



AN APPRAISAL OF THE 21ST CENTURY THROUGH BAUDRILLARD'S IDEAS IN THE
CONTEXT OF THE INTERPLAY AMONG POLITICS, PHILOSOPHY, ORGANIZATIONS
AND BEING HUMAN

BAUDRİLLARD'IN FİKİRLERİ ÜZERİNDEN 21. YÜZYILIN SİYASET, FELSEFE,
ÖRGÜTLER VE İNSAN OLMAK ARASINDAKİ ETKİLEŞİM BAĞLAMINDA
DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Aytaç ODACILAR¹, Onur KAZANCI²



1. Arş. Gör. Dr., İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi.
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi. Siyaset Bilimi
ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü,
aytac.odacilar@ikcu.edu.tr,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6125-8799>
2. Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi,
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, İşletme
Bölümü, onur.kazanci@ikcu.edu.tr,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5187-2699>

Makale Türü Article Type
Araştırma Makalesi Research Article

Başvuru Tarihi Application Date
12.04.2023 04.12.2023

Yayına Kabul Tarihi Admission Date
15.07.2023 07.15.2023

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.30798/makuiibf.1281747>

* Part of the content of this paper was presented orally
at the SSHIF2015 International Symposium on Social
and Human Sciences and Global Approaches: Theory
and Practices in Warsaw with the title 'The Relation
of Philosophy to Politics and a Baudrillardian
Approach to the 21st Century'.

Abstract

This paper explores the relationship between philosophy and politics in the twenty-first century, using the thought of Jean Baudrillard, one of the most prominent intellectuals of the 20th century, taking into account the idea of what it means to be human. The study will argue that the human being is a creature capable of aestheticization as the capacity to express something with the help of other things. After setting forth such a definition of the human being as a basis, the study will then address the relationship between philosophy and politics. In this context, the historical foundations of this relationship will be presented within the framework of the study. Then, the state of philosophy-politics interaction in the twenty-first century will be discussed in the light of historical themes and Baudrillard's ideas. Finally, an evaluation of all the explanations will be made in relation to some of the problems that are visible today and potential approaches will be put forward to rectify the problems in this connection.

Keywords: *Politics, Philosophy, Baudrillard, Human, Organizations, Trans-Human.*

Öz

Bu çalışma, yirmi birinci yüzyılda felsefe ve siyaset arasındaki ilişkiyi, insanın da ne anlama geldiği düşüncesini de hesaba katarak, 20. yüzyılın en tanınmış entelektüellerinden biri olan Jean Baudrillard'ın düşüncelerini kullanarak incelemektedir. Çalışma, insanı bir şeyi başka şeyler yardımıyla anlatma kapasitesi olarak estetizasyon yapabilen canlı olarak ileri sürülecektir. Çalışma, böyle bir insan tanımını zemin olarak ortaya koyduktan sonra, felsefe ve siyaset ilişkisini ele alacaktır. Bu kapsamda, bu ilişkinin tarihsel temelleri çalışmanın çerçevesi içinde sunulacaktır. Ardından felsefe-siyaset etkileşiminin Yirmi Birinci Yüzyıl'daki durumu tarihsel temalar ışığında ve Baudrillard'ın fikirleri doğrultusunda tartışılacaktır. Son olarak, yapılan tüm açıklamaların bir değerlendirmesi günümüzde görünür olan bazı sorunlarla ilişkili olarak yapılacak ve bu bağlamdaki sorunları düzeltmek için potansiyel yaklaşımlar ortaya konulacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Siyaset, Felsefe, Baudrillard, İnsan, Örgütler, Trans-İnsan.*

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Çalışmanın Amacı

Çalışma siyaset ve felsefe arasındaki ilişkiyi kavramların teorik akıl ve pratik akıl içerikleri üzerinden tarihsel olarak değerlendirip, 21.yüzyılda bu ilişkiyi mümkün kılan zeminin ortadan kalktığını göstermek amacıyla yazılmıştır. İlgili ilişkinin tartışma zemini insanın ne olduğuna ilişkin bir hipotez üzerinden kurulmuştur. Bu doğrultuda insanın temsil kabiliyeti kapsamında anlamlandırılması ve bahsi geçen iki aklın da bu kapasite çerçevesinde iki farklı form olarak konumlandırılması sağlanmıştır. Tarihsel dönemler üzerinden bu ilişkinin ortaya konmasına müteakip, 21.yüzyılın değerlendirilmesi Fransız düşünür Jean Baudrillard'ın ayartma, radikal düşünme, simülasyon ve trans-gerçeklik kavramları üzerinden yapılmıştır. Bu kapsamda tarihsel olarak ilgili iki kavramının 21.yüzyılda tartışma zemininin buharlaştığı ortaya konulmaya çalışılmıştır.

Araştırma Soruları

Çalışmanın araştırma soruları 'siyaset ve felsefe arasındaki ilişkinin zemini nasıl ifade edilebilir?' 'İlgili iki kavramının akletme tarzları ile uyumlu bir insan tanımı nasıl geliştirilebilir?' 'İlgili iki akletme tarzının tarihsel süreç içindeki çatışma alanları hangi konularda/olaylarda belirginleşmiştir?' '21.yüzyılda bu ilişkinin zemininin değiştiğine dair örnekler var mıdır?' şeklinde ifade edilebilir.

Literatür Araştırması

Çalışmanın metodolojisi kapsamında gömülü kuram yer yer fenomenolojik yöntem kullanıldığı için literatür taraması ilgili kuram kapsamında ilişkinin mahiyetini ortaya koyacak seçicilik de ortaya konmuştur. Bu kapsamda ilişkinin ortaya çıkmasına ilişkin başlangıç Platon'un düşünceleri olarak belirlenmiştir. İlgili iki nosyonun tartışma alanları da yine Platon ve Aristoteles'in görüşleri ile paralel serimlenmiştir. Dönemsel tarama kapsamında Platon öncesi ve sonrası dönem, Roma dönemi, Hristiyan düşüncesi hakim olduğu dönem olarak Orta Çağ, Modern dönem makalenin amacına uygun olarak ele alınmıştır. 21. Yüzyıl'ın ele alındığı kısımlar için post-modern düşünce havuzu literatür taraması kapsa elden geçirilmiş ve son olarak spesifik olarak Baudrillard düşüncesi kavram bazlı seçici şekilde taranmıştır.

Yöntem

Çalışmada bahsi geçen iki nosyonun ilişkisinin zemini daha önce ele alınmamış bir zemin tasarımı üzerinden kurgulandığı için gömülü kuram çalışmanın metodu olarak belirlenmiştir. İlgili iki nosyonun bahsi geçen yeni zemin üzerinden ele alınıp tarihsel süreçteki olaylarla ilişkilendirilmesi için de fenomenolojik yöntem stratejisi kullanılmıştır.

