, "My father," said Beatrice, feebly... "Wherefore didst thou inflict this miserable doom upon thy child?" (p.176). He has used her for the fulfillment of his desire to make an experiment. Similarly to the other social exploiter Giovanni as, "Farewell, Giovanni! Thy words of hatred are like lead within my heart; but they, too, will fall away as I ascend. Oh, was there not, from the first, more poison in thy nature than in mine?" (p. 177).

Hawthorne describes that how do the commodity gleaners play the politics of economic domination and find their way with the help of hegemony and ideology, which is dug deep into our social and emotional relations and how do the economic dependents like Beatrice fall an easy prey to them as they make it such a common practice in social set up that the commodification of economically dependents seems normal. Rappaccini commodifies her for his scientific obsession and makes her live an unnatural and miserable life of loneliness. This is the strategy which is always applied by the commodity gatherers that they convert human beings into commodities for their pleasure and needs. Dr. Rappaccini who commodifies her daughter, makes her poisonous, alienates her and at the end again tries to use her for the expansion of her experiments through including Giovanni in it while he forgets that Giovanni is also the product of the same social structure. He also commodifies her like Rappaccini and with this lethal combination of two exploiters at the same time she gets killed. The story shows up that innocent Beatrice is made commodity by commodity collectors of her social and emotional relations.

Wakefield: Hawthorne is a man of exceptional qualities of mind and heart. He can observe the commodification in the system. He shows his deep insight into the socio-economic relations and creates fiction of such type which is mirror of his society. His stories are a kind of historical materialism. His fictional pieces of art get the reader acknowledge that it is not the consciousness of men which is determining factor rather it is material position. The life and its trends are set by the ones who own the ways of productions. He describes in detail the commodity producing system encircles and engulfs the whole social activity. He explains (2013) in *Wakefield* the inter-connection of base with the ideology which is a part of superstructure. He portrays that commodity accumulators keep manoeuvring the social gaps and sustain their power in form of hidden economic domination. The story hits the bull's eye with the framework where the commodity economy is exposed along with the help of framework. Marx explains that it is not only the life but also the whole life activity of the economically dependent which is commodified. Mr. Wakefield spoils the whole youth of his wife by leaving her alone and uninformed. He spends twenty long years of his life just next lane keeping an eye on his wife. He commodifies her for his desire of excitement and loves spying on her. He shows his instinct of a commodifier when he gets excited knowing that she is dying in his absence. He does not take her more than just a commodity. Wakefield's authority at home shows his position as he is the owner of the house and means of earning, "lord and master" (Hawthorne, 2013, p. 7). Hawthorne depicts the maintenance of power of commodity owners on micro level which is actually the manifestation of macro display of commodity producing social system. Marx explains that all the history to the date is the history of continuous struggle where wealthy people use and commodify the needy ones. The same situation has been depicted by Hawthorne when he shows the inner feelings of Mr. Wakefield who is

completely assured that even his absence of twenty years will not make any kind of difference and at his home there is no one in a position to question him or his authority as, “he entered the door one evening, quietly, as from a day’s absence, and became a loving spouse till death”. The command of social and emotional relation seems clear to the dependent Mrs Wakefield on the very first page of the story he declares the life long sentence which is imposed on Mrs. Wakefield is, “without a shadow of reason” (p.2). These lines prove that commodity owners take the lives of economically dependents as an object and thing which they are free to use for their pleasure and adventures.

Hawthorne describes in his fiction the placement of power running under the cover of social relations where exercise of power is made normal and natural phenomenon. There is nothing shown objectionable from social perspective and no oddities are brought to light in regard to Mr .Wakefield’s behavior towards his dependent wife. Here we observe Mosco (2013) correct when he expresses Smith’s belief about wide spreading effect of political economy that is all about the two aspects of the story one is the control over social order and the other is the survival of the deprived one. Hawthorne proves himself as social realist. He exposes the power relations of the social actors. Commodity collectors of social relations seem more interested in exercise of power in casual inter-connections. The commodity gleaners have always been aware of the states as subjects, conflicts and dominations. They keep considering these practices in the context of appropriateness for and by their over-determination as economic domination. Hawthorne shows their hidden connections in the roots of economy, politics and ideology. One can observe the Marxist approach of the ways of productions, their relevance to control over state, intellectual activities and ultimately on the minds as well as the hearts of the people. Hawthorne unfolds the layers of the social evils of the tactics of social commodity hoarders who have naturalized and mystified their economic power. One such example is found in *Wakefield* where economically dependent Mrs. Wakefield does not have her existence as Hawthorne discloses the commodification of social commodity gatherer Mr. Wakefield who dominates his wife and makes her a thing or an object which belongs to him. She has just been mentioned and discussed as a possession or belonging of the commodity gleaner of social relations and nothing else as he knows her as his, “How his exemplary wife” (p. 6).

