

УДК 1:3 + 1:93

Ilyin I. V.

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

JEAN BAUDRILLARD IN THE MIRROR OF THE BRAND

The author analyzes the criticism of Marxism by Jean Baudrillard that based on the Lacanian concept of «the mirror stage». This analysis leads to the clarification of Marx's theory of the ideal-mirror that undermined the theoretical fetishism of both French philosophers. Further, the author examines the metaphor and meaning of the phenomenon of the mirror in the context of the transformation of commodity into the brand by studying of a department store that appeared in the second half of the XIX century in Western Europe. In this space the capitalists reflexively subsumes-produces the worker-consumer through the specific arrangement of mirrors, translating its class identity to the bourgeois habitus in the department store. Thus, a worker is not the one who is reflected in the «mirror» of the brand, but his inverted, criticized image from the point of demand of the surplus that necessary to capital, from the point of view of the desire of capital.

Keywords: mirror, brand, fetishism, department store.

У статті аналізується критика Жаном Бодріаром марксизму, підставою для якої є лаканівська концепція «стадії дзеркала». Цей аналіз призводить до з'ясування того, що у Маркса присутня теорія ідеального-дзеркала, яка підриває фетишизм розуміння дзеркала у обох французьких філософів. Далі автор розбирає значення метафори та феномена дзеркала в контексті трансформації капіталізму – його брендизації на прикладі виникнення універмагу в другій половині XIX століття. В універмазі капітал рефлексивно підпорядковує-виробляє робочого-споживача за допомогою пристрою дзеркал, транслюючи його класову ідентичність в буржуазний габітус. Таким чином, в «дзеркалі» бренду відбивається не той, хто в нього дивиться, але його інвертований, критикований образ з точки зору необхідної для капіталу додатковості, з точки зору бажання капіталу.

Ключові слова: дзеркало, бренд, фетишизм, універмаг.

В статье анализируется критика Жаном Бодрийаром марксизма, основанная на лакановской концепции «стадии зеркала». Этот анализ приводит к выяснению того, что у Маркса наличествует теория идеального-зеркала, подрывающая фетишизм понимания зеркала у обоих французских философов. Далее автор разбирает значение метафоры и феномена зеркала в контексте трансформации капитализма – его брендизации на примере возникновения универмага во второй половине XIX века. В универмаге капитал рефлексивно подчиняет-производит рабочего-потребителя посредством устройства зеркал, транслируя его классовую идентичность в буржуазный габитус. Таким образом, в «зеркале» бренда отражается не смотрящий в него, но его инвертируемый, критикуемый образ с точки зрения необходимой капиталу прибавочности, с точки зрения желания капитала.

Ключевые слова: зеркало, бренд, фетишизм, универмаг.

I would study a function of mirrors in department stores, but firstly answer to Jean Baudrillard's criticism of Karl Marx that based on the concept of «the mirror stage» of Jacques Lacan. This answer allows us to find the concept of a mirror in the concept of the commodity form in Marx's theory, but also will provide a definition of mirror in the historical transformation of commodity into the brand. Further, it is important to note the procedural character of this phenomenon which means that creation of the «mirror double» of a capitalist by symbolical, socio-spatial «embourgeoisement» of the worker, encounters with impossibility through to the immanent contradictions of capitalism.

According to Jean Baudrillard in «The mirror of production», Marx supposedly found his reflection in a mirror of political economy. This event made forming impact on Marx's identity, having made him precisely that Marx, how he knew about himself (and known, to all appearances, today) – the carrier of «a productivist ego», thinking of production as a paramount importance. This reflection, according to Baudrillard, played an evil joke with Marx, having deprived him of the opportunity to go beyond ideology of production, and broadly, beyond the limits of the project of Enlightenment, with its rational eschatology, a substantialism and teleology, and expedient usefulness of nature (signified) as an object of transformation of labor (signifier). Hence also follows, according to Baudrillard, a false expansion of this mythologeme in Marxism onto the whole history of

civilization. Marx appeared in the sphere of imaginary of political economy (production, work, use value) by being reflected in «the mirror of production»: «<...> through this scheme of production, this *mirror* of production, the human species comes to consciousness [*la prise de conscience*] in the *imaginary*. Production, labor, value, everything through which an objective world emerges and through which man recognizes himself objectively – this is the imaginary» [2, p. 20] [italics in the original – I. I.]. Thus, Baudrillard said that it is necessary to move further from Marx, beyond the political economy and to study the thin and totalitarian power of the modern capital in the form of monopoly of code, domination of free-floating signifiers, the sign form which is the cornerstone of both use and exchange value, and a cornerstone of all ensembles of the social relations; it is necessary to trace more precisely a process of transformation of all ensembles of the social relations into the operational structure of a sign.

However, Marx warned about this self-reference character inherent in the capital: «<...> capital has one sole driving force, the drive to valorize itself, to create surplus-value, to make its constant part, the means of production, absorb the greatest possible amount of surplus labour» [16, p. 342]. And in this regard, Marx specified that the capital will make all workers its own reflection, or as Baudrillard writes, reflection in «the mirror of production»: «<...> general industriousness has developed (under the strict discipline of capital) and has been passed on to succeeding generations, until it has become the property of the new generation» [20, p. 85], that becomes, according to Marx, at the same time realization of a great historical mission of the capital and its end.