Sonuç ve Değerlendirme

Sonuç olarak siyaset ve felsefe arasındaki ilişki insanın temsil kapasitesi üzerinden tanımlandığı bir anlamda teorik ve pratik akletme ilişkisi olarak ele alınabilmektedir. Bu ele alınabilme tarzı temsillerin niteliği üzerinden birbiriyle yer yer çatışma yer yer de tahakküm ilişkisi içinde olmuştur. 21. Yüzyıla gelindiğinde, ilgili ilişkiyi mümkün kılan temsil tarzlarından ziyade bizatihi temsilin

sorunsallaştırılması sonucu ilişkinin otantik zemini ortadan kalkmıştır. Bu kapsamda iki nosyonun da tabi olduğu simülatif ve trans gibi sıfatlar tarif edilebilen yeni bir zeminden bahsetmek mümkündür.

1. INTRODUCTION

The ideas in Plato's works are a good place to start for the history of the interaction between philosophy and politics (427 BC - 347 BC). While it is true that this perspective determines the historical beginning, there has been no in-depth evaluation of the historicity of this relationship in the literature. This study aims to fill this gap by utilizing the terminology of Jean Baudrillard, one of the most renowned intellectuals of the 20th century. In this context, the first issue to be addressed and problematized is who establishes and supports this relationship: the human being. It can be said that all interactions in the world revolve around the human being who makes everything possible. This can be explained by the fact that humans give meaning to everything. Considering the connection between giving meaning and something existing as something, it would not be wrong to say that human beings make things possible in terms of creating those things as a particular thing. Considering that the mode of existence of everything in the world of phenomena is immanent to such a process, it can be concluded that the human being is the fundamental subject of "understanding". This position of the human being can be determined in many ways. The relationship between politics and philosophy can be expressed as a relationship that clearly reveals this position of the human being. It is possible to deduce this from the meanings of politics and philosophy. Basically, philosophy can be defined as the theoretical reason and politics as the practical reason. In this respect, the link between politics and philosophy can be seen as a link between the world one defines and the world one has to define together with others. In other words, while politics is the practice of improving the situation and solving the problems of communities produced by certain people coming together, philosophy can be expressed as an abstraction that follows a practice (rationality) in which a particular person develops universal and normative knowledge. The relationship between the universal and the particular can be used to illustrate this relationship. In such an inquiry into the nature of the relation, it is clear that a particular definition of human nature will serve as a basic assumption about the nature of the relation in question and will form the focus of the analysis. Therefore, following an assessment of what is human, the historical foundations of the relationship between philosophy and politics will be presented in this study. Then, the state of philosophy-politics interaction in the twenty-first century will be discussed in the light of historical themes and Baudrillard's ideas. In the 21st century, the discussion of organizations/businesses in terms of the relationship between politics and philosophy will be given as an example of the manifestation of the relationship in different fields. Finally, a general evaluation and potential areas for the elimination of problems in this context will be presented.

2. WHAT CONSTITUTES THE HUMAN SPECIES OR AN ASSESSMENT OF WHAT HUMAN BEING IS

It is possible to see the human being as the center that makes everything possible in terms of its capacity to determine what things are. In Kant's famous statement "Without perceptions there are no

ideas, without concepts perceptions are blind", the subject as a human species can be said to be the inevitable binding latent agent. At this point, it is meaningful to discuss how human beings make decisions based on events that occur outside themselves. In doing so, the first thing that needs to be explained is the definition of the human being itself. This definition can be considered as the first assumption on which human actions would be meaningful. However, the very definition of a human being is also a human product. Any definition of man can be considered in this case. Definitions in this context may include Homo Erectus, Homo Sapiens, Homo Habilis, Homo Faber and Homo Luden. These definitions, along with others that associate the word "human" with something social (such as "man is a political animal"), fail to explain how man became a member of the human species. The first gap that needs to be filled at this stage is the gap caused by the question "How can a living being be human?". This question can also be addressed by specifying what is at the beginning or at the center of all the characteristics that distinguish human beings from other living beings.

It can be said that the question "What is man (?)" has an immanent meaning to the question "What is this (?)", which can be asked for everything. The reason for this is clarified by the positioning of the person in question. The place where the question "What is this (?) positions human being expresses the position of human in determining the meaning of something. At this point, the relationship between language and human reveals the basic assumption of our study. As Demir (2015) points out, there is a clear connection between being human and the existence of language as a world design (Demir, 2015). This study establishes the basic assumption of human definition by associating it with language as the capacity to give meaning to something. In this context, it can be argued that language, in general, is used by man as a means of determining things in a certain sense. In other words, language allows man to express things in some way, placing man in a central position in determining the meaning of things. The oldest animal painting discovered can be seen as the starting point of human history. In other words, it would not be wrong to say that humans entered the human species with this drawing, according to the definition of human put forward as the main hypothesis of this study. The reason we start the history of human beings here is that humans have answered the question 'what is this? The people who painted the prey they hunted on the cave walls made them exist with a linguistic expression as a tool independent of the animal they hunted. The individual who drew a picture of the animal he had just killed on the cave wall transformed his perception of what he saw (or hunted and ate) into something else through language. It is possible to see these representations as "alternative expression capacity of human beings". In this sense, it is possible to express the feature that makes human beings human as "the ability to represent". In this respect, human history can be considered as a kind of history of representation. Considering language as a relational abstraction, it would not be wrong to see these paintings as early forms of language. In this context, it can be argued that there is a parallelism between the evolution of language and the evolution of human beings. Therefore, the evolution of language can also be seen as a part of the history of representation, which we can see as the history of human beings.

Since symbols, icons, even words, as beings detached from their reality, have infinite spheres of existence, language, the most basic human characteristic, is also the basis of problems/issues. This fundamental problem can be expressed in Heideggerian terms as the elasticity of being to existence. In other words, the meanings of words, especially abstract terms, can be filled with aspirations or desires depending on one's state of mind, way of life and experiences. In this respect, understanding something can be expressed as having all the meanings attributed to it. In other words, to grasp something is to fully understand all its past, present and future meanings (Heidegger, 2002). This phenomenon can also be considered as the absence of absolute meaning as post-modernists construct their thoughts. In this context, when the infinite time necessary for absolute meaning is taken into account, a connection between absolute meaning and divinity can be established. Umberto Eco (2009) has pointed to this fact by saying that the search for absolute meaning is a search for the language of God spoken in Babylon, and that modernity is nothing but a search to create the perfect language.