Hawthorne’s depiction of economically dependent Mrs. Wakefield is a description of a socially as well as economically crippled person. She has been put in a situation that she willingly and knowingly takes herself as an object or commodity. Klages (2012) relates it as when we try to observe old Marxism we find that our culture, its thoughts and practices are all shaped by and made of the economy which is under the commodity gleaner. He keeps the economically dependents away from the objective facts about their existence. In this story Hawthorne presents the master-slave situation in social relations. Wakefield is aware of his superiority over his wife and does not bother himself for consulting his wife while taking a decision to leave her for unlimited time. He leaves her and starts living just a next street of his house in London. Hawthorne shows the ruthlessness of the commodity accumulator of social relations as he makes the life of his wife as abstract and non-existent. It has been considered to be the quality of the commodity gatherers that they reduce the concrete to abstract. In commodity producing societies one finds that it is system’s creation and achievement that they know the ways to change the concrete human activities into abstract form. Hawthorne portrays the relation between Mr. and Mrs. Wakefield, the relation of things or commodities rather than that of human relations. Hawthorne works on the idea that commodity hoarders are exploiting the social capacities and exercise their power through them rather than showing their power overtly and visibly. Mr. Wakefield’s character is not doing

anything unusual by leaving his wife for no reason rather it is manifestation of exercise of his power. He utilizes the socially structured capacities. He is well aware of his power being a commodity gatherer and the support to him is provided by the ideology of superstructure which is based on the economy, he has with him already. Hawthorne presents that commodity owner's game of exercise of power in social relations can only be enjoyed within social beings rather than being in isolation. The dialectic of wealth-labor as well as master-slave has always been indispensable and incomplete without each other. Mr. Wakefield needs his commodity, Mrs. Wakefield for his play as, "he beheld his home every day, and frequently the forlorn Mrs Wakefield" (p.2). Commodity owners use workers as machines on larger level while on smaller level they exploit and use the whole life activity of socially dependents. These commodity hoarders always have a tendency to commodify people around for their gains and profits, on economic grounds they do with the workers while on social grounds they do with their family or dependents. Hawthorne presents in his fiction the idea of Marx's (2000) comments of Mill that in private possessions the power appears greater and in a progressed way, the owner, the commodity collector proves to be much more egoistic, insensitive and alienated from a human being's normal nature. Marx says that the way people do barter of things and commodities in the same way they exchange the life activities with one another in social life. Thus man's life activity appears to be the division of labor. This kind of division changes a person into an abstract one rather into some machine's tool. Same thought has been expressed in Hawthorne's story *Wakefield*. Mr. Wakefield being a commodity collector in social scenario emerges as a ruthless and merciless husband who puts her in a life imprisonment and commodifies her life activity as well as her emotions. He takes her as a machine or commodity which he uses for the pleasure of his mental activity. Hawthorne shows that Mr. and Mrs. Wakefield sustain the relation despite each of them is pretty clear about the other. Mrs. Wakefield knows that goodness is something in Mr. Wakefield as almost "perhaps non-existent" so she knows her commodity accumulator (p. 3). He does not go a long distance from her rather, "It is but in the next street!" (p. 9). He keeps living there for complete twenty years and does not take care of her emotional life. She feels helpless despite that she remains hopeful because his absence is uninformed and unpredictable and keeps feeling like, "She sometimes doubts whether she is a widow" (p. 4). Holloway (2002) explains the situation as the power of the commodity accumulator is very much like horrifying modern bullets which do not only make a hole in human's body and tear the flesh apart the victim but also blow up his inner self into thousands of particles and it is not something far away from separation of doing or done (as was in the concept of ideology or hegemony) rather one finds it as an integral part of that very separation. That very partition is not only splitting commodity accumulators and laborers rather it explodes inside human body and shapes the whole system the way one can think and thus transforms every single moment of life in struggle against the other.