But I think that Baudrillard, criticizing «the mirror of production» got to other mirror – a mirror of a sign, a sign form, claiming that «[t]he monopolistic stage signifies less the monopoly of the means of production (which is never total) than the monopoly of the code. <...> the signified and the referent are now abolished to the sole profit of the play of signifiers, of a generalized formalization in which the code no longer refers back to any subjective or objective “reality”, but to its own logic» [2, p. 128]. **But how then Baudrillard can criticize Marx who was quite recognizing reflectivity, mirror-ness of the capital, its self-reference character, and to accuse him of «specular reflection» in the mirror of political economy?** *Statement of a problem* of the present article is defined by this question, and the answer to it defines its *purpose*. However, Baudrillard thereby involuntarily set *the task* of an explanation of the metaphor of a mirror and determination of its place for the theory and practice of capitalism, and research of the meaning of a new stage of self-reference character, «reflectivity – mirror-ness» of the capital which he declared in his work.

Relevance of this research is caused by need to comprehend Baudrillard’s criticism of Marx not from the point of view of his key substantial provisions, but using one of the most important metaphors used in this criticism. It allows not only showing insolvency of this criticism, but also is the essential help for research of those transformations of capitalism which happened since the time of Marx. As a key for the analysis of these transformations will serve an attempt to conceptualize Marx’s thoughts of mirror-ness reflexivity of capitalist relations of production.

Degree of a readiness of the questions raised in this article is very small. It is obviously possible to allocate as the closest to our research Elisabeth Carlson’s thesis «City of Mirrors: Reflection and Visual Construction in 19th Century Paris» where the author presented mirrors not as a metaphor but as «an integrated component for fetishization of goods; the mirror reproduces everything that is placed opposite to it, turning goods into illusion» [6, p. 9]. However, the author shows how mirrors transformed social spaces of Paris and became key factors for disciplining of a gaze, visual pleasure, and also infinite multiplication of city space.

Novelty of this research is defined by the analysis of a metaphor of a mirror in the Baudrillard’s critique of Marx; conceptualization of mirror-ness reflexivity of capital in Marx’s theoretical heritage; the analysis of use of a mirror in department stores of the XIX century for production of consumers, workers embourgeoisement and also the proof of a role of mirrors in this process.

It is necessary to pay attention that Baudrillard, speaking about a mirror, refers to Jacques Lacan’s concept – «the mirror stage». What does Lacan mean in his concept of «the mirror stage»? In the article «The Mirror Stage as Formative of the *I* Function as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience» Lacan writes that during the period from 6 to 18 months the human baby recognizes himself in a mirror. Being integrally biologically unformed, without being able to walk and so forth,

the baby perceives the image in a mirror with triumph because this image gives him / her, according to Lacan, wholeness (Gestalt) and an anticipation of its growing. Thanks to this recognition child receiving an ego, thereby an anticipation of (an ideal ego, that is the image in a mirror) his present and the past (Lacan describes this last as disturbing and uncomfortable feeling of «bits and pieces», fragments instead of wholeness) opens to the child. Together with this identification with an image the child falls into misunderstanding (*méconnaissance*): first, because considers the ego as property of reflection, and secondly, distracts from the disorganization beyond a mirror, from fragmented reality for joyful experience of wholeness in a mirror. Thus, identification, discovery of the self happens occurring through alienation in an image. Specular *I* precede, according to Lacan, social self: «<...> the subject caught up in the lure of spatial identification, turns out fantasies that proceed from a fragmented image of the body to what I will call an «orthopedic» form of its totality – and to the finally donned armor of an alienating identity that will mark his entire mental development with its rigid structure» [13, p. 78]. However in other works written after this article, Lacan started developing the concept, bringing into it the relations between parents and other children. So, now a mirror is conceptualized not as the object-sensual mirror, but as a metaphor of other children – and here the baby mirroring those feelings in case of crying, pain, etc., that is identifying with them [13, c. 92]. The context of a mirror stage extends to understanding of importance of an exchange of gazes between the child and the parents [13, p. 55, 56], using of language by the parents and gestures in a case with recognition in a mirror of the child (e. g. “Here, look in a mirror. It’s you!”). Also Lacan addresses to Hegelian slave-master dialectics for the explanation of an identification with an image: «the slave identifying with the despot, the actor with the spectator, the seduced with the seducer » [13, p. 92]. On the one hand, seeing itself in a mirror, creating, so to speak, substance of reflection by the own body, the child subject itself, becomes the slave of the own reflection, and reflection «take one’s own line» in consciousness of the child, bringing inexpressible pleasure, the primary narcissism. On the other hand, if to understand a mirror as the Other, then other children becoming «masters», and forming an ego of child depended from relations with them; only through slavery the child can come to freedom: «<...> in the movement that leads man to an ever more adequate consciousness of himself, his freedom becomes bound up with the development of his servitude» [13, p. 148].