It could be argued that language's inability to represent absolute meanings creates countless possibilities for manipulation in terms of how things should be represented. It is possible to say that this is where philosophy begins, as it allows things that are not organic parts of reality (words, thoughts, symbols) to be continuously constructed and produced through the mind. This procedure of representation is not unique to philosophy but is the source of all human language in general. In other words, philosophers are subject to this procedure systematically, and ordinary people are subject to it without dwelling on it too much. It can be said that this thinking procedure in which human beings are involved has two opposite meanings. The first of these meanings implies freedom in terms of infinity in determining objective reality. According to this meaning, since there is no fixed meaning, it can be said that there is freedom in terms of renewal of meaning. On the contrary, another meaning is being in a linguistic prison due to the necessity of thinking in language (Jameson, 2013). The linguistic prison stems from the fact that the importance of every expression, word, concept and symbol depends on how well they connect with other expressions, words, concepts and symbols. In other words, everything exists as a result of a representation and can only be understood within the limits of the meaning it conveys (in the linguistic prison).

The assumption of what a human being is can be expressed as the agent between these ongoing processes of representation. At this point, it can be said that Politics (practical reason) and Philosophy (theoretical reason) represent the two aspects in between. Both politics and philosophy can be considered as structures expressed through representations. However, while politics relies on the notion of freedom of language in terms of drawing a path for itself through the actual validity of representation, philosophy, on the contrary, chooses the pursuit of absolute meaning as its goal. In this respect, philosophical theories, like any representation, have a framework that limits the being that is susceptible to becoming in the Heideggerian sense, whereas politics does not feel obliged to abide by the limits of this framework in terms of the emergence of new representations that are necessary in the present. In other words,

whereas philosophy actualizes itself by giving ultimate meanings to things through an intellectual activity, politics, due to its commitment to the domain of praxis, reigns in a domain where the validity of what is described is constantly tested. However, it cannot be said that philosophy and politics function in complete opposition to each other. Politics can benefit from philosophical ideas. It can even take an active role in the acceptance and enactment of those ideas. Politics can benefit from philosophical ideas. It can even take an active role in accepting and putting into action the relevant ideas. However, it must be said that politics acts in a way that breaks the framework of philosophy when politically accepted philosophical ideas fail to grasp matter and reality as it currently applies. In other words, the interaction between philosophy and politics becomes strained in this state of alienation and inability to accurately depict reality. In this context, the conflict between philosophy and politics can be used to illustrate the tension between representation and representation, between freedom and captivity (the linguistic prison) in human life.

3. A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS

Since this study deals with an analysis of the relationship between politics and philosophy, it is necessary to show what philosophy and politics are considered to be. This is significant in terms of showing the two axes of the study. In this sense, philosophy in our study refers to a way of thinking that seeks to represent things in order to reveal their ultimate meaning. In this regard, philosophy can be said to involve a kind of theoretical reason. On the other hand, politics, as used in our study, can be defined as the practical reason used to preserve and develop the harmony and coexistence of phenomena and people on earth. The dependence of politics on practical reason can also be expressed as the dependence of politics on actual capacities of representation.

Historically, Plato's works can be taken as the starting point for the comparison of two political and philosophical intellects. The reason for this can be explained in many ways, but the most important one is that it is in Plato's works that we see the first fundamental clash of these two minds. Politics before Plato can be seen as a battlefield where many views and ideas were discussed. Undoubtedly, it can be said that this kind of a society reveals a political philosophy that supports pluralism. Considering that the philosopher's ideas, which were produced for the purpose of describing the ultimate reality, took the form of an opinion rather than a truth when they entered the political sphere, it can be said that politics was in a superior position to philosophy in such a society. Socrates' execution can be explained through such a superiority relationship. In this context, Plato can be positioned as the first figure to discuss the dominance of politics over philosophy. In other words, he can be positioned as the first thinker to state that politics and philosophy are in conflict. In this context, it can be argued that the murder of his teacher Socrates constitutes a concrete example of this conflict in Plato's mind. It can be said that the subject of why his teacher was executed is important in the development of Plato's thoughts. Socrates' conversation

with young people within the scope of his search for the ultimate meaning, which we deduced from the dialogues of Socrates put forward by Plato, constituted his death sentence. In other words, Socrates was tried and executed for his actions against the fixed beliefs and wishes of the political organization. In this sense, it can be thought that Socrates' ideas question the foundations of the field in which politics is dominant. It can be seen that Plato also considers the issue as the overlap between philosophy and politics and tries to solve the problem by establishing a hierarchical system. It can be argued that Plato's positioning of philosophy as the dominant power in politics, and the hierarchical framework in which he placed the wise philosopher at the head of the state, reveals this. It can be said that Plato, within the framework he established, tried to reduce the plurality prevailing in the previous system to the dialogues that took place in the cave and to change the axis of the state within the scope of the final truth. In other words, it can be said that Plato elevates philosophers who understand the ultimate truth to the status of philosopher-king, placing theoretical reason above practical reason.

It can be stated that in the Platonic system, politics is understood by relating it to ultimate knowledge. In this respect, it can be thought that the ultimate teachings of his philosophy have the feature of an unchanging standard for all decisions and changes in the field of human interactions that can be seen in the field of politics (Küçükalp, 2011). It can be argued that this idea, systematized by Plato, started the conflict between politics supported by reality and philosophy as a representation style that does not have to be dependent on reality. It can be said that the first criticism of this system put forward by Plato came from Aristotle, who valued politics as the field of different perspectives.

Aristotle's opposition to Plato cannot be said to be an opposition to philosophy. Rather, it can be claimed that he is in opposition to Plato within the scope of his evaluations on the nature of truth, and to this extent, to philosophy as theoretical reason. According to Aristotle, the capacity for judgment, which he calls phronesis, can be used to determine what is true in politics (Gambetti, 2014). Phronesis is a virtue that involves recognizing the issue as it is and making decisions about how to deal with it, not a craft-specific skill. Since Aristotle's phronimos attacked the idea of the unity and immutability of truth and promoted pluralism and unpredictability, in contrast to Plato's philosopher-king, who advocated a truth that would prevent the diversity inherent in world conditions, Aristotle's evaluation of the concept of phronesis can clearly be considered as evaluations that will strengthen the hand of politics in terms of representations. In this respect, it can be argued that the first conflict in the relationship between politics and philosophy emerged in the context of Plato's and Aristotle's thoughts through the opposition of the concepts of Sophos (a wise person) and phronimos (a person with political virtue). It can be asserted that the Plato-Aristotle conflict has been the source of philosophical-political frictions in various forms throughout history. According to Gambetti (2014: 531), three points can be used to schematize the conflict between Plato and Aristotle that has influenced philosophy and politics throughout history:

1. *The belief that there can be a single truth in politics and the belief that politics is a field nourished by plural opinions;*
2. *The belief that only education can lead to correct decision-making in politics and the belief that debates in the public sphere can do the same;*
3. *Centralized systems and approaches advocating decentralization.*

For the position of the Roman Empire in the debate, it can be stated that until the fall of the Western Roman Empire and the beginning of the Middle Ages, it was in line with the polis system of Ancient Greece and Aristotle's systematics. For example, Cicero used the terms *civitas* (city/state) and *res publica* (belonging to the people) for the words state and nation respectively. In other words, just as the Greeks saw the polis, the Roman people (*Res Populi Romani*) did not have an abstract understanding of the state but thought of the state as what the citizens brought together (Wood, 1991). In the related debate, it can be argued that the Romans preferred the Aristotelian conception of truth to the Platonic conception of truth in the sense that they saw laws and jurisprudence as the foundation of the state where politics flourished. In his *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, Cicero expressed this fact as follows (Erçelik, 2014):

“Our state lost its constitutional status during a time when the senate was no longer acknowledged in state management, laws had no legal standing, courts were disregarded, and ancestral customs were abandoned.”