Hawthorne represents Marx's commodity collector as Wakefield uses his power of economy and makes Mrs. Wakefield's life a futile activity. He makes her sick with his absence for such a long time and for his pleasure he keeps watching and observing her almost every day. Her life and emotions are like a good pass time for him. His commodification touches the maximum heights when Hawthorne shows, "Will she die? By this time, Wakefield excited to something like energy of feeling"(p. 8). He is committing all these atrocities on just behalf of the commodity producing social set up which provides him all the rights to exploit his socially and economically dependent relations in whatever ways he likes and there has been no one to question him for that act. Here Hawthorne portrays wage labor situation where free exchange happens to be the main reason of exploitation. Hawthorne represents the fact that social system gives free hand to the commodity

hoarders of social relations as they exercise their power which has been made a normal phenomenon with the help of that old economic base of the society. Mr. Wakefield destroys the whole life of Mrs. Wakefield and enjoys her getting sick and even gets excited if she may have died in his love. He commodifies her whole life activity as well as her life as Hawthorne describes that there has not been any reason of doing all this except the feeling of, “A morbid vanity, therefore, lies nearest the bottom of the affair” (p. 6). Hawthorne further elaborates his callousness as a part of a true selfish when Hawthorne shows his emotions by writing that “He will not go back until she be frightened half to death” (p. 8). Mr. Wakefield does all this just out of “A peculiar sort of vanity, the most uneasy attribute about him” (p. 3). Hawthorne represents Marx’s social theory of commodity accumulators and deprived ones struggle in his story and unfold the secrets of the commodity producing social system. He has been sensible enough to understand the economic base which is organizing all the rest of society and institutions in a way that the ideas of the commodity gatherers are taken as the ideas of the existing people. Those set norms, values, culture, education and socially accepted trends go all in favors of the commodity hoarders of means of production in general and of social relations in particular. These commodity accumulators have been playing havoc with the lives of the workers and economically dependents and commodify them for their gains and profits. Literature and fiction have been taken as showing the internal as well external emotions of the human beings in specific age which are actually caused by the outer forces and conditions. We observe after thorough and detailed study of Hawthorne’s fiction that he reflects the social values of his age in allegorical and symbolic way. This research uses Marxist commodification theory as a touch stone to delve deep into the Hawthorne’s stories and recognize the theory’s significance to the themes of Hawthorne’s literary creations. The normal concept about a genuine piece of literature is considered to be a tool to understand the conditions of that time.

Commodification through Marxism and economic domination has been depicted in his stories *Rappaccini’s daughter*, *Wakefield*, *Mrs. Bullfrog* and *The birth mark*. Hawthorne produces a series of short stories and novels. He has a deep insight of the social structure and explains artistically the manoeuvre of commodity accumulators in social relations. Marxism in the form of clash of economically deprived ones and commodity hoarders’ struggle seems a dominant theme as well as a concern on his part. He proves himself the one mirroring the life of his age in writings. Bell (2005) explained that Hawthorne always tries to explore new themes in one way or the other. Although one finds that he feels to match the outer reality with his imagination as uninteresting yet one realizes that the public issues as well as the common situations and conditions of his age have not been expressed so well by anyone else than in his writings. He is conscious and well aware of Marxist economic domination, observes its deep roots and exercise by the social actors and performers in the form of Dr. Rappaccini, Mr. Wakefield, Mrs. Bullfrog and Aylmer. The common themes of all short stories evoke the feeling of oppression and exploitation, love and commodification, a constant movement in the narration which touches the lives of the characters torn badly in the dilemma of oppressing circumstances. This clearly shows his genius of understanding the life around at that time. Trilling (1953) says that Hawthorne has been dealing artistically only with the realities, with considerable things, in short he is dealing exactly with only realities. This study examines all the stories time and again and finds out the commodification of commodity hoarders through social and economic domination. Power is dispersed throughout society and social relations. Hawthorne highlights the politics of ideological and hegemonic economic domination under the cover of the super structure. He makes it crystal clear, the way politics of the ideology makes the economic domination as normal practice. Hawthorne shows that economically sound social relations have control over dependents. He portrays the common

practice as of commodity accumulator-worker, ruler and slave reasoning where both are dependent on each other. Thus social inter-dependence is same as that of commodity and labor and that of Rappaccini-Beatrice, Mr. Wakefield-Mrs. Wakefield, and Mrs. Bullfrog-Mr. Bullfrog as well as of Aylmer and Georgiana.