In the article «On My Antecedents» Lacan claims that «[t]he mirror stage establishes the watershed between the imaginary and the symbolic» [13, p. 54]. What does it mean? From the Lacanian point of view of imaginary in the «mirror stage» is in an image of the child, introjection into the child as an ideal ego, and also as object of fantasies and desires (narcissism). Imaginary in this case gives to the child appearance of independence, self-determination, autotelic self. But at the same time, symbolic designates the sphere of language, and in a mirror stage it has crucial meaning, that is without communication, gazes from Big Other, an identity of the child will not be created: «<...> invisible traces of alterity, impressed upon the body-image by desire / fantasy-conveying Others (with their gazes, voices, demands, loves, jouissance, and so on), are infused into the visible avatars of this estranging, ego-level identity, this «self» created and sustained within a crucible of unsurpassable otherness» [11, p. 6]. But that’s the trick of «the mirror stage»: the child ignores this presence symbolical in this process, primacy of language, by being captivated by the power of the image.

Thus, coming back to Baudrillard it should be noted that using «the mirror stage» of Lacan for an explanation of a position of Marx, he (Baudrillard) thereby pointed to the undoubted dependence on Lacanian methodology. Both Lacan and Baudrillard give preference to the language, a symbol, an image in definition of conditions which determine production of the identity. Baudrillard obviously chose non-Marxist approach to this problem, and this fact determined his further conclusions. The mirror in a case with the child and Marx is positivistically understood both as an object, and as a metaphor for gazes, gestures and so forth of other people, Other.

Though at the same time the mirror is a spatial phenomenon *per se*, it is an object which refers to space, pays attention to it. Michel Foucault notices that a mirror is «<...> a utopia, since it is a placeless place. In the mirror, I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent: such is the utopia of the mirror. But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy. From the standpoint of the mirror I discover my absence

from the place where I am since I see myself over there» [9, p. 23]. The mirror is non-(mis)placed space, but at the same time the inverted indication of a real place. Henri Lefebvre is much closer approaches to the socio-spatial interpretation of a mirror: «Into that space which is produced first by natural and later by social life the mirror introduces a truly dual spatiality: a space which is imaginary with respect to origin and separation, but also concrete and practical with respect to coexistence and differentiation» [14, p. 186]. That is, a mirror, reflecting, but transforming, though remaining similar to the original. The mirror differentiates, being identical and identifies, being different. The mirror is a phenomenon of social space which it is necessary to treat concretely and practically, from the point of view of utopias and heterotopias of social space. And for Lacan and Baudrillard a mirror refers to the transformations in the subject (the child becomes self, and Marx becomes the preacher of a rational eschatology). In a word, all these thinkers addressed to consequences of mirror existence, instead of its reasons. Without being to establish the causes of the phenomenon of mirror it is very possible to receive the limited version of its consequences.

Marxist notion of ideal-mirror. Answer to Baudrillard

However, none of the above mentioned French thinkers problematize «fantastic» possibilities of a mirror – whether to produce the subject as in case of Lacan and Baudrillard, or to invert, double the social space, as for Foucault and Lefebvre. The mirror is «fantastic» and «transcendental», as well as commodity that Marx notes, with its fantastic quality – exchange value. However, if, say, a bread possesses the value and the financial markets possess ability to self-valorization at own will as in the fairy tale «Sweet Porridge» of Brothers Grimm where the magic pot needed to be told «Cook, little pot, cook!», and porridge cooked without stopping. If so, then it is really quite possible to imagine a result of such reasoning – the modern civilization should go eternally spin around itself, with the immutable satellites – simulations, simulacra, value, signs, images and so forth. Moreover, Marx from the point of view of such reasoning will appear as the adherent of magic, transcendental things, the conductor of a rational eschatology. But after all Marx did not stop with analysis of the commodity form on recognition of the fantastic nature of these modern «things» (in his time, fantastical exchange value). He specified that the value cannot be found in the substance of a commodity, but thus it extremely «is inherent» in it, – commodity, as Marx said, is «sinnlich übersinnliches Ding» [17, p. 85], that is sensually supersensual thing. And Marx writes further: «[t]he price or money-form of commodities is, like their form of value generally, quite distinct from their palpable and real bodily form; it is therefore a *purely ideal or notional form* (ideelle oder vorgestellte Form)» [17, p. 110] [my italics – I. I.]. What does ideal form means according to Marx? «<...> the ideal (ideelle) is nothing but the material world (Materielle) reflected in the mind of man, and translated into forms of thought» [17, p. 27]. And what does material world means at Marx? Here examples of the established use of this word in «The German ideology»: «materielle Tätigkeit und den materiellen Verkehr» [18, p. 26], material activity and material communication as basis for ideas, representations and so forth., «materielle Produktion» [18, p. 27], production of goods; «materielle Macht der Gesellschaft», material force of society as basis for domination of ideas of ruling class [18, p. 46] etc.

