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CHAPTER V

Man, Alienation & Freedom: A Comparative and Critical Analysis of Karl Marx & Jean Paul Sartre

5.1 INTRODUCTION:

This chapter aims at bringing out a comparative analysis of the philosophies of Karl Marx and Jean Paul Sartre. Here we will attempt to analyse the concept of 'man', 'alienation' and 'freedom', as developed by both the philosophers, in the light of their scientific, historical and logical developments. But a question which arises at this point is that how far we are justified to take a comparative, historical and scientific study of Karl Marx and Jean Paul Sartre, when their ways and methods of doing philosophy are quite different besides a long time gap. It is generally accepted by most of the scholars that whereas Marx has developed a scientific theory, Sartre has developed a theory which is purely anti-rational, emotional or we may say psychical in nature. We will discuss the basic features of Marxism and Existentialism under the section 5.3 of this Chapter. As we have already discussed in our Introductory Chapter that according to our methodology in every consistent philosophical system, epistemology, ontology, language, logic and reality are intrinsically related. That means a particular philosophical system either implicitly or explicitly
presupposes a particular epistemological and a corresponding ontological position.

Sartre is silent about his epistemological position and has given much importance on Ontology. By separating ontology from its epistemology, language from reality; subject from its object; Sartre has given a subjectivist turn to his philosophy.

In case of Marx, we will see that ontology and epistemology are intrinsically related. Marx has establishes a dialectical inter-connection between man and man, man, society and nature etc. Thus in our opinion Marx’s philosophy in comparison to Sartre’s philosophy is scientific in nature. These two issues we will bring out under the section 5.3.

The other point, which we will discuss in this chapter is the concept of ‘existence’ or ‘consciousness’. It may be noted here that, this is a fundamental feature in the philosophies of Karl Marx and Jean-Paul Sartre. Sartre in our opinion, misinterpreted the theory of consciousness by using it only in the sphere of consciousness itself. We agree with Sartre’s view that man is a conscious being. But consciousness is not the first essential characteristics of man. Hence in this context we have accepted Karl Marx’s views of man i.e., man is a socio-concrete historical being, in the sense that his consciousness develops inside the society. We will discuss this issue later on in the course of our discussion. The philosophy of existentialism is
irrational in nature. Therefore, 'consciousness' about which the existentialists have talked about is a static phenomena, which has nothing to do with the social reality. We will also discuss Marx's theory of consciousness, which has been developed within a social context, and having its social existence. The main observation of our thesis will be based on what the philosopher is actually doing. We will also discuss how far the concepts used by both these philosophers are applicable in connection with the present social reality.

The other broader perspectives, which we have taken into account in this chapter, are those issues, based on the concept of 'man', 'alienation' and 'freedom'. In this chapter, we have also taken into account certain issues like Rationality, Scientificity, Individuality etc., briefly. We will show how the issues like rationality, individuality and scientificity figure in the writings of modernity and postmodernity under the section 5.2. In this section we will discuss how existentialist position is similar to post modernism in some respect.

And finally in the section 5.3 we will compare the philosophy of Karl Marx and Jean-Paul Sartre taking into account their views on 'Man', 'Alienation' and 'Freedom'.
5.2 MODERNITY VERSUS POST-MODERNITY:

The period of history, which is commonly called modern, are based on many things which differentiate modern from its medieval period. Of these two are most important; i.e., falling of the authority of the church, and the rapid growing of science and technology. During the modern period the realm of power shifted from the church to the state. The democracies or tyrants gradually replaced kings. The first serious irruption of science had taken place with the establishment of Copernican theory in 1543. But this theory had not much importance until Kepler & Galileo improved it in the Seventeenth Century. And it is the diminishing authority of the church that helped to establish the growth of individualism in the society. Until 17th century no important thing has developed in philosophy.

The philosophers like Descartes (1596-1650), Locke (1632-1784), Berkeley (1685-1753) and Hume (1711-1776) along with the Scientists like Galileo and Newton represent the main line of thinking modernism. Individualism along with scientific knowledge and rationality plays a vital role in this movement. This is clearly depicted in the philosophy of Rene Descartes who has established knowledge from the certainty of his own existence, and accepted clearness and distinctness as the criterion of truth. He is also famous for his mind body dualism. It may be mentioned in this
context, as we have already discussed in our introductory chapter, for Locke knowledge is the agreement and disagreement of ideas.

Berkeley in his philosophy has rejected the existence of material substance and accepted the existence of God or spiritual substance. In our opinion, Locke prepared the ground for the development of Berkeley’s Idealistic empiricism. Berkeley has abstracted sensations from the sense organs and declares them to be the only source of the knowledge of the material world. Like Locke and Berkeley, David Hume has presented a systematic account of bourgeoisie views. He attempts to justify capitalism through his political, ethical, ontological and epistemological aspects of philosophy.