His brilliance and deep insight to the social relations and exercise of power enables him to understand and reproduce the transformation of commodity gatherers inter-connection between every day exercise of social power and transformation of economic domination in selected stories. An exercise of power has been interwoven and intermingled in the structure from pre-historic times, an exercise which is done and repeated from so long that it has become natural and normal phenomenon, a phenomenon created by the combination of hegemony and ideology in the result of superstructure.

Conclusion

The present research sets its sights on analyzing the theoretical conception of Marxist commodification in Hawthorne's fictional selected works to explore often overlooked commodity which transforms literally human beings into things and objects. The main design of the research is to unravel the development of commodity in Marx's works and transfigure it to commodification. This research tries to explore commodification, a new terminology of Marxist discourses to underscore the hidden exploitation of economically dependent social emotional relations. Marx never uses the term of commodification. The researcher tries to apply it on human social emotional relations. Hawthorne has applied this concept in socio-emotional relations. He verifies in his fiction Marx's demonstration and importance of commodity and its exchange value in social life and its further spread due to which commodification has changed the whole human life's entire activity and relations. One finds in such situation that commodity form has started ruling supreme on social system as well as relations and has made them a social factory of commodity accumulator and worker. Marx's idea of time measuring and making worker's life and life activity abstract has been related with the help of fictional characters where economically strong people of social relations bring the abstract labor or life activities to the concrete reality's end for utilization of their personal purposes intentionally. He reveals with the help of his fiction as themes and characters that in commodity producing social mechanism people are constrained by ideological domination. He unravels the structural tendencies of commodity accumulating system which thoroughly entangle the entire society into political economy and seem covering all possible aspects of human social life. He depicts that commodity gatherers keep renewing their power bloc and maintain the relative unity as it is not a thing rather it is a social relation. Hawthorne discloses through his fiction the success of the commodity by organizing its domination with the help of some inbuilt practices. The writer demystifies dispersed commodity hoarders' power and their alliance with economic domination with the help of which they commodify the dependents or workers of social relations. They take shelter under the umbrella of cultural hegemony which derives its power from economy and gets success by producing the active consent of the dependents. His characters show structural coherence with commodity gleaner's will and with proneness to exercise their power over lives and life activities of their dependents with all tendencies to make their whole life activities abstract. He reveals the tactics and strategies for the social organization of making their exercise of power acceptable. The commodity producing structural cause makes its people self-regulating and self-executing. Hawthorne's fictional selected works reflect a considerable representation of commodification on economic grounds. He has depicted his characters constrained of norms and values of social structure which has been grounded in hegemonic ideology. He

relates through his fiction the tricky games of commodity producing social construction where free will of economically dependent relations is sabotaged and human socio-emotional relations are manipulated. His characters are brought up under the persuasiveness of commodity producing society and being economically dependents suffer emotionally as well as physically. They seem accepting all socio-cultural presumptions implanted in hegemonic commodity collector's ideology. The selected works of fiction represent Hawthorne's awareness of relativity of commodity producing social system and commodification. He unfolds through his fiction the deeply rooted and grounded ideas of commodity accumulators' in social emotional relations which bring out grave consequences. This research tries to spotlight the commodification of emotional relations which is a misdemeanor and offence of moral as well as religious laws. The researcher tries to suggest that an attitude of irreverence must be avoided towards social emotional relations and they should not be treated as commodities as they are a heavenly gift of God which are of incalculable value. These emotional relations seem abstract but do possess divine euphoria and bliss which makes man's life on planet Earth worth living so these relations should not be weighed in worldly commodity economy as their true worth is above and beyond any human's imaginative faculty.