Thus, value is an ideal form of concrete historical material social relations of production. Not for nothing through «or» Marx uses «vorgestellte» to designate that value *represents* not immanent attribute of commodity, but ensemble of the social, material relations. The mystery of a commodity form of a product is that it represents to people thing-like character of the products of their work, which is the social relations of people are made as the social relations of things because of the social, material relations are carried out by the isolated producers and so forth. And therefore, it seems, that exchange value is a feature of the commodity same as the ability of the capital to self-valorizing is the attribute of the means of production of the capitalist. The fetishism, according to Marx, is when socio-historical attributes of objects, their *ideal or represented form* seems to be the natural attributes of these objects. The ideal form is a mold of social and material activity of people which is embodied in all set of material culture of civilization. Therefore to understand any object, from the point of view of Marx, it is necessary to understand what it represents, and on the other hand to make any object it is necessary to find schemes and forms, images of form-building, ideal activity of people, that is to learn to use a spoon, language, rules of behavior, art and so forth.

Now turn to the article «Dialectic of the ideal» of Evald Ilyenkov to understand for more specifically the meaning of the concept of the ideal. So, he writes: «There is no doubt that the “ideal” so understood – i. e., as the universal form and law of existence and change in diverse, empirically perceptible phenomena given to a person – becomes apparent and established in its “pure form” only in historical forms of intellectual culture, in socially significant forms of its expression (its “existence”）」 [10, p. 155]. The ideal form, thus, cannot be «seen», «felt» in object, on the physical level because it is a special «press» (as Ilyenkov precisely noticed in other place) of social and material activity of civilization, objectivized in the object, it is a form of an activity without an object, a social form of an object, but beyond its objectness: «At the end of every labour process, a result emerges which had already been conceived by the worker at the beginning, hence already existed ideally (ideell)» [16, p. 284]. That is, the person carries out activities according to socially developed schemes, norms of this activity, reproducing ideally social and collective, historical experience of the relations of people with this activity, with this object. **Therefore, understanding the mirror positivistically, as if it has some immanent properties, above-mentioned French philosophers omit this ideal form, in fact, interpret a mirror as a fetish, and, therefore, recognized certain sociohistorical «print» for destiny of this object.** Ideal – is «a relationship in which one sensuously perceived thing, while remaining itself, performs the role or function of representing quite another thing (to be even more precise, it represents the universal nature of that other thing, that is, something “other” which in sensuous, corporeal terms is quite unlike it), and in this way acquires a new plane of existence» [10, p. 174]. For example, material connection of labour of workers, as Marx writes, «the interconnection between their various labours confronts them, in the realm of ideas, as a plan (ideell als Plan) drawn up by the capitalist, and, in practice, as his authority, as the powerful will of a being outside them, who subjects their activity to his purpose» [16, p. 450]. It means that «plan» represents the summarized expression of domination of private ownership (and not of the «realm of ideas» as in translation of volume one of «Capital» by Ben Fowkes) on means of production; existence of labor power freed from means of production and therefore it dependence on the will of the capitalist.

Moreover, Marx compared the concept of the ideal with the mirror (Spiegel). Mystery of a commodity form reflects (*zurückspiegelt*) to people their thing-like relations under capitalism [17, p. 86]. Commodities «look into» each other as into mirrors: «The value of a commodity, the linen for example, is now expressed in terms of innumerable other members of the world of commodities. Every other physical commodity now becomes a mirror (Spiegel) of the linen’s value» [17, p. 155]. The commodities reflect to other commodities its value, substance of their identity – quantity of the social labor expended for their production, abstract social labour. In this sense, as Marx writes, the persons are similar to commodities: «<...> a man first sees and recognizes himself (in German: *bespiegelt*) in another person. Peter only relates to himself as a man through his relation to another man, Paul, in whom he recognizes his likeness. With this, however, Paul also becomes from head to toe, in his physical form as Paul, the form of appearance of the species man for Peter» [16, c. 144]. The most eloquent fragment where Marx uses both, the concept of the ideal and mirror concerns the ancient societies with undeveloped productive forces: «These real limitations are reflected (in German; *spiegelt sich ideell*) in the ancient worship of nature, and in other elements of tribal religions» [16, p. 173].

What does it mean? Marx understood specular background of the ideal and danger which conducts to identification of an object and an ideal form of an object – a fall into fetishism. Moreover, Marx specified that the commodity fetishism is the objective characteristic of the social relations under capitalism and it’s not a subjective mistake, but the objective and ideal fact of the capitalist social relations. The theoretical fetishism – identification of concept and sensual perceived objectness – is the content of ideal world under capitalism. Thus, the theoretical fetishism is guaranteed by the objectivity of commodity fetishism. When Baudrillard claims that Marx fell into «the mirror of production», he did not notice that Marx already has a theory of the ideal-mirror which serves not for a fetishization, but for a critique of capitalism. Baudrillard’s theoretical fetishism reveals itself in his thoughts concerning totality of semiurgical manipulation and monopoly of the code. Exactly here Baudrillard was reflected in really functioning semblance mirror of capitalism. Besides, it is proved also while he refers to «the mirror stage» of Lacan. When Lacan describes the child captivated by his reflection in a mirror, consigning to oblivion the Others, omitting symbolic sphere, and also the

slavery in imaginary, it means that in Marx's language is designated by commodity fetishism: when in commodities one can see only commodities, when the child sees in a mirror only himself. No wonder that Lacan recognized that the prerequisite of his concept of «the mirror stage» was the Marxian analysis of a relative form of value [12, p. 81].