Hume, through his epistemology and ontology carries forward Berkeley’s attempt to interpret science in a idealistic framework. Hume believes that knowledge can be possible through ‘impressions’ and ‘ideas’. ‘Impressions’ are derived from sense-experience. We find, Hume’s impression is similar to Sartre’s views on appearance.

In our opinion all these above mentioned philosophers see the subject of knowledge and man as pure-consciousness which is separated from body. Thus, their philosophy does not help man much to interact with other human beings.
In reaction against Hume's agnosticism Kant, Fichte and Hegel have developed a new kind of philosophy. The subjectivistic tendency that begins with Descartes is carried into its extreme form in the philosophies of Kant, Fichte and Hegel.

Science, which has been a chief source of novelty since the seventeenth century has taken a new shape in 19th century. Like Galileo and Newton of the 17th century, Darwin, establishes a remarkable changes in Science in the 19th century.

Darwin's theory has two parts, on the one hand there is doctrine of evolution, where he has discussed, different forms of life have gradually developed from a common ancestry. Darwin is famous for his second part of the theory, which is based on the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. We are not giving a detailed account of Darwin's theory of evolution. In our opinion, like Darwin, Marx has brought similar changes in philosophy. Not only in philosophy but also in almost all social sciences Marx thought played a central role. He has developed the Hegelian Dialectics and for the first time in the history of the world establishes a scientific theory which brings an interconnection between man and man, man and nature, and man & society etc.

Karl Marx, the founder of scientific socialism, who does more than any one else, to establish a society where every one is having equal rights.
There would be no exploitation among the rich and poor. His philosophy is still dominating in the recent history of Europe.

Russell describes, Marx, like Bentham and James Mill has nothing to do with romanticism\(^1\), "it is always his intention to be scientific."\(^2\)

Though Hegelian Dialectics influences Marx, Yet he has interpreted it in different way. For Hegel, wrote Marx, in the preface to the second edition of the first volume of the *Capital* "the thought process (which he actually transforms into "idea") is the demiurge (creator) of the real.... In view of the other hand, the ideal is nothing other than the material when it has been transposed, and translated inside the human head".\(^3\)

Coming back to the early 20\(^{th}\) century we will find another school of philosophy has emerged that is 'Existentialism'.

Existentialism took birth in Europe in the early 20\(^{th}\) century. It is an irrational school of philosophy which rejects all scientific and logical thinking. Kierkeggard (1813-1855), Nietzsche (1844-1900), Heidegger (1889-1976), Albert Camu, Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961), are often treated as the central figures of existentialist philosophy. It is generally agreed, as

\(^1\) Romanticism: A broad movement of thought in philosophy, art, history and political theory, reached at its height in Germany, England and France towards the end of eighteenth century as a reaction against the rationalism and the empiricism of the period of the Enlightenment, Romanticism is best characterized by its idealist celebration of self.


Robert C. Solomon describes, "the beginning of Existentialism is to be found in the 'Untimely' works of Soren Kierkegaard, and that existentialism as a movement – and the philosophy Kierkegaard in particular – is to be distinguished as a radical break with traditional philosophy. Both are distinguished by a "Passionate individualism" an integration of philosophy of life," and "anti rationalism."" Hence, we find, the main thrust of the studies of the above mentioned existentialist philosophers are based on the 'theory of consciousness'. This philosophy separated consciousness from the rest of the world. They also reject scientific, logical thinking as a means of understanding man. Existentialists look at the gloomy side of life and they expound philosophy through such concepts as 'fear', 'anxiety', 'despair', 'loneliness', 'despondency' etc..

Here we would like to say that the postmodern philosophy is quite similar with the philosophy of existentialism.

Some of the general features of postmodernism mark it methodologically different from modernism. But there are certain features of post modernism, which makes it methodologically similar to existentialism.

---

We find dualism is an essential aspect, which is present in most of the modernist schools of thought either explicitly or implicitly. This dualism actually started with Descartes. Postmodernists, particularly Derrida criticizes the dualistic assumption of modern philosophical thought. For them, the reality follows diverse models, which are mutually exclusive and are rich in conflicts. Modernists view history as process of development and objective in nature. But for the post modernists, history is an interpretation, circular and there is a subjective element involved in it. Postmodern philosophy is antirational in nature. Even existentialism is antirational and subjective.