The period after Ancient Greece can be defined as the Roman period. Although this period can be divided into the Republican period and the Imperial period, it is difficult to claim that philosophy dominated politics both in the Republican period and the Imperial period. On the contrary, it is possible to observe the determinism of politics in both periods. For example, after the transition from the republican period to the empire, rule by monarchy was not a structure that was strongly opposed. However, with this change, as the emperor turned into an absolute monarch, *principatus* was replaced by *dominatus* (the rule of the master over the subjects, not the citizens) (Ağaoğulları and Köker, 2006). In other words, although Roman citizens became subjects, they did not engage in principled struggles for the re-representation of politics. This can be regarded as the clearest indication showing the absence of the authoritarian guidance of philosophy in Rome and the supremacy of politics in terms of determining what to do in the face of existing situations.

The rise of the Church and its domination of politics can be read as the domination of philosophy over politics rather than the domination of religion over politics. This can be explained by the fact that philosophy and religion as a source of absolute knowledge can easily be used interchangeably. As a matter of fact, we can see the origins of the dominance of the Church in Augustine's systematic presentation of Christianity by grounding it in the concepts of ancient philosophy. According to Augustine, God is the only and fully knowable one. The reality of everything else is partial and insignificant in itself. The aim of man is to know this full reality. God reveals himself in the Bible and nature. Augustine recommends that human beings continue their existence under these guides. Here,

Augustine's philosophy is a holistic theory and is intended to shape the life of man (and later the state) accordingly. The domination of this philosophy over life and thus politics can be associated with the proposed absolute knowledge. Ağaoglu and Köker (2006) state that this situation can be better understood by connecting Augustine's statement 'God is called light in the Bible; so when we understand light better, we understand better what God is with Plato's cave metaphor in which light represents truth and is described as the real truth After Christianity became the official religion in 380 AD, the Church gradually became philosophically dominant. In this context, according to Barker (1951), it was first recognized that the Church was superior to the emperor in matters concerning the spiritual-religious sphere and the Church and the empire were shown as two separate swords and two separate powers as earthly authority and divine authority. As Ağaoglu and Köker (2006) stated, later on, the Church dominated the whole system with the idea that the universal truth should cover everything.

The sovereignty of the Church, that is, the theological philosophy, over society began to be questioned with the changing social order in the 12th century. Since the changes in life necessitated the reorganization of representations, it is possible to evaluate the related questioning and its reasons within the scope of the representation-reality dichotomy on which our study is based. However, it is important to note that the restructuring of representations takes place gradually in society. In this context, it should be noted that old representations and their representatives developed ideas within the scope of modification of old representations in order to maintain their sovereignty. For example, in the relevant period, the Christian philosopher Thomas Aquinas put forward a synthesis of revelation and reason (Aristotelian). What Thomas did here can be seen as an effort to adapt representation to reality in order to ensure the continuity of religion. In other words, Thomas tried to harmonize the church and the changing reality. As Ağaogulları and Köker, (2008) stated, since the Roman Church did not adopt Thomas' ideas and insisted that it was superior in everything in the world, it was doomed to failure.

From the 12th century onwards, it can be asserted that the importance of matter, the earth and human beings gradually increased. As a matter of fact, in the 15th century, geographical discoveries and discoveries in astronomy undermined Ptolemaic cosmology, which had an important place in the teachings of the Church, and brought what we know as the Renaissance into confrontation with religion and disrupted the Church's conception of the world. It can be said that during this period, with Nicolas of Cusa and especially Giordano Bruno, the idea of infinity began to permeate the new conception of the universe (Russ, 2011). In connection with this, it can be argued that geometry became the dominant element in the act of knowing in this period. In terms of representations of knowing, it would be correct to say that mathematics gradually took over the sovereignty of representation at this point. The change in the view of matter and the world brought about a change in human beings. With the Reformation movements, man became autonomous and the idea of the individual began to emerge. It is possible to express this individual as a representation of a human being who has a vision of an infinite universe and sees the world as a place to be acquired. It is possible to express this as the evaporation of the old human

representation and the production of a new human representation. When we consider that representations are essentially definitions that make things meaningful, we can understand how the evaporating human representation creates a gap. The gap mentioned here can also be expressed as the gap of meaninglessness-purposelessness-nothingness. It can be claimed that politics is more active and functional than philosophy in terms of re-representing reality in this new period. The direct relationship of politics with the filling of the gap caused by the evaporation of old representations can be evaluated within the scope of its dominant role in the process of constructing the reality of the world imagined through new representations. In this respect, it is possible to evaluate the national churches that emerged as a result of the Reformation movements in terms of politics transcending the Church, whose representations were no longer applicable. In addition, it should be noted that observation, research and mathematics, which provided the basis for the evaporation of old representations, occupied an important place in new representations. Galileo made this clear by saying that the language of the universe is mathematics and that understanding the universe reveals itself through mathematics.

In the process that began with the Renaissance, it can be argued that politics played an active role in the transformation of society by relying on realities and overcoming the philosophy of the period (the Church). We can observe the clearest examples of this in the way Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes laid out the foundations of political science. For example, according to Machiavelli, the sole purpose of the state is the continuation of the state, and this is the way reality works for the state; if this is not followed, reality will manifest itself in various ways and put an end to the state. Another example is Thomas Hobbes' narrative of the state of nature. Thomas Hobbes' famous state of nature narrative functioned (and functions) as the first assumption of the political structures of the new world.