This circumstance also complicates Baudrillard's attempt to criticize Marx by means of Marxian-inspired Lacanian concept. In the same time, the child actually don't reflecting in a mirror (as it was cleared by Lacan in later version of «the mirror stage»), but those desires, fantasies projected by Others did. As Marx showed earlier, that commodities aren't reflected in commodities (though it actually occurs, as well as in a case with the child), but those relations between producers, when the qualitatively definite kind of labour (we could tell, labour of the tailor) is expressed through the quantity of the abstract labour, deprived of distinctions, that is through a value form, and only then a fabric can be exchanged for, say, bread. **However for Lacan the ideal corresponds to image, language, in a separation from material practice. Therefore, both in object (after all, the early version «the mirror stage» means sensual and tactile subject – a mirror) and as an ideal form (Other without any further definitions), the mirror remains taken for granted.** Therefore it is necessary to investigate a mirror as an ideal form, as the sensual and tangible object representing set of the material and social relations, just as gold «is it the material representative (der materielle Repräsentant) of general wealth» [21, p. 103], that is such social relations in which the wealth produced in the form of a huge accumulation of things. At the same time **Lacan and Baudrillard's theories need to understand that «the mirror stage» is connected with the real transformation of capitalism, if their theories assign primary importance to the mirror-ness and reflexivity in the production of the subject. It is necessary to assume that Marx's anticipation of the general discipline which capital will bring up in workers, in other words, the capital will reflexively, specularly subordinate workers to itself, – this an anticipation began to transform into tangible forms.**

The mirrors in the department stores. Turning commodities into brands

Ralph Cheyney in his «Hints on How to Merchandise», published in 1928, notices: «You probably realize the value of mirrors of brightening the store and expanding its size, but they also please the womenfolk – who do eighty percent of the buying in America today» [cited by: 6, p. 157]. Striking example of an «immense collection of commodities» (ungeheure Warensammlung [21, p. 15]) in the second half of the nineteenth century was a department store. Unlike former forms of retail trade, the department store represented a pure, aired, light receptacle of shops, cafes and so forth. In department store commodities were paraded, instead of hidden in boxes as it was in former shops. Mirrors in the sensual and tactile form were used as it was noted by Cheyney, for increasing a quantity of commodities without the actual their increasing, and also repeating reflection of light of candles, and then and electric lamps. Mirrors increased space, made it infinite, autoreferential, closed, «narcissistic». Jacques Derrida describes commodities from the point of view of its mirror-ness: «<...> this whole theatrical process (visual, theoretical, but also optical, optician) sets off the effect of a mysterious mirror: if the latter does not return the right reflection, if, then, it phantomalizes, this is first of all because it naturalizes» [8, p. 195]. **On the surface this theatrical process in department store reflected only commodities, but a spatial practice of department store transformed commodities into brands.**

Women from middle and working classes thanks to mirrors could see itself as a part of space; see hers from outside without gazes of others. This reflection in a mirror showed to the women who is she is now and whom she can be because of the commodities surrounding it. The mirror, on the one hand, reflected the women, but at the same time, reflects the surrounding magnificence of the commodity world on this surface. In a mirror there is only its reflection with desired commodity. There is a double fetishization – at first, commodities, and then the consumer. Not only an admiring itself, but also an admiring itself what can become in the future with these commodities. More precisely, it is both dimensions merge into one. Jacques Lacan specifies that bringing the child to a mirror on walkers (trotte-bébé), and its exultation owing to the image, a sense of completeness, promising of a growing, that his future shown in a specular reflection (image) opens a dimension of history for the child. The consumer (middle class, the proletariat) finds new self in a department store

instead of cares, working life, continuous postponement of pleasure. In department store the mirror reflects the consumer (and in this act creates it) without barriers to desirable goods, without restrictions in pleasure, and with thirst of finding of him / herself in kingdom of freedom. **The capitalists organized department stores as spaces for production of the consumer, and also sensual – not only visual which Derrida mentions, but also audial, after all in many department stores one could hear live music and so forth – image of commodities in mirrors, quarantining any possibility of the overcoming own domination, because of freedom, free time now possible to find in this place at last.** Access to the other society, to all appearances, beyond capitalistic, other self is given in this space: «Free access, the freedom to look with no obligation to buy, was the initial element in this formulation. Perhaps for the first time, a woman could «circulate on her own, unattended, without interference from anyone and without rendering account to anyone». <...> There was a freedom within the store situation that was not often duplicated in other areas of a woman's life» [1, p. 189]. This spatial practice was a condition sine qua non of the transformation of commodities into a brand as carrier of a certain project of life, legitimated by the capital.