Poststructuralism - a philosophical school under Postmodernism, began as a reaction against Levi Strauss and structuralism. The main figures in this rebellion, are Michel Foucault (b.1926) and Jacques Derrida (1930). Foucault as well as Derrida has rejected the name 'structuralism' and then the 'philosophy'. Derrida is a student of Husserl and Heidegger. He is influenced by Hedeggerian and Husserl's philosophy. Derrida in his Dialogues with Richard Keranly says:

"I am not happy with the term philosopher..... It is true that 'deconstruction' has focused on philosophical texts. And I am of course a 'philosopher' in the institutional sense that I assume the responsibilities of a teacher of philosophy in an official philosophical institution- I Ecole Normale Superieure. But I am not sure that the 'site' of my work, reading philosophical text and posing philosophical texts and posing philosophical questions, is itself properly philosophical. Indeed I have attempted... to find a non-site, non-philosophical
cite, from which to question philosophy. But the search for a non-philosophical attitude."\textsuperscript{5}

Derrida himself has accepted that “My philosophical formation owes much to the thoughts of Hegel, Husserl and Heidegger. Heidegger is probably the most constant influence and particularly his project of ‘Overcoming’ Greek Metaphysics…. My relationship with Heidegger is much more enigmatic and extensive: here my interest was not methodological But existential”.\textsuperscript{6} He further says: "The themes of Heidegger’s questioning always struck me as necessary especially the ‘Ontological difference’. The reading of Platonism and the relationship between language and being.”\textsuperscript{7}

Postmodernism is a philosophy, which has nothing to do with social reality. Like existentialists, postmodernists also observe that all claims about the nature of the world are embodied in language and mediated through a theoretical paradigm. Language is not system of representation rather a finality in itself. Derrida regards ‘deconstruction’ as a critical reading of texts- a reading, which presupposes the dismissal of all notion of truth and insertion of new meaning into it. Derrida criticises the whole history of metaphysics on the ground that it operates through a false


\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p.109.

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., p.109.
conception of language and argues “the so called ‘thing itself’ is always already a representamen shielded from the simplicity of intuitive evidence. The representamen functions only by giving rise to an interpreting that itself, becomes a sign and so on to infinity.”

Hence, for Derrida, a sign for its meaning refers to another sign and so on infinitive and language is non-transcendental in nature.

Postmodernity defies all sorts of definitions, because it is not a given thing or entity. Postmodernists claim it is rather a movement which can be found in a vast field ranging from philosophy to art, architecture, literature, poetry, dance, drama to film. Besides this post-modernity stays away from all definitions and objectification’s and criticises any attempt to capture the truth in propositions. Postmodernity is not a school of thought, which is goal-directed or rule-governed. In this context, Bishop Gregorios writes,

“(Postmodernity) is a ‘Movement’ is an ‘attitude’ or a ‘Mood’, but not a systematic thing where you can develop concepts and relationships, precisely what the postmodernists are against. Any attempt to oversystematize thought by being reduced to any kind of system is to reduce thinking as such. So postmodernism is basically a ‘mood’.

Postmodernity as Jean-Francois Lyotard claims is not a denial of modernism. Rather it is a continuation of modernity. His book *The Postmodern condition: A report on Knowledge* represents the core of

---


postmodern thinking. In this book Lyotard argues that, “The whole idea of postmodernism is perhaps better re-thought under the rubric of rewriting modernity”. In the Postmodernists writings, the issues like sexuality, dream, madness, fantasy, irrationality, hospital, in famy, indeterminacy, etc., occur at the center whereas the concepts like rationality, scientificity occur at the margins. Whereas postmodernity is a movement, post structuralism is a philosophical school among many other schools which come under it. Poststructuralism basically started in France and can be traced to the structuralism of Lacan, Levistruss and Saussure. Post Structuralism also emerged from the philosophies of Neitzsche, Heidegger and Sartre. Post modernity in general always defies any sorts of definition. In this context Paulos Mar Gregorious clearly states, “If you ask any post modernist to say what post modernism is, he is lost. There is no way of defining it.”

We are not going to deal with the postmodernity philosophy in a detailed manner. We have taken postmodernity into consideration to show that a trend which is popular is in the present era, has not succeeded in giving a scientific worldview. Here our intention behind bringing out the Postmodernist’s philosophy is to show that it is an out come of a particular


methodological approach, which not much different from existentialist approach. Both the schools of thought, as we find, have no concern about the real problems faced by individuals in their daily life. Whereas for the postmodernists, any attempt to search the truth beyond the polygemy of literature is metaphysical; similarly the existentialists confine their studies to the sphere of analysing the nature of consciousness. Also the existentialists like the postmodernists have developed their philosophy which has nothing to deal with reason, experience, history etc. Like post modernity the theory of existentialism is text based. There are lots of similarities between existentialism and post modernism, comparing these two, existentialism has a better position. Concepts like 'existence', 'being', 'responsibility', 'condemned', which are used by existentialists can be found in the post modern writing especially in Derrida, who is a central figure of poststructuralist as well as postmodernist movement. Given this situation it may be concluded that existentialism and postmodernism are not only similar types of philosophies but their origin can be trace back to Husserl and Heidegger invariably.