When it comes to the Enlightenment period, it can be stated that the re-representation of the world dominated by the Renaissance and the idea of humanism began to be stereotype for the generations to come. In this period, we can see that the rational individual, with the contribution of the mathematization of physics, was placed at the center of the world and philosophized. In other words, As Russ (2011) stated, it can be claimed that the definition of the human being in this period was philosophized by claiming that it had reached a definition that could be valid for everyone. Pica della Mirandola's statement 'There is nothing greater in the world than man', uttered during the period when humanism was effective, was realized with the idea that man had reached his ultimate meaning (Russ, 2011). The most fundamental feature of Enlightenment thought is the idea-philosophy of progress, which is inherent in the knowability of everything in the world. In line with this idea, it is possible to say that with the Enlightenment, just like in the Middle Ages, human beings were detached from their fluid reality by being fixed for the sake of an ultimate meaning. In this respect, it can be said that the world came under the yoke of a new philosophy in this period. It can be said that politics became the instrument of philosophical thought itself. Modern nation-states that believe in progress that emerged in this context can be given as an example. All ideologies that emerged in the process of modernity can be

mentioned as different fruits of this philosophizing. It can be claimed that each ideology represents the world in different ways, and through this representation, it is blended with philosophy and narrativized. In terms of the unlimited possibilities of representations, it can be said that such philosophizing is an attempt to limit and interfere with reality itself and its becoming. As a matter of fact, from time to time, in geographies dominated by some ideologies, we have come across as a fact that the realities envisioned by ideological representations have not come into being. For example, within the scope of the dialectic that dominates the communist vision of the world, the revolution took place in Russia when it should have taken place first in England and similar industrialized countries. Afterwards, its functioning was not in line with the vision as well.

It is an observable fact that the dominance of philosophy, which began with the Enlightenment and the idea of modernity, began to be questioned after World War II. It can be argued that the center of this questioning is related to modern thought's conception of the world, in other words, its ability to represent the world. The most important of these questionings can be mentioned as post-modern thought. Although some thinkers call it a continuation of modernism and others call it a radical version of modernism, post-modernist thought has questioned or led to the questioning of philosophy itself through its ability to represent. Post-modern thought, in general, can be expressed as a thought focused on the issue of whether something can be represented or not. It can be argued that their analysis of the nature of representation is problematic in terms of liberating politics from the domination of philosophy-ideals (human rights, freedom, democracy...etc.) and enlightening in terms of exposing representations that have no connection with reality. The belief in an uncontaminated reality and the mediating position of the human being in the act of knowing can be expressed as truths uncovered by post-modernists (Murphy, 2000). As Derrida says, the post-modern world can be characterized by a radical change in which opposites are mixed together (Cited from Derrida, Ryan, 1982). According to postmodernists, the world is not an object but a 'text' that is read and interpreted synchronically. Therefore, the world cannot be represented, and one can only construct a version of it (Scholes, 1985). As a member of this tradition of thought, Baudrillard is one of the most important thinkers to take this radical stance. In the 21st century, we will evaluate this radical critique of philosophy in relation to politics (practical reason) through a Baudrillardian analysis in the following section after the Baudrillard heading.

4. OUTLINE OF BAUDRILLARD THOUGHT

Baudrillard is a French thinker who, like post-modern thinkers in general, has developed his discourse through the criticism of modernity. Baudrillard, who thinks that modernity has disappeared with technology, industrial capitalism and the sovereignty of the signifier, sees the age we are in as a post-original state in which simulations, entropy, fractal subjects, indifference, transvestism are widespread (everywhere in science, art, politics, etc.), everything is liberated, possible, doable, and culture has become fractal (Best and Kellner, 1996). Reflecting on Western culture, modernity, post-

industrial global situation, media, consumption and mass culture, Baudrillard declares the end of the social by arguing that we are living in the age of simulation, where hyper-reality, which is more real than reality, replaces production. Baudrillard, who thinks that the social is lost in the 'mass', compares the mass to a black hole in terms of the absence of a sociological reality, a specific meaning, and a purposeful action (Baudrillard, 2013). In this respect, it is possible to say that it is this idea of the mass that makes the age of simulation possible. The concept of simulation is a central concept in Baudrillard's thought and through this concept he analyzes the individual, society, culture and art based on the signs of today's world. Pointing to the media and mass media as the most active and important means of simulation, Baudrillard argues that reality is no longer given in a direct connection with the world, but is instilled in us through TV screens. In a way, he reduces the world to TV and says that human beings live in a world of fiction in which imitation replaces production and information replaces meaning in a world of imitations where the media is active. Başaran (2004) states the historical equivalents/appearances of the concepts used by Baudrillard as follows:

Figure 1: The Tripartite Structure of Subject and Conceptual Transitions in the Ages of Crafting, Manufacturing, and Simulation

Age of Craft	Production Era	Simulation Age
God, Being	Ideology	Simulacrum
Religion	Labor Power	Code
Renaissance	Industrial Revolution	Design
Natural Laws	Power Relations, conflict	Binary Oppositions
Metaphysics of presence	Energy, Principle of Determination	Principle of Determination, Viral
Tradition	avant-garde	Mass Culture
Truth	Equivalence Logic	The logic of ambivalence
Display = Displayed	Exchange of Signifier and Signified	Exchange of sign with sign
Hierarchy	Classes	Mass
Sacred, Magic	Revolution	Disaster

Source: Melih Başaran, Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Baudrillard, Jean", C.2, Etik Yayınları, 2004

Criticisms of Baudrillard converge in the fact that he only criticizes, in the ambiguity of his discourses, and in his inability to replace what he criticizes with something positive. In implicit response to these criticisms, Baudrillard uses the concept of radical thought (also for the meaning of the ambiguity in his discourse and the thought it invites). According to Baudrillard (Baudrillard, 2012), radical thought 'lies at the crossroads where meaning and the absence of meaning, the real and the unreal, intersect sharply. It is a type of thought that reveals the absence of meaning in the world, the absence of truth in phenomena, as indicators not of something but of nothing. In this respect, radical thought is *the power*

of comprehension without hope, the non-deciphering, alien to any solution to the world as an objective reality and its decipherment (Baudrillard, 2012: 129).

5. A BAUDRILLARIAN ANALYSIS OF THE LINK BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Within the scope of Enlightenment thought, it can be said that reality was philosophized and produced as a book. It would not be wrong to say that philosophical domination spread to the world through the concepts of this truth. The concepts used as instruments of domination can be expressed as the concepts of modernity such as the individual, freedom, equality and progress. It can be said that the common characteristic of these concepts or the concepts put forward as ideals is that they are not historical but bookish. In other words, it can be argued that these concepts are representations produced within the scope of philosophical thought without being in constant communication with social reality. After the Second World War, the problematic nature of these representations began to be revealed by emphasizing historicity in the context of the idea of becoming. In this respect, it can be argued that by the 21st century, modern representations of reality, ideologies and the ultimate goals of enlightenment have dissolved and evaporated (Baudrillard, 2012b).