References

1. Abrams, M. H. (1981). *A glossary of literary terms.*, (4th ed.) New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
2. Adorno, M. H. T. W. (1972). *The dialectic of enlightenment*, (J. Cumming, Trans.). New York, Herder & Herder, (Original work published 1947).
3. Althusser, L.(1971). "*Lenin and philosophy" and other essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). (Original work published 1970). Retrieved from: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive>
4. Aristotle.(HYPERLINK "<https://archive.org/search.php?query=date:1922>" 1922). *The poetics of Aristotle*, (Trans by Butcher, S., H. & Henry, S.). Publisher: London : Macmillan Collection, Retrieved from: <https://archive.org/details/poeticsofaristot00arisuoft/page/n11/mode/2up>
5. Aristotle (2009): *Politics, A treatise on Government*, (1st, ed. 1912), (W. Ellis, Trans.). The Project Gutenberg [e-Book], Retrieved from: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/6762/6762-h/6762-h.htm>
6. Bell, M. (2005). *Hawthorne and the real. Bicentennial essays*, Ohio State University Press.
7. Booker, M., K.(1996). *A practical introduction to literary theory and criticism*, White Plains, New York: Longman.
8. Bressler, Ch., E.(2007). *Literary criticism: An introduction to theory and practice*. Upper Saddle river : Pearson Prentice Hall.
9. Campbell, M., L& Gregor, F., M. (2002). *Mapping social relations: A primer in doing institutional ethnography*. Aurora, ON: Garamond.
10. Cole, M. (2003). *Might it be in the practice that it fails to succeed? A Marxist critique of claims for postmodernism and poststructuralism as forces for social change and social justice*. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 24(4), 487-500. Retrieved from: HYPERLINK "<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690301922>"
11. Conway, M., D. (1890). *Life of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Newyork: Scribner adn Welford Broadway.
12. Daigrepoint, L., M. (1979). *Hawthorne's conception of history: a study of the author's response to alienation from God and man*. Louisiana State University. Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College, London.
13. Debord, G. (1978). *Society of spectacle*. Detroit: Black and Red Press.
14. Donzelot, J. (1979). *The policing of families*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon.(Original work published, 1977). ISBN 0-394-50338-4 ISBN 0-394-73752-0 pbk.
15. Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and literary criticism.*, University of California Press.
16. Elliott, J. (2016). "*Professor Roberts's Marx: On alienation and economic systems.*". *Journal of Economic issues* Vol. 9. (3), 471–500.(Original work published,1975). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.1975.11503298>
17. Engels, F. (1996). *Anti-dhuring*. (E. Burns, Trans.). Marxists internet archive, (Original work published 1877-1878). Retrieved from:<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1877/anti-duhring/>