Before we end the discussion on modernity vs post modernity, we would like to say that both these schools (Existentialism as well as post modernism) have not developed a scientific theory. By rejecting rationality historicity, scientificity in their philosophies, they have propagated a subjectivistic and an ahistorical world-view.
Comparing these two schools with Marxism, we will see that Marxism has still relevance even today. It is the only philosophy, which deals with the problems of man that he encounters inside the society. It has developed a scientific world view not only in philosophy but also in almost all social sciences natural sciences.

In our next section 5.3 we will discuss the basic underlying features of Marxism and Existentialism.

5.3 MARXISM VS. EXISTENTIALISM:

In this section we will analyse the basic features of Marxism and of Existentialism with special reference to Karl Marx and Jean-Paul Sartre.

In this complex world of today things keep on changing. Enormous changes have been taken place which affect the very foundation of human existence. Still the class division is an underlying feature of each and every corner of the society, in one form or the other. People are living in a state of oppression, exploitation or we may say that oppression, exploitation, corruption is gradually, increasing day by day in the present day society.

Looking at the conditions of the society we are hopeful to the establishment of New World order in the near future where there would be no exploitation of man by man. In this context Marxism is quite relevant today. Marxism is a committed philosophy in the sense that, throughout its
history it has been inseparably and openly supported the cause of the revolutionary struggle of working class, working people, for their physical, mental, social, intellectual developments. In this connection Prof. Suman Gupta writes, "The socialist revolution, basing itself on the philosophy of Marxism aimed at ending the exploitative society through the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and work for the creation of a new future society in which man would live with dignity and freedom. But the recent collapse of the Soviet Union and the East European socialist regimes has shattered the hopes of a bright world in the near future. A cynical approach has led many people to question the validity of Marxism". She further claims, "...Failure of the first experiment of changing the society does not prove that Marxist philosophy is invalid." In our opinion, Marxist philosophy, whose philosophical basis is dialectical materialism, tries to establish a philosophy where man by interacting with other human beings can transform the nature. The credit goes to Marx the genius man, who far the first time has establishes the role of nature in human life. Alexander Spirkin in his book *Dialectical Materialism* describes, "The philosophy of Marx was a turning-point in the development of world philosophical thought. Its great innovation was to make philosophy into a science, to remould the very purpose of

---


13 Ibid., p.1.
philosophical knowledge, which as it became established not only explained but helped to transform the world. Marxist philosophy, as Lenin put it, has the integrity of something forged out of a single piece of steel. It is a harmonious, consistent system of materialist views on nature, society and the mind, on the general laws of their development.\textsuperscript{14}

Marx has talked of knowledge not in abstraction. In Marx's view all sensation or perception is an interaction between the subject and the object. Marx is the first person to develop the idea that practice is the criterion of truth. He writes:

"The question whether objective gegenstandliche truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question. In practice man must prove the truth, that is, the reality and power, the this sideness Diesseitigkeit of his thinking.... Social life is essentially practical. All mysteries, which misled theory to mysticism, find their rational solution on human practice and in comprehension of this practice.... The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways the point however, is to change it."\textsuperscript{15}


In our opinion, it is indeed true that, to establish the truth of an idea, it is necessary for the human beings to perform certain practical action. Action without practice is meaningless.

According to Dialectical Materialism the objective reality – both natural and social – is not a static phenomena, but is constantly undergoing change. In our opinion, ‘change’ is an essential aspects not only for the development of individual being but for the entire world. Development of a society depends on the change. In conformity with the Dialectical Materialist Methodology the cognition of man is equally dynamic. Lenin writes:

“Dialectics, as understood by Marx, and also in conformity with Hegel, includes what is now called the theory of knowledge, or epistemology, which too, must regard its subject matter historically, studying and generalising the origin and development of knowledge, the transition from non-knowledge to knowledge.”16

The main objective of Karl Marx is to establish a society where all men will have equal rights, and exploitation of man by man can be brought to an end. In Marx, we find, there is a systematic study of ‘man’ and his relation with other fellow beings, his relation with nature and society etc.

16 Lenin, V. I., Selected Works (in three volumes), vol. 1, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970, p.36.
Here we would like to say that Sartre as well as other existentialists have taken man as the center of their study. But Sartre’s discussion of man is limited within the boundary of his consciousness. Consciousness of Sartre is not a social phenomenon. ‘Consciousness’ is the subject matter of both the philosophers of our research, so far as their philosophical study is concerned. But whereas Marx has interpreted it in terms of social existence, Sartre has discussed it in terms of consciousness itself. Let us take some concrete social problems to analyse how far Sartre’s position can be effectively used to find out the solutions. Take for example: a factory worker who is working 20 hours a day, but not getting anything in return according his labour. Or we may take another example of a research scholar, who has already spent six years for his research work, having in the mind that after completion of his study he will get a good job. But at last he actually fails to get a job according to his qualification. To speak honestly, in both the situations Sartre’s notion of consciousness cannot be used to find out the solution. But Marx say that since the problem arises because of a particular social set up the solution can be found in the social sphere not in the sphere of abstract consciousness.