After the 2nd World War, it can be argued that middle class people, who a century ago generally believed in these ideals, took a stand against those who saw the bookish truth as more authentic than the lived truth. The attitude taken by these people can also be argued to be an attitude aimed at changing the world through biblical truths, that is, through the philosophical ideas that were most intense in the 19th century. However, this attitude should not be considered as a collective decision. It can be said that this attitude manifested itself more as indifference. In this respect, it is important to emphasize that opposing attitudes also developed in inauthentic ways during this period. For example, it is possible to consider the Beat generation, the hippies and the student movements of '68 in general as counter-attitudes in this context. It can be argued that the youth of this generation, in a sense, reacted against their fathers who were immersed in the practices of life and pursued practical goals. Indeed, in the Baudrillardian sense, in the 21st century, there is a transformation from a society (socius: togetherness, togetherness) to a mass. indeed, in this process, philosophy has been replaced by politics that feeds on the meaning of history and continuity. In this process, it is possible to say that democracy was much more developed in the West than in other periods. In this respect, it can be argued that philosophy lost its power against the historical thinking in this period. However, it is not possible to say that philosophy was completely rejected. However, it is also a fact that the influence of philosophers on societies and states has diminished. It is not that philosophical concepts are not rejected and used by the masses; however, it should be stated that the use of these concepts is in accordance with the practical life of the masses. Since these usages are filled and emptied as desired, they have ceased to be an ideal and turned into objects of consumption. In other words, intellectual and philosophical concepts (such as freedom) have

been transformed into concepts that are used not as a concept brought about by systematic thinking, but as an object of concrete purposes in practical life, as the user wishes. Baudrillard (2012c) summarized this situation by saying that nothing is really reflected in this period, neither in the mirror nor in the dizzying field. This can be easily seen in the case of the Charlie Hebdo attack. In the aftermath of Charlie Hebdo, international leaders and millions of people gathered in Paris and could only say one thing: freedom of expression. One could say that this statement was their only intellectual foundation. But a week after the march, an event took place that revealed that this rhetoric had been eviscerated for practical purposes. About a week after the march, an eight-year-old elementary school boy was charged with terrorism for refusing to attend the Charlie Hebdo commemoration in schools. The fact that individuals who defended freedom of expression a week earlier did not face a similar backlash shows that the concept of freedom of expression is an object of consumption. Similarly, the law passed in the French parliament a few years ago that criminalized saying "it is not genocide" in reference to the controversial events of 1915 can be considered in the same context. What was done within the scope of these legal negotiations, that is, the fact that such a clear attack on freedom of expression is not considered within the scope of freedom of expression, can be seen as evidence that laws can be explained in terms of their use value rather than their philosophical value. In Baudrillardian terms, such contradictions are the contradictions of the twenty-first century. In his work 'The Soul Sold to the Devil or the Theory of the Sovereignty of Evil', Baudrillard defined this situation as dualism as follows (Baudrillard, 2015).

'There is no harmony or perfection that cannot be abruptly lost balance through a spontaneous reversal procedure.'

"Anything that chooses to integrate by disobeying the fundamental principle of duality will have to dissolve in the face of the ferocious resistance of the re-emerging dualism," the author said. We can state, if you'd like, that it will dissolve in accordance with the principle of evil.'

In this period, it is possible to observe that the claims of holistic reality, which emerged under the yoke of Philosophy, problematized within unitary and totalitarian systems and emerged as problem areas discussed in the 21st century. As Baudrillard says (2015: 182), duality disrupts holistic reality and tries to disintegrate any unitary or totalitarian system through emptiness, impact, viruses and terrorism. As Baudrillard mentions in his book Symbolic Exchange (Baudrillard, 2011), politics in this period is the process of adapting to the symbolic exchange of values(!) in the practices of life within the scope of the principle of duality and struggling for sovereignty (seduction) over and over them. Since there is no stable value in this period, everything is a part of the hyper-reality universe. In this respect, the act of seduction represents dominating the universe of symbols (the universe of hyperreality) (Baudrillard, 2014). Here, it is more accurate to see the concept of seduction, which Baudrillard also alludes to in various places as the act of politics, as a game played with desire rather than a desire (Baudrillard, 2005).

Since the Enlightenment period, it can be said that political legitimacy is based on the people who are governed. It can be said that the continuity of this legitimacy is ensured through elections. In the 21st century, it can be said that this method has also changed in line with the realities of the age. While until the 21st century elections were a method where principled values and ideas competed, in the 21st century political elections are now presented as a race inherent in a festival rather than a political action where opinions compete. This situation is also put forward by many politicians on Election Day with discourses such as 'the festival of democracy'. At this point, it can be observed that the fact that the festival is an entertainment activity is in line with the change we have mentioned. In this respect, political elections may no longer be seen as an area of struggle related to responsibilities. As a matter of fact, election processes, with the influence of mass media, are a process in which the race of numbers is seen rather than political stances. In this respect, the probes, tests, referendum and mass media encountered in the process function as devices belonging to a simulative system rather than devices belonging to a representative system (Baudrillard, 2013). It is possible to state that one of the most decisive features of this era is that the masses have more importance in politics than experts and their derivatives. It can be asserted that in every news channel and every discussion program, this audience is seen as the most important and broadcasts are made in parallel with this. In this context, the intervention of the audience in the broadcasts is kept open with various social platforms and hastags are created as an incentive. Baudrillard expresses this situation as follows (2015): 'The system does its best to make the masses speak in any way it can. It tries in every way to make them understand that they are social, unionized beings and that they must participate in entertainment and free speech'. It can be argued that the mass retains this importance by constantly changing, not like its ancestors of a century ago who were mired in philosophical truths. In this age, everything changes and everything is associated with everything, confirming the discourses of the post-moderns. In this context, in Baudrillard's terms, this age can be described as the age of Trans. It is possible to see this situation in every field such as trans-politics, trans-sexual, trans-aesthetics (Baudrillard, 2012c). In this period when philosophy exists on the basis of use value, it can be easily said that politics, which is separated from philosophy, has internalized and adapted to this situation. For example, a person beloved for his movies becoming governor of the state of California, a wrestler of the century becoming a national representative, a famous model entering politics, a national football player becoming a political figure, famous singers being present at party rallies as symbols etc. can be given as examples. But it is important to note that this relationship does not only manifest itself in a political way. In this age, the idea of trance, where everything is blended with everything, manifests itself in every field. More precisely, representations in which the idea of trans is captured can take hold in this age. For example, football programs that only talk about football have no chance against 'Beyaz Futbol', the best example of trans programs in Turkey, where everything from politics to aesthetics, music to politics is discussed. As a matter of fact, weekly ratings figures confirm this (Kara, 2021).

6. ORGANIZATIONS / ENTERPRISES AS SIMULATIONS AND IMPOSERS OF TRANS-HUMANISM

Similar things can be said about organizations in the social context. Organizations, as downsized societies, are governed by a similar "simulation of realities". Today, especially in the context of businesses and business life, it can be said that people spend the most important and productive parts of their lives in organizations. Human beings tend to position organizations as superior and more divine than themselves. However, all organizations, even the concept of organization itself, belong to creativity of human beings. Organizational life can be considered as an initiatory and esoteric experience unique to each organization. Each member of the organization acquires the realities of that organization, sometimes directly (in a formal way) and sometimes indirectly (or informally) through the perception and interpretation of symbols. In this context, it can be stated that the subject's comprehension of the organization takes place through a perception created by formal, environmental and personal influences (Parker et al. 1995). This esoteric structure itself can be considered as a simulation that originates from the subject but is perceived in a more sacred way than the subject.