However, as in a situation with «the mirror stage» the child does not notice, that he is not reflected in the mirror, he is not a subject actually (though becomes one), but the object of desires of parents, as well as shopsellers served in a department store as a mirrors of desire of the capital – production of surplus desire – for consumers. Hence in the Canadian department store Eaton the attention was heavily paid to appearance, personal qualities and behavior of shopsellers [3, p. 110]. Right outward appearance was maintained through participation in sports trainings, competitions, healthy nutrition, the correct bearing, and also obligatory rules of what to dress and how to keep oneself with the client [3, p. 117]. In 1900 Eaton issued the whole list of violations of the rules of etiquette. For example, it was inadmissible to sellers to gather and to talk, clean nails, to ruminate or take a tobacco, to speak loudly, to harm to department store property and so forth [3, p. 121]. The special attention was paid to hands as they carry out important function when the commodities are offered, sale. Even the contents of the speech, tone and mood of the worker-seller were strictly regulated by the capitalists: «Eaton's Winnipeg staff magazine also tried to guide employees' selling strategies. "Don't sell things <...> sell happiness", one article stated, and then continued: "Don't sell clothes – sell personal appearance and attractiveness <...> Don't sell furniture – sell a home that has comfort and refinement and the joy of living. Don't sell toys – sell gifts that will make children happy <...> Don't sell books – sell the profits of knowledge <...> Don't sell radio sets <...> sell the beauty of music"» [3, p. 123].

Thus, in addition to the seductive spatial practice of department store shop sellers served as direct conductors of buyers, including and workers, in the world of consumption, unpunished pleasure, in the world of hedonistic values. But thus, being agents of temptation and pleasure, shop sellers submitted to accurately established rigid rules of morality of work. In other words, the morals of work extended on self-creation of them as healthy, clean, respectable, subject. The morality of work assumes now the moment of surplus, free, hedonistic, bourgeois taste. From now on it is not enough to be the productive worker, now it is necessary to be also real bourgeois consumer, the expert of «how» of the objects, caring of the pleasures of life outside the kingdom of need since bourgeois habitus assumes «<...> demand of art a high degree of denial of the social world and incline towards a hedonistic aesthetic of ease and facility, symbolized by boulevard theatre or Impressionist painting» [5, p. 176]. After all, the main attention of taste of the bourgeois concentrates on a form, on the infinite game in analogy, interpretation, regardless of a social context and class teleology. The desire of the capital is reflected in shop sellers in order that then subjectivated in the consumer. **In a mirror the consumer sees not himself, but the incarnate desire of the capital. More precisely, the desire of the capital to increase without any reference is embodied in a mirror, so, the consumer joins this reflexive game.** But if for Marx self-expansion of the capital was explained by labor exploitation in the course of production of commodities, in a case with the department store production of certain subjectivity (the consumer) and also the carrier of the desire of the capital – the shop seller – turns into work. Therefore commodities in department store already possess political value – transformation of the worker into the bourgeois consumer. The commodities become the representative of the desire of the capital.

Michel Foucault in his «Of other spaces» writes, that «[t]he present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition,

the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed» [9, p. 22]. Beside an utopia as an unreal place, Foucault distinguish another form of space – a heterotopy: «There are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted» [9, p. 24]. Heterotopy pulls together different spaces which beyond it are incompatible. In the heterotopias there is another order of time (heterochronies), they always include a special order of opening and closing, the admission. Heterotopy in the relation to all other space are illusion space, showing that real life is illusory or «other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled» [9, p. 27]. The department store is, in fact, a heterotopy of capitalism. Here capitalism is organized is not inconsistent but representing the project of life, the project of subjectivity.

When capitalism organized the project of legitimated life, then it transforms commodities into the brands. In department store another time is started – a primacy of pleasure in the present time, an instantaneous pleasure. Life is reflected in the mirror of department stores in inverted and criticized way (Is it possible to look so and so? How could you put these on you? Aren't you ashamed of yours manners and outward appearance?); work and rest, public and private space are pulled together, or, to be exact, the public space is privatized, quarantined in the private space. Everyone, who looks in a mirror, is subjected to the desire of the capital – to make oneself as it's mirror double. **The mirrors in department store carries out a role of means of a subjectivation, but at this time the department store has to be understood as a brand of capitalism, that is in this space capitalism creates the organized and idealized image of life which it legitimates, life which is worthy to live for. For this reason in a department store there is not only commodities are represented, but also and all ensembles of the fetishized social relations of capitalism, including that subject who reflects the desire of the capital – the shop seller initiating a consumer subjectivation. The commodities become brands, that is, refers to the bourgeois project of life, an ideal of the social relations (including in an image of the shop seller – pure, clean, and respectable and so forth). The commodities – shown in a mirror that is in the virtual space, taken in totality in the image – prove commitment of the capitalism to life, to pleasure, freedom and free time.**

The commodities become brands exactly through spatial practice of department store – the tempting atmosphere, seductive and provocative shop sellers. Both of these moments unite in a mirror – a phenomenon of a mirror as sensual object and as a metaphor (an ideal form). Without having seen itself in a mirror, the person does not become a consumer; without having become the mirror double of the capital, the shop seller will not create the consumer. Therein lies a double function of the mirrors in the course of the transformation of commodities into the brands. On the one hand, the mirror places commodities (and the person) in the space of consumption, and with another, reflects the project of life, legitimated by the capital. For example, George Dufayel with his *The Grands Magasins Dufayel* in France created at the end of the nineteenth century a brand from the process of transformation of the working class in the consumer. First of all, it concerned with that part of the working class which worked for him. Together with a savings fund for postponement of money for future purchases in department store and the insurance fund, and also with acts of paternalistic charity (e. g., providing the worker, the victim of a fire, all necessary, including housing; the general dinners), – Dufayel sought to prove and show that he is a friend of the worker, «provider of opportunities both cultural and financial, and largely (not single - handedly, no!) responsible for bringing working-class Paris into the modern era of mass-produced convenience and plenty. Dufayel <...> attract the working class to participate in a new consumer society that was anything but traditional. He created an image of his company that encouraged the public to associate it with his own personal image» [23, p. 119].