Marx holds that it is the social existence that determines the consciousness. Social conditions play a dominant role in determining both the factors. As far our above example is concerned, both the worker and the research scholar are determined by their social structure.
Before going detail into the discussion regarding the comparative study of Marx and Sartre, it is pertinent to show here that how Marx studied the concepts like ‘man’, ‘alienation’ and ‘freedom’ with reference to the development of the society in terms of its material conditions.

5.3.1 **Historical Materialism as a Part of Marxist Philosophy:**

Both Dialectical Materialism and Historical Materialism studies the laws of Dialectics, namely; The law of the transition of quantitative to qualitative changes, the law of the unity and struggle of opposites and the law of the negation of negation. Both study the law to establish a interrelationship between mater and consciousness on the one hand individual and society on the other. Historical materialsim like dialectical materialsim establishes certain specific laws in the social life of man. And these laws govern the functioning of the development of society. According to A.P.Sheptulin “Whereas dialectical materialism established the laws of interconnection of consciousness and matter in general by offering a solution to the basic question of philosophy, historical materialsim, while dealing with this problem as applied to society, reveals the laws of interconnection between social being and social consciousness, the material and spiritual life of society.”

---

Thus, historical materialism establishes an intrinsic relationship between matter and consciousness. Man and society etc.

The above analysis of Marxism shows that Karl Marx has developed a scientific worldview in the subject matter of philosophy. The method of his philosophy is something abstract to concrete. The significance of Marxism lies in the application of Dialectical Materialism as well as Historical Materialism and its laws. In our opinion, Karl Marx both in his earlier as well as later writings has taken 'man' as a socio-concrete historical being, who encounters with the world faces the problem inside the society and tries to find out the solution by applying his physical and mental capabilities. All he does being a member of society with the help of other human beings.

But in contrast, the existentialist concept of man is a subjective being who always tries to avoid the society. His social relationship develops inside his own consciousness. Being responsible for his action existentialist concept of man always tries to escape himself from the responsibility.

Existentialism is an irrational philosophy, which has grown out of man's attempt to live with utmost moral passion. This school represents a philosophy of man who is involved in life and its problem. "Existentialism", as Ramakant Sinari describes, "postulates no scheme, no
creed no method and no formula. It does not pay need even to the use of words which everybody many endorse...By its very nature, illogical. It approaches human life as one continuous flow of consciousness, struggling, suffering, despairing and tending towards death. It never questions the validity of reason..."18 This philosophy believes in the theory of human existence where man’s consciousness only exists. Where Marxism has visualised men within the social nexus, existentialist concept of man is free from social relations. Neither they have taken into consideration human labour nor human nature.

In our opinion existentialists like postmodernists try to criticise the whole western philosophy. Man for them is purely a subjective being. Here we would like to define existentialist concept of ‘subjectivity’. In our opinion the existentialists have not used the concept of ‘subjectivity’, like the idealists. Neither they have interpreted ‘subjectivity’ like the Dualists, or Phenomenologists, because existentialists denounce reason. When Sartre used ‘consciousness’, he has explicitly stated that it is some thing, which is purely empty. Neither the object nor the self can resides inside it.

The concept ‘consciousness’ has got a very significant use so far the human life is concerned. Here we are using the word abstract taking into consideration the applicability of the concept in day today life of man.

How can we say that a person is conscious without referring to his interaction within the society, and with other fellow beings? How the consciousness of man develop? For this a dialectical interaction between man and man, man and society etc. is essential. For example, If I say, I am having consciousness. and my consciousness has nothing to do with the interaction with other people, than what does it mean? In that case I can not differentiate myself from the animal, who is also having the consciousness. My consciousness and my knowledge of consciousness develop only when I interact with the people. Existentialists reject the role of objectivity, reason, history, in their philosophy. A similar kind of philosophy has been developed by the postmodernist thinkers.

Comparing these two schools of philosophy on the one hand and Marxism on the other hand, we can say that Marxism has brought out a scientific theory so far as human life is concerned. In their book *German Ideology* Marx and Engels wrote:

"The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly inter woven with the material activity and the material inter course of men the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking the mental inter course of man at this stage still appear as the direct efflux of their material behaviours. The same applies to mental production as expressed in the language of the politics, laws, morality, religion. metal physics etc., of
a people. Men are the producers of their conceptions, ideas etc., that is, real active men, as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces of the inter-course corresponding to these, up to its further forms. Consciousness (das Bewusstsein) can never be anything else than conscious being (das be wusste sein), and the being of men is their actual life-process....”