Organizations are one of the places where the conflict between philosophy (theoretical reason) and practice/politics (practical reason) is often encountered. The intellectual structure of the organization is often just an illusion that covers the flaws in practice. One of the best examples of this is the strategic practices of organizations. Strategies, which are the most basic organizational activity and on which all the dynamics of the organization are based, are an illusion that is thought to be the solution to all organizational problems, as they often contain a representation that is disconnected from reality (Grandy & Mills, 2004). This is even more salient for businesses as profit-seeking organizations. Even in the context of socially responsible behavior, businesses seek to align it with their strategies and turn it into a competitive advantage (Corazza et al., 2017).

Likewise, the concept of ethics in business remains in the realm of philosophy (discourse) and its effectiveness in business practices becomes controversial (McCann & Brownsberger, 1990). In essence, businesses exist as abstract objects when it comes to business ethics (Dobson & Helmes, 2014). The individuals who will realize or are expected to realize ethical practices are the individuals who constitute the business, including decision makers.

Since organizational politics is based on the sharing of power by organizational subjects, organizational politics can be seen as a part of this simulation (Ferris & Hochwarter, 2011). It can be stated that organizational politics affects many job and individual-specific situations such as attitudes, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It has a significant impact on work-related factors such as attitudes, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship, and job involvement (Randall et al. 1999). In addition to these, it also affects individual factors such as stress, tension, fatigue, and burnout (Cropanzano et al. 1997).

On the other hand, the reality of a factor that has such a wide impact on individuals within the organization is a matter of debate. It is not possible to be sure whether there really is a political structure in the organization as perceived, or if there is, whether the power balances and role perceptions that constitute it are real. In this respect, it seems to be a suggestion that individuals should not be in a hurry to be sure of the reality of their organizational political positions. Especially when the power and power struggles of managers within organizational politics are taken into account, it seems that trust in formal organizational structures can be misleading.

In this context, it would not be wrong to say that organizations and businesses with all their elements are a simulative universe. This simulation deepens even more, especially in businesses trying to comply with the spirit of the time. Organizations/enterprises, which can be considered as copies of human life, have now been elevated to a more real position than reality itself in the Baudrillardian sense.

In addition, especially with the covid-19 pandemic, it can be said that we are living in a period when the capitalist economy has met the concept of "human who can get sick". From this point of view, it has been realized by businesses that the human being, whose subjectivity is lost more and more in the virtuality of businesses, is now insufficient with its physical condition. In terms of bringing productivity and indeed profitability closer to ideal, it would not be wrong to say that the current point of evolution of humanity has made him an element that prevents productivity in this state. In this context, human beings now must go beyond "human" or be divested by the production side of the economic system.

Humans are offered two paths, they are advised to become trans-human in order not to leave their place to the machines. This idea, which takes the alienation between human production and consumption to the extreme, can be given as a radical example of the evaporation of the connection of representations with reality. The idea of accelerating the evolution of man through technologies, at least physically to transform him into a superior being, is not new. It was Julian Huxley, the biologist brother of Aldous Huxley, who put forward the idea that human evolution is not progressing as fast as it used to (Swetlitz, 1995). Although it is highly debatable to what extent machines and artificial intelligence can replace consciousness, or can be called as geist, the capitalist economy is not interested in it. At least it believes that it should not be.

Man must be enhanced if he does not want to give up his place in production to machines. There is great debate about the trans-humanization or post-humanization of the human being. The idea that making human beings "better" with other "parts" may distort the human self is an opposition. However, on the other hand, although we perceive the being we construct as human as a whole, it actually continues its life as a symbiotic being. 1/3 of the human body is composed of bacteria and other microorganisms. Already, a significant part of our body is composed of beings that do not belong to us. In addition, it can be said that the history of transhuman goes back to homo-faber. A person who uses a tool is already changing the definition of himself by using it as an extension of himself. It is unclear how

much difference in the context of transhumanism between driving a car, using a smart phone, a smart watch, flying on an airplane, using the internet and online social networks, producing chemical drugs to prolong human life, and building cybernetic parts in the human body.

It is inevitable that the practices of transhumanism will pose very different ethical problems. In particular, the answers to the question of by whom and for what purpose the data to be obtained from the networks to which enhanced human beings will be constantly and completely out of their control will be used are depressing. In addition, cybernetic add-ons will significantly differentiate or even eliminate many social experiences of human beings.

Returning to the business context, it seems inevitable that human beings will “enhance” themselves or be completely excluded from production. This trend has only accelerated or has been consciously accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. The development of remote working technologies is accelerating day by day. Even jobs that require physical strength can now be done remotely. Psychiatrists conduct remote therapy sessions with their patients.

This situation is heading towards the removal of human beings and all human structures from the enterprise. In this context, it seems inevitable that philosophy and organizational politics will cease to be a factor in the future in the context of businesses.

Currently, businesses and business life are already virtualizing human beings and human-related mechanisms. Due to the realization that the current economic system needs a future without people, both organizations and people will become more virtualized. They will be much more simulated.

7. CONCLUSION

Philosophy and politics have been in a relationship throughout history as theoretical reason and practical reason. This relation has sometimes been relatively democratic, and sometimes turned into a relationship of domination. In this context, thinking about the nature of this relationship and the determinants of how human beings are human can form the basis of a historical analysis. In this context, our study first put forward the ability of representation as the most important feature that distinguishes human beings from other living things. This ability can be more clearly expressed as the ability to describe something with something else that has no organic connection to it. It can be said that this is a kind of transcendence of the physical world with the help of language. In addition, it can also be seen as the granting of freedom to phenomena through the re-evaluation of phenomena. It can be said that the bond between human beings and philosophy intersects precisely at this point. This connection can be put forward as the connection between philosophy as a world created by detaching it from reality and freezing meaning, and the human being who reveals his/her existence as a capacity of representation. On the contrary, it can be said that politics has a dynamic connection with reality in the historical process. As a matter of fact, when historical facts are considered, it can be said that in periods of crises