18. Engels, F. (2000). *Engels to Franz Mehring*. (Trans. by Torr D.). International publishers. (Original published in 1968). Retrieved From: HYPERLINK "https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1893/letters/93_07_14.htm"
19. Farris, K. (2020). *The incorporeal scientific method: Gender, hybridity, and the rise of material science in American literature, 1840-1900*.Dissertation. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Graduate School, North Carolina. HYPERLINK "<https://doi.org/10.17615/skz2-x897>" <https://doi.org/10.17615/skz2-x897>
20. Ferber, M. (1990). *The ideology of the merchant of Venice*. Vol. 20, Issue (3) , 431-446.Retrieved from<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1475-6757.1990.tb01442.x>
21. Fliessener, P. (2016). "*Commodification*" of knowledge in the global information society.Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228670321>
22. Grahame, P.,R. (1998). *Ethnography, institutions, and the problematic of the everyday world*.*Human Studies*, Vol.21(4), 347-360.
23. Gramsci, A. (2000). *Prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare, G., N. Smith, Trans.). Antonio Gramsci internet archive,(Original work published 1971). Retrieved from: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/>
24. Habib, M.,A.,R. (2005). *History of literary criticism and theory:From Plato to present*. Oxford,Blackwell Publishing Ltd. HYPERLINK "[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISBN_\(identifier\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISBN_(identifier))" \o "ISBN (identifier)" [ISBN](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISBN_(identifier)) HYPERLINK "<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:BookSources/978-1405176088>" \o "Special:BookSources/978-1405176088" [978-1405176088](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:BookSources/978-1405176088) .
25. Han, S. (2008). *Competence: Commodification of human ability*.*Education Research Institute*,Vol. 9. Issue(1) 31-39, DOI: HYPERLINK "<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03025823>" \t "_blank" [10.1007/BF03025823](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03025823) , Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225988382_Competence_Commodification_of_human_ability
26. Harvey, D. (2010). *A companion to Marx's capital*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso Publishing.
27. Haslam, N. (2006). *Dehumanization: An integrative review*,Vol. 10 issue: (3) 252-264. DOI: HYPERLINK "http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4" \t "_blank" [10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4) , Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6927454_Dehumanization_An_Integrative_Review
28. Hawthorne, N. (1996). *The birth mark, Rappaccini's daughter, Mosses from an Old Manse and Other Stories*, [e-Book #512]. Retrieved from: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/512/512-h/512-h.htm>
29. Hawthorne, N. (2013). *Mrs. Bullfrog, Wakefield, Twice-told tales*,[e-Book #508]. Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/508/508-h/508-h.htm>
30. Hegel,G., W., F.(1873). *Encyclopaedia of the philosophical sciences*.(3rd ed.). (Trans. By Wallace, W.).(Original work published 1830) Retrieved From: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/sl/introduction.pdf>
31. Holloway, J. (2002). *Change the world without taking power* . London: Pluto Press.
32. Johnson, C., D. (2000). Hawthorne in Salem, *The secular calling and the protestant ethics in The scarlet letter and The house of the seven gables*. Retrieved from <http://www.hawthorneinsalem.org/page/10136/>
33. Klages, M. (2012). *Key terms in literary theory*, Continuum International Publishing Group,New York. EISBN: 9781441115737.
34. Leitch, V., B., Cain, W., E. , Finke, L., A., McGowan, J., Sharpley-Whiting, T., D. & William., J., J. (2018).*The Norton anthology of theory and criticism*. (3rd ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.
35. Lukács, G. (1962). *The Theory of the Novel: A Historico-philosophical essay on the forms of great epic literature*. (A. Bostock, Trans.). (Original work published 1920). Retrived from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/theory-novel/index.htm>
36. Lukács, G. (1967). *History and class consciousness*,(R.Livingstone, Trans.).(Original work published 1919-1923). Retrieved from: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/>
37. Marcuse, H. (1972). *The foundation of historical materialism*.(B. Reid, Trans.). Herbert Marcuse Archive(Original work published 1932). Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/historical-materialism/index.htm>
38. Marx, K. (2015). *Grundrisse: Foundations of the critique of political economy* , 1939-41,(M.Nicolaus, Trans.).Marxists Internet Archive, (Original work published 1839-41).Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/grundrisse/>
39. Marx, K. (1999a). *Das capital: A critique of political economy*,Vol.1. (S. Moore & E. Aveling, Trans.). (Edited) by F. EngelsMarxists Internet Archive, (Original work published 1867).Retrieved from<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/>.
40. Marx, K. (1999b). *Wage labor and capital*, (F. Engels.Edited/Trans.). Marxists Internet Archive. (marxists.org).(Original work published 1849).Retrieved from<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/wage-labor/>