Existentialists, in contrast to Marx and Engels, maintain that human existence is not something that can be analysed and studied objectively, rather it is to be felt, intuited and lived through. And in doing so, to exist is to be free regardless of all circumstances. Marxism on the other hand, maintain that human existence is something that can be analysed and studied objectively as well as subjectively. It is to be felt through human action and practice. And it can be possible through the human labour. Human existence for Marx is a dynamic concept, which is responsible for the transition from ape to men. I.M. Bochenski remarks about the general characteristics of existentialism by saying that: “Existentialism addresses itself to what are today called the existential problems of man- the meaning of life, of death, of suffering, to name but these....” And “the commonest

19 Marx, Karl & Engels. F., German ideology, Moscow : progress publishers, 1976, p.42. (The Manuscript originally had.) man are the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc., and precisely men conditioned by the mode of production of their material life, by their material intercourse and its further development in the social and political structure.

20 Loc. Cit.
characteristics among the various existentialist philosophies of the present
is the fact that they all arise from a so called existential experience....”\textsuperscript{21}

Whereas the existentialists have been taken “ontology” to explain
and examine their philosophy, Marxism on the other hand has taken both
ontological and epistemological issues to explain and examine their
philosophy.

It is generally viewed that the philosophy of 'existentialism' is to be
found in the works of Soren Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard’s philosophy starts
as an anti-rational movement. He has also rejected Hegelian concept of
'Real is rational' and 'Rational is real,'. Kierkegaard’s interest in the
problem of reality is not epistemological or objective rather, reality lies in
the existence of the individual which is by its very nature irrational.
According to him “One would not emphasize existence (or subjectivity)
he claims, with greater forces than I have done.”\textsuperscript{22}

In this context Robert. C.Solomon writes, “Existentialists differ
from other philosophical movements, in their “intense” individualism.”\textsuperscript{23}
Solomon further views that, “common objection to existentialism is its
focus on the gloomy and perverted aspects of human reality: its constant

\textsuperscript{23} Solomon, Robert.C., \textit{From Rationalism to Existentialism}, New York, Evanston London: Harper
talk of dread, anguish, despair, abandonment; its obsession with the question of loneliness, death, and suicide; and its often perverted view of sex, marriage and human institutions in general. Consequently, existentialism often accused of picturing man at his worst, and presenting this degrading portrait as if it were the only possible perspective." 24

To conclude this section we would like to analyse the summary of the above discuss.

From our discussion three things follows i.e.,

Firstly, whereas the "Consciousness" of existentialist thinkers is subjective in nature having no 'ego' and it is the consciousness itself, which presupposes nothing. Marxism on the other hand talked of consciousness in terms of its social background. They explicitly stated that. It is not the consciousness, which determines social existence rather it is the social existence, which determines the consciousness. Secondly, existentialists denounced the rational and scientific aspects of man. Therefore, their concept of man is something irrational, asocial, a historical in nature. They have not given importance to cognition. Rather they believe in an ontological inquiry of a thing. On the other hand Marxism has given importance to rational and scientific aspects of man. Man for Marx is a

24 Ibid., p. 4.
socio-concrete historical being. Marxism believes in the ontological inquiry as well as epistemological inquiry.

Finally, where as existentialist have interpreted every thing in terms of their ontology. Marxism on the other hand believes that in a particular philosophical system logic, language, epistemology, ontology and reality are intrinsically related. We have discussed this issue in our introductory chapter.

In our next section we will anlayse how both the philosopher's of our study has developed the concepts of 'man' alienation and freedom.

5.4. KARL MARX & JEAN PAUL SARTRE

In this section, we will compare and critically analyse the concepts like, 'man', 'alienation' and 'freedom' with reference the views of Karl Marx and Jean Paul Sartre. Before that we would like to give a brief introduction of their early writings out of which their philosophy grew. The ideas set forth in the earlier writings of Karl Marx, i.e. in The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, and Holy Family has also been projected in his later writings i.e A Critique of Political Economy and Capital. In case of Marx a consistent development of thought has taken place. But in case of Sartre, the ideas set forth in his earlier works such as in The Transcendence of the Ego, psychology of Imagination, L’a Nausea, Being and Nothingness (1943), is different from his later works i.e
Critique of Dialectical Reason, Search for a method. Earlier Sartre is said to be a subjectivist where as later Sartre claims to be a follower of Marxism. Whereas in The Being and Nothingness represents an existentialist conception of man, whose 'existence precedes his essence' and in which the individual is absolutely free - free even he is in chairs- is responsible for his action, he is the master of his own fate. But in the Critique of Dialectical Reason a historical materialistic conception of man has taken place. Referring to this point Leo Fretz states that, "... Existentialism is reduce to the status of an enclave within the tenants of Marxism. Evidently, during the of - and after- the second world war, Sartre’s ideas altered to such a degree as to necessitate a radical revision of his anthropological view points."25

Michel Contat and Michel Rybalk has described that the question of a possible "Coupure epistemologique" Epistemological break between Being and Nothingness and the Critique has not yet been decisively settled."26

Sartre during an interview has explicitly rejected such a break. He says.