The capital in the form of a brand provokes a special form of life, to all appearances, deprived of any exit to a social-class context, economic exploitation and so forth. ***The capital produces life as the commodity, in the form of the special commodity – a brand. The brand means production of a legitimated form of life by the capital, provoking a subjectivation of workers in a bourgeois habitus by means of the arrangement of the mirrors.*** Through a brand the spatial revolution occurred which is absolutely unnoticed by all critics of capitalism after Marx, consisting in the

domestication of workers, creation of the cultural infrastructure of production of bourgeois subjectivity of the worker. The commodities are transformed to a sample of the form / norm of life under capitalism; formation of the worker as the mirror double of the capital, that is the reflection of desire of the capital. Spatial revolution shows itself in the heterotopias of a brand, showing to all capitalist society how it is possible to live under capitalism, without changing its fundamental structures. Physically healthy, spiritually developed, moral individual is an ideal. **The aestheticized space serves as means for the production of the moral worker. Marx arguing with bourgeois socialist, wrote that they want to have «the bourgeoisie without a proletariat», that is want to keep capitalism, but without its bad sides [19, p. 69]. «The bourgeoisie without a proletariat» also can mean, in our case, formation of the bourgeois habitus in proletarians, translation of class identification in the area of moral self-improvement and the aestheticized everyday-ness of family life, that is, in a word, «the bourgeoisie without the proletariat» means reflection in the mirror of the brand.**

The Victorian advertising can serve as an example of such reflection in the second half of XIX century, where «[t]he commercial woman had a focus on pleasure that necessarily required leisure. The recurrent motif of the woman looking into her mirror amplifies this commercial ideal <...> In advertisements, the beautifying effects of Erasmic Soap and Beecham's Glycerine and Cucumber Powder, for example, facilitate a satisfying reflection. They seem to create beauty or at least they improve the viewer's perception of her reflected image. These advertisements suggest that the ideal woman was self-absorbed and pleasure-oriented enough to delight in her own reflection» [15, p. 42]. In the context of a department store, and also the double functioning of a mirror of a brand it is necessary to mention the short film of Allan Forrest «The face in the mirror («I wonder»)» (1940) [22]. In this movie the history is narrated about the man, left to make shopping at the insistence of the wife. Coming into different shops, he meets different shoppellers – disrespectful, indifferent, useful and so forth. The central moment going after sale is that: looking of this man in a mirror with this or that product (a hat, a tube, shoes and so forth). Thus the shoppeller describes what remarkable choice was made by him. After the commission of the successful transaction, he happily nods to the seller in a mirror, thus he is thanking. The main character buys nothing from indifferent sellers, advising them to look at their behavior in a mirror. At the end of the movie our hero comes to his work and shares the experiences from purchases with the boss. The boss noting a sad mood of our hero, brings with it a mirror and asks: «Would you buy anything from the salesmen you see in the mirror?». And the main character knowingly looks and answers with a smile: “I wonder”. So, capitalists use a mirror, and in it its ideal form, for a subjectivation of the worker and also the consumer as the carriers of the brand. This subjectivation entirely concerns authenticity of the human relations. The capital wants to serve as the guarantor of human relations, the human relation to the world. Such image of it also legitimated in a brand. In a brand the capital hides its origin – the exploitation of labor. On the one hand, making the representative of a brand as the shoppeller from the worker, and on the other, creating spaces for a subjectivation of the worker in the consumer – absolutely unpaid labor to the capital.

Colin Cremin in his «Capitalism's New Clothes» introduced a concept of *reflexive exploitation*, which designates a process of subjection of the worker to the desire of the capital through a self-assessment, consciousness, that is through, by all appearances, autonomy from the capital [7, p. 45, 46]. Cremin gives an example of self-assessment as an incarnate form of desire of the capital – in the CV the worker has to express himself in language which will be accepted by the potential boss. And now he / she already is taken into the account not only technical skills, but also «human» qualities. **Being reflected in a mirror of the CV, the worker seeks to grant the desire of the Other, remaining thus the independent and autonomous individual. However, in the form of department store the capital reflectively exploits the proletarian for a long time.** It is remarkable that mirror in Lacanian sense functions as instrument of production-exploitation gained tangible form in a mirror of BMWi (the cars using electricity as fuel) in New York where the huge mirror, by means of video and computer technologies, virtually transforms passing cars to models of BMWi [4]. Here the capital shows the importance of «mirror» for its functioning. In the form of a mirror of BMWi the imagination of the subject is already even not necessary, but virtual, imagined transformation is carried out by the technological apparatus of capitalism. The potential form of passing car or, if I may, its surplus form is actually reflected in space of a mirror. The surplus desire here is autoreferential

because of reflection and transformation taking place literally in the mirror (thus always having an empirical material – really passing car: there is something from a Kantian transcendentalism!), thus being desirous of the capital to make a surplus value through production of desire of the consumer (the process of subjectivation that is unpaid for the capital) and realization of this value in the act of purchase.