41. Marx, K. (2000). *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844*. (M.Mulligan, Trans.).Marxists Internet Archive, (Original work published 1932).Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/preface.htm>
42. Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2010a). *Collected works Vol:6(1845-1848)*. (J.Cohen, M.Hudson,C.Judelson, J.Kemp, F.Knight, H.Rodwell, B.Ruhemann & Upward,C., Trans.) (Eds.) USA: J.S.Allen, P.S. Foner, D.J. Struik & W. W. Weinstone. Digital Edition Copyright © Lawrence & Wishart ISBN 978-1-84327-950-1. (Original work published 1976).
43. Marx,K.& Engels,F. (2010b). *The German ideology* . (C. Dutt., W. Lough & C. P. Magill Trans.). (Eds.)USA: J.S. Allen, P.S. Foner, D.J. Struik & W. W. Weinstone. Digital Edition Copyright © Lawrence & Wishart (Original work published 1932).ISBN 978-1-84327-949-5.
44. McGuire, R., H.(2006). *Marx, child and trigger,citing Patterson,2003*.(ed.) by R. Williamson, pp. 61-79, McGill University Press, Montreal. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/944079/Marx_Childe_and_Trigger Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.
45. Mosco, V. (2013). *The political economy of communication*,(2nd ed.).SAGE Publications Ltd (Original work published 2009).
46. Murdock, G. (2006). *Marx on commodities contradictions and globalisations resources for a critique of marketised culture*.DOI: HYPERLINK "<http://dx.doi.org/10.30962/ec.v7i0.95>" \t "_blank" [10.30962/ec.v7i0.95](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324243814) Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324243814>
47. Nordstrom, J., M. (2012). *The ideology of the capitalist dystopia: A Marxist analysis of William Gibson's Neuromancer*. 26. Lulea University of Technology department of Arts, Communication and Education. ID: 784bd5c0-cf1b-4393-98af-21662081e8e7
48. Omrani, E., S., R. (2016).*Class oppression, commodification, and consumerism in Dreiser's sister Carrie, Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 19.(3), 39-59*.DOI: HYPERLINK "<http://dx.doi.org/10.5782/2223-2621.2016.19.3.39>" \t "_blank" [10.5782/2223-2621.2016.19.3.39](https://doi.org/10.5782/2223-2621.2016.19.3.39)
49. Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation*, Farrar & Rinehart, USA.
50. Ricardo, D. (1817). *On the principles of political economy and taxation*. Retrieved from www.marxists.org.
51. Ritzer, G& Stepnisky, J. (2011). *Sociological theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
52. Royanian, S. & Omrani, E. (2016). *Class oppression and commodification in Shakespeare's Hamlet and Merchant of Venice*.*World scientific news, Vol. 50*,186-196. Retrieved from <http://psjd.icm.edu.pl/psjd/element/bwmeta1.element.psjd-c15d0f3a-0c27-483a-8819-ab0c880e132a>
53. Rummel, R. (1977). *Marxism, class conflict, and the conflict helix*. In *Understanding conflict and war: Conflict in perspective Vol. 3*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/CIP.CHAP5.HTM>" <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/CIP.CHAP5.HTM>
54. Saturaman.,V.,S. (1989). *Contemporary criticism: An anthology*. Madras: Macmillan India Limited.
55. Schiller, H., I. (1991). *Culture, Inc.: The corporate takeover of public expression*. Oxford University Press,New York (Original work published 1989). Retreived from: HYPERLINK "<http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/CIP.CHAP5.HTM>" <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/CIP.CHAP5.HTM>
56. Shakespeare, W. (1988). *King Lear*. Project Gutenberg's, [e-Book #1532]. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1532/1532-h/1532-h.htm>" <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1532/1532-h/1532-h.htm>
57. Smith, A. (2009): *An inquiry into the Nature and causes of the wealth of Nations*, [e-Book #3300] (Original work published, 1776). Retrieved from: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3300/3300-h/3300-h.htm>
58. Smith, C., A. (2021). *Shakespeare's influence on Kael Marx: The Shakespeare's roots of Marxism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis group publisher.
59. Smith, D., E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Northeastern University Press. Boston, [Massachusetts] HYPERLINK "[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISBN_\(identifier\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISBN_(identifier))" \o "ISBN (identifier)" [ISBN](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISBN_(identifier)) HYPERLINK "<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:BookSources/978-1555530365>" \o "Special:BookSources/978-1555530365" [978-1555530365](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:BookSources/978-1555530365)
60. Smith, D., E. (1999). *Writing the social: Critique, theory, investigations*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press. Toronto Buffalo London. DOI: HYPERLINK "<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2654602>" \t "_blank" [10.2307/2654602](https://doi.org/10.2307/2654602)
61. Solomon, M. (1979). *Marxism and art: Essays classic and contemporary*, Detroit: Wayne state university press.
62. Toscano, A. (2008).*The culture of abstraction*.<http://www.sagepublications.com>,DOI: 10.1177/0263276408091983, Retrieved from: <http://tcs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/25/4/57>
63. Trilling, L. (1953). *The liberal imagination: Essays on literature and society*. Viking press, New York.

64. Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today: A user friendly guide.* (2nd ed.) © 2006 by Lois Tyson. ISBN: 13: 978-0-415-97410-3, Retrieved from: https://mahollandela.weebly.com/uploads/5/4/9/5/54951553/critical-theory-today__1_.pdf
65. Walby, K. (2005). *Institutional ethnography and surveillance studies: An outline for inquiry.* *Surveillance & society*, Vol.3 (2/3), 158-172. DOI: HYPERLINK "<http://dx.doi.org/10.24908/ss.v3i2/3.3498>" \t "_blank"
66. Zanger, J. (1983). *Speaking of the unspeakable: Hawthorne's "The birthmark".* *Modern philology*, The University of Chicago Press. Vol. 80, (4) 364-371, Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/437071>