“I think that there is more continuity in thought. I do not believe that there is a break. There are naturally changes in one’s thinking; one can deviate; one can go from the one extreme to the other; but the idea of a break, an idea from Althusser, seems to me to be mistaken. For example I do not think that there is a break between the early writings of Marx and Capital. Naturally there are changes, but a change is not a break.”

It is true that the ontology which is a hallmark of Sartre’s philosophy comes directly from the philosophy of Hegel. Being and Nothingness of Sartre shows his ontological concerns. In that book Sartre has not given an explicit reference to the Capitalistic modes of production. Neither he has described man in terms of labor nor social relations. In our opinion, earlier Sartrean as well as the later Sartrean position equally reflects Cartesian dualism. In case of Marx, we will see, that the development of dialectics has taken place from his earlier writings to his later writings. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 in our opinion is the first monumental work of Karl Marx, which was written in the year 1844. One of the central problems of this Manuscripts is the problem of “estrangement” or “alienation”.

“Estranged labour” has constituted the initial expression of the future Marxist theory of the appropriation of other by capital. The important ideas of his earlier writings were developed in his later works Capital. In Karl Marx’s Manuscript, 1844, we will find a scientific analysis of the capitalistic mode of production, concept of man, Dialectical interaction between man and man, man and nature and the application of dialectical laws. In this manuscripts Marx has used the traditional terminologies of Hegel and Feuerbach. Marx in his later works (The critique of Political Economy, and in the Capital) takes a ‘commodity’ as the cell of capitalism. Marx, here also puts forward alienated labour as the central concept. He even views private property and division of labour are the causes of alienation. Many brilliant thoughts are to be found in his earlier as well as his later writings. For example, Marx in his Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts has differentiated human activity from the animal activities. Sensation is the basis of human knowledge. Human consciousness passes through a historical, social and cultural process.

Labour also plays a vital role in the process of the evolution of man himself and as well as of the society. Marx observes labour is the source of all wealth. But it is unfortunate that the owners of labour power have not got proper recognition and their due. This tells the plight of the workers, who are responsible for the production are deprived of their products. Citing A Study concerning the living conditions of the workers, George
Novack writes, "an entire school of contemporary American sociologists, headed by David Reisman, has based its analysis of the condition of men in "the mass society" on the fact that the average person is bored and depressed by the drudgery of his work in factory or office and finds satisfaction for his individual needs in leisure hours\textsuperscript{28}. A similar survey conducted by me and by my friends regarding the living and working conditions of the factory workers under Noida region, New Delhi. It was a project undertaken by the Centre for women's development studies, carried out in the shoe manufacturing factory in Noida from 31\textsuperscript{st} Nove, 1997 to 31\textsuperscript{st} December 1997. We find the living and working conditions of all workers is to be miserable. The factory owners are not only exploiting the workers, they are also torturing them physically. Even the women workers are also not spared. Neither they are living in a proper hygienic condition nor the amount which they are earning is sufficient for their livelihood. So working in this type of conditions does no more give pleasure to the worker. As Marx described:

"Labour is external to the worker, i.e., it does belong to his intrinsic nature; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The

\textsuperscript{28} Novack, George., \textit{the problem of Alienation"}, \textit{Great western political thinkers : karl Heinrich marx}, (ed) by subrata Mukherjee and Sushila Ramaswamy New delhi : Deep & Deep publications, p.366.
worker therefore only feels himself. ... He feels at home when he is not working and when he is working he does not feel at home. His labour is therefore not voluntary, but coerced; it is forced labour it is therefore not the satisfaction of need... Labour is shunned like the plague."

The concept of labour discussed by Marx’s earlier writings has been developed in a full detailed manner in his later writings.

The young Marx, with the influence of Hegel and Feuerbach, analysed capitalist relations by counter posing what is dehumanized to what is truly human.

The later Marx, interprets it in terms of class oppositions. The most important discovery of Karl Marx in his book Capital, is the discovery of the two fold character of labour. Firstly the concrete labour which produces the ‘use value’ and secondly, the abstract labour which produces ‘exchange value’. Chief contribution of Marx, to the science of political economy lies in his explanation of the nature of commodities the source of value and power of money. These two kinds of labour assert decisive place in his analysis.