of representation, politics took a more active role in solving the crises by relying on real facts. In this respect, it can be said that politics is more powerful in life than philosophy in terms of establishing itself based on existing facts/realities and the representations of these realities. However, as can be seen in the periods when modern thought was dominant, it is possible to say that philosophy and politics can very well work together in cases where there are no problems with the physical and factual life in the representations of philosophy. But in this regard, we can say that the hand of politics is stronger in the sense that it is not always in favor of representations but leans on factual-physical life. On the contrary, it has been observed in history that a philosophy blended with religion or a similar belief, in the absence of a resistance that would show that factual physical representations are contradictory, has established domination over politics. The best example of this is philosophy dominated by the Church in the Middle Ages. We can say that politics is always on the alert in such cases and, with the first resistance, reveals itself as the destructive tool of this domination. As a matter of fact, the process that brought the end of the Middle Ages was shaken by the contradiction of the physical and factual world with representations and changed its shape with political revolutions. In our study, after presenting the historical process, we have seen that the 21st century is a break in the classical relationship between politics and philosophy. The reason for this can be said to be related to the disappearance of representation, which is the field of conflict in the classical relationship, in this period. In the Baudrillardian sense, a sender required for representations to exist has disappeared in this era. It can be said that the society, which was a sender in the classical conflict in this period, has turned into a mass in this age and the mass is a ball of uncertainty. These masses especially appear as enterprises where today's people spend the largest and most productive part of their lives. Organisations today have rapidly started to be seen as a living superior entity independent of human beings. The churches, kingdoms, empires and nations under which the subjects were gathered in the past have been replaced by enterprises, especially large-scale and global enterprises. For this reason, this age dominated by the mass can be seen as an age of simulative reality dominated by simulations. In other words, it would not be wrong to say that in this age, reality has dissolved and simulations, which are considered more real than reality, exist as trances far from certainty intertwined with each other. We see a similar situation in enterprises and organisations in general. It can be said that the capitalist economy has begun to see human beings and their physical and psychological weaknesses as an important obstacle to the efficiency and profitability of enterprises. For this reason, robots and artificial intelligence applications are rapidly being put into use to de-humanise production. People are forced to choose between being unemployed by succumbing to this tendency or becoming trans-human to improve themselves physically. Nevertheless, we can say that Politics perceived the simulative situation as a reality and harmonized with it. Philosophy, on the other hand, has faded and melted in the face of historicity. In short, we can say that in the age we live in, Philosophy has lost its discursive orthodoxy, while politics continues its existence in the current situation in a similarly simulative manner.

BİBLİYOGRAPHY

- Ağaoğulları, M. A., Köker, L., (2006). İmparatorluktan Tanrı Devletine, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Ağaoğulları, M. A., Köker, L., (2008). Tanrı Devletinden Kral-Devlete, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Barker, E. (1951). St. Augustine's Theory of Society, Essays on Government, Ernest Barker (Editor), Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baudrillard, J., (2005). Anahtar Sözcükler, Oğuz Adanır ve Leyla Yıldırım (çev.), Ankara: Paragraf Yayınevi.
- Baudrillard, J., (2011). Simgesel Değiş Tokuş ve Ölüm, Oğuz Adanır (çev.), İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Baudrillard, J., (2012a). Kusursuz Cinayet, Necmettin Kamil Sevil (çev.), İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınevi.
- Baudrillard, J., (2012b). Neden Her Şey Hala Yok Olup Gitmedi, Oğuz Adanır (çev.), İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Baudrillard, J., (2012c). Kötülüğün Şeffaflığı, Işık Ergüden (çev.), İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınevi.
- Baudrillard, J., (2013). Sessiz Yığınların Gölgesinde: Toplumsalın Sonu, Oğuz Adanır (çev.), Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Baudrillard, J., (2014). Baştan Çıkarma Üzerine, Ayşegül Sönmezay (çev.), İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınevi.
- Baudrillard, J., (2015). Şeytana Satılan Ruh ya da Kötülüğün Egemenliği, Oğuz Adanır (çev.), Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Best, S., Douglas, K., (1996). Postmodern Teori, Mehmet Küçük (çev.), İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınevi.
- Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 18(2), 159-180.
- Demir, G. Y., (2015). Sosyal Bir Fenomen Olarak Dilin Belirsizliği, İstanbul: İthaki Yayınevi.
- Dobson, J. & Helms, E. (2014). Heroic Business "Ethics." *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 33(2/3), 131-146.
- Eco, U., (2009). Avrupa Kültüründe Kusursuz Dil Arayışı, Kemal Atakay (çev.), İstanbul: Literatür.
- Erçelik, P. A., (2014). Marcus Tullius Cicero, Ahu Tunçel ve Kurtul Gülenç (Editörler), Siyaset Felsefesi Tarihi:Platon'dan Zizek'e I.Cilt içinde, Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları, sayfa: 64-79.
- Ferris, G. R. & Hochwarter, W. A. (2011). Organizational politics. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 435-459). American Psychological Association
- Gambetti, Z., (2014). Siyaset Bilimi ve Felsefe, Gökkan Atılğan ve E. Attila Aytekin (hazırlayanlar), Siyaset Bilimi: Kavramlar, İdeolojileri, Disiplinler Arası İlişkiler içinde, İstanbul: Yordam Kitap. Sayfa: 525-539.

- Heidegger, M., (2002). Anlama ve Yorum. Hüsamettin Arslan (Çev. Ve Der.), İnsan Bilimlerine Prolegomena: Dil, Gelenek ve Yorum içinde. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınevi. Sayfa: 307-333.
- Jameson, F., (2013). Dil Hapishanesi Yapısalcılığın ve Rus Biçimciliğinin Eleştirel Öyküsü, Mehmet H. Doğan (Çev.), İstanbul: YKY.
- Kara, M. (2021) “Yeni Medya Televizyon Yayıncılığında Etkileşim: Spor Programları Örneği”, (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi), Maltepe Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Küçükcalp, D., (2011). Siyaset Felsefesi, İstanbul: Say yayınları.
- McCann, D. P. & Brownsberger, M. L. (1990). Management as a social practice: Rethinking business ethics after MacIntyre. *The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics*, 10, 223-245.
- Murphy, J. W., (2000). Postmodern Sosyal Analiz ve Postmodern Eleştiri, Hüsamettin Arslan (çev.), İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınevi.
- Parker, C. P., Dipboye, R. L. & Jackson, S. L. (1995). Perceptions of organizational politics: An investigation of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of management*, 21(5), 891-912.
- Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior: The international journal of industrial, occupational and organizational psychology and behavior*, 20(2), 159-174.
- Russ, J. (2011). Avrupa Düşüncesinin Serüveni: Antik Çağlardan Günümüze Batı Düşüncesi, Özcan Doğan (Çev.), İstanbul: Doğu Batı yayınevi.
- Ryan, M. (1982). Marxism and Deconstruction, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Scholes, R. (1985). Textual Power, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Swetlitz, M. (1995). Julian Huxley and the End of Evolution. *Journal of the History of Biology*, 28(2), 181–217.
- Wood, N. (1991). Cicero's Social and Political Thought, California: University of California Press.