Summing up the result of this research, it is necessary to draw the following *conclusions*. The Lacanian concept of «the mirror stage», and Baudrillard leaning on it, are an ideal reflection of spatial transformation of commodities into the brands in capitalism, – in which together with socio-economic production-exploitation of the worker will adjoin reflectively-mirror-ness production-exploitation of the bourgeois consumer. In the mirror of the brand the capital reflects specific capitalist project of bourgeois life (subjectivity), transforming all who looks into this mirror, in potential «ghosts» (thinking in the manner of Derrida), so to speak, carriers of the brand. And this looking is ordered to the modern subject as it becomes more and more necessarily condition of its possibility.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Abelson E. When ladies go a-thieving: Middle-class shoplifters in the Victorian department store / E. Abelson. – Oxford University Press, 1989. – 292 p.
2. Baudrillard J. The Mirror of Production / J. Baudrillard. – St. Louis, MO : Telos Press, 1975. – 167 p.
3. Belisle D. Retail Nation. Department Stores and the Making of Modern Canada / D. Belisle. – Vancouver, Toronto : UBC Press, 2011. – 320 p.
4. BMWUSA. BMW i – A Window into the Near Future : [video; electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=12B63umLkWU>.
5. Bourdieu P. Distinction: a social critique of the judgement / P. Bourdieu. – Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 1984. – 613 p.
6. Carlson E. City of Mirrors: Reflection and Visual Construction in 19th Century Paris / E. Carlson. – University of Minnesota Press, 2006. – 311 p.
7. Cremin C. Capitalism's New Clothes: Enterprise, Ethics and Enjoyment in Times of Crisis / C. Cremin. – Pluto Press, 2011. – 224 p.
8. Derrida J. Specters of Marx: The Work of Mourning, the State of the Debt, and the New International / J. Derrida; [trans. by Peggy Kamuf]. – New York and London : Routledge, 1994. – 258 p.
9. Foucault M. Of other spaces / M. Foucault, J. Miskowiec // Diacritics. – 1986. – Vol. 16. – № 1. – pp. 22-27.
10. Ilyenkov E. Dialectics of the ideal / E. Ilyenkov // Historical materialism. – 2012. – Vol. 20. – № 2. – pp. 149-193.
11. Johnston A. The object in the mirror of genetic transcendentalism: Lacan's objet petit a between visibility and invisibility / A. Johnston // Continental Philosophy Review. – 2013. – pp. 1-19.
12. Lacan J. Formations inconscient. Le Séminaire 1956-1957. Livre V / J. Lacan. – Paris : Seuil, 1998. – 519 p.
13. Lacan J. Écrits: The first complete edition in English / J. Lacan. – New York, London : WW Norton & Co, 2006. – 878 p.
14. Lefebvre H. The Production of Space / H. Lefebvre. – Wiley-Blackwell, 1991. – 454 p.
15. Loeb L. Consuming Angels: Advertising and Victorian Women / L. Loeb. – New York : Oxford University Press, 1994. – 240 p.
16. Marx K. Capital: Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy / K. Marx; [trans. by Ben Howkes]. – Penguin Classics, 1992. – 1152 p.
17. Marx K. Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Erster Band. Buch I: Der Produktionsprozeß des Kapitals / K. Marx – Berlin : Dietz Verlag. – Marx-Engels-Werke-Ausgabe, 1962. – Band 23. – S. 11-802.
18. Marx K. Die deutsche Ideologie. Kritik der neuesten deutschen Philosophie in ihren Repräsentanten Feuerbach, B. Bauer und Stirner, und des deutschen Sozialismus in seinen verschiedenen Propheten / K. Marx, F. Engels. – Berlin : Dietz Verlag. – Marx-Engels-Werke-Ausgabe, 1978. – Band 3. – S. 9-553.

19. Marx K. Manifesto of the Communist party / K. Marx, F. Engels. – Peking : Foreign Languages Press, 1970. – 85 p.
20. Marx K. Marx's Grundrisse / K. Marx; [ed. by David MacLellan]. – London : Macmillan; New York : Harper and Row, 1971. – 152 p.
21. Marx K. Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie / K. Marx. – Berlin : Dietz Verlag. – Marx-Engels-Werke-Ausgabe, 1961. – Band 13. – S. 3-161.
22. The Face in the Mirror (I Wonder) : [video; electronic resource]. – Mode of access : http://archive.org/download/1981_Face_in_the_Mirror_I_Wonder_The_M00878_00_01_03_00/1981_Face_in_the_Mirror_I_Wonder_The_M00878_00_01_03_00.mp4.
23. Wemp B. The Grands Magasins Dufayel, the working class, and the origins of consumer culture in Paris, 1880-1916 / B. Wemp. – Montréal : McGill University Press, 2010. – 282 p.