Whereas Marx in his earlier as well as later writings has taken man as a concrete being, Sartre in his earlier as well as later writings has

---

interpreted man as a subjective being. In his book *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre interprets consciousness or human reality as opposed to and outside the opaqueness of being. It is characterized not by the fullness of being but by its emptiness, the lack of being-nothingness. It is its own nothingness. It is not actuality but possibility, not soliablity but translucidity. As such human reality is free. Freedom constitutes its very being, its ontological structure. In the *Critique* Sartre has change his position in favour of a materialistic monism. He says:

"... the only monism which *starts with the human world* and which situates men in *Nature is the monism of materiality. It alone is a realism.*"\(^{30}\) Sartre in the *Being and Nothingness* proposed that his ontology avoids both "idealism" and "realism". But later in his *Critique* it seems that he has taken "realism" to be granted in developing his philosophy. Sartre rejects Marx's Dialectical materialism." The term he uses in his *Critique is "Realistic Materialism"* which according to Hezel É. Barnes, is a disguised idealism for Sartre.

*Sartre says:*

"There is a materialistic idealism which is actually only a discourse on the idea of matter; its true opposite is realistic materialism, the thought of a human being *situated* in the world and acted upon by all the cosmic


forces, one which speaks of the material universe as something which is
revealed gradually through a praxis in situation."^{32}

Although Sartre claims that in his later writings *Critique of Dialectical Reason* he has taken the concept of man like Marxism, but in our opinion, he has not done so actually. One can observe that even in the *Critique of Dialectical Reason* his phenomenological existentialist position is still retained. His position, in our view, is similar to idealistic position. Mc, Bride and Hazel E. Barnes also claims the position of Sartre as Idealist.\(^{33}\)

In our next section 5.4.1 we will analyse and give a comparative account of the concepts of 'man', 'alienation' and 'freedom'.


\(^{33}\) Hazel, E. Barnes claims: "Sartre's view of consciousness as free, transducers process of nation has seemed to set man apart from the world of nature, ... human reality cannot be made the proper object of purely scientific study. His insistence that man's self consciousness demands that we assign to him a special region of being, being for itself...", "Sartre as Materialist", *The Library of Living Philosophers*, (ed.) by Paul Arthur Schillip La Salie, Illinois: open court publishing company 1991, p.662. Mc bride has concluded that Sartre is "A materialist in terms of the traditional philosophical controversy among idealist, dualists, and materialists." Mc bride, however, does not think about he consequences of his assertion. He wrote, "Sartre an man... is material, and as a substance, nothing else can be said about him, but this just what it is not important to say about him". "Man, Freedom, and Praxis", Existential philosophies: Kierkegaard to Merleau Ponty, (ed.) by George Alfred Schrader, Jr. (New York).
5.4.1 'Man', “Alienation” and “Freedom”: A comparative study of Karl Marx & Jean-Paul Sartre:

In this section we will analyse and bring out a comparative account the concepts like 'man', alienation and freedom as developed by Marx and Sartre. We will also analyse, in what respect their views are similar and in what respect they are different. As we have discussed in our introductory chapter that our aim is to establish what the philosopher is actually doing. And when we say these two philosophers have certain commonalities and similarities that does not mean that they have identical views.

The affinities lie in both Karl Marx and Jean-Paul Sartre that the concept of 'man' is the center of the study of both the philosophers. In other words, 'Man' is at the center of both the philosopher's philosophy. Where as Marx has given a dialectical interpretation of the concept man Sartre has given a subjective interpretation to it.

In our opinion 'man', alienation' and 'freedom' are three central issues so far as human life is concerned. It is not that Marx and Sartre are the only philosopher who developed these concepts. Long before these concepts were there. And debate and discussion or still going on this issues starting from the psychologist, scientists, social scientist including the philosophers every one tries to interpret the concept 'Man', 'alienation' and 'freedom' in their own way. So what is important is not to define a concept
rather to see the use value of a concept and how far its applicability is relevant for human life? We will discuss this issues taking Karl Marx and Jean-Paul Sartre’s account into consideration.

Firstly, in what way we can define man? What man exactly is? And what is man is a psychological being having consciousness. His behaviour is determined by his consciousness. Scientists Will interprets man as biological being. Idealists will interpreters man as a spiritual being and tries to reduce human essence to the spiritual principle. Christian theology will describe the concept man as the “image and likeness of God.” According to Vedanta, the specific principle of human being is it man or Brahman man is identified with the universal spiritual principle Brahman.

The ancient Greeks, Aristotle, for example has defined ‘man as socila being’ mendolved with a ‘reasoning soul’.

Christianity defines the concept of man in term of the image and likeness of god.

The age of Renaissance is totally inspired by the idea of human autonomy and mans creative abilities. Descartes who is said to be the father of modern philosophy explains the concept of man in terms. Of reason or rationality. Reason is basic feature of man. For him mind and body are two
independent entities. Feverbach develops an anthropological re-orientation of philosophy centering it an man.

Existentialists defines 'man' in terms of its existence. They believe man is an existent being which can not be reduced to any essence biological, psychological and social. Even for Sartre, Man is a pure conscious being. Sartre has explicitly stated man in terms of its existence, consciousness and nothingness. Sartre as well as other existentialist have a believe that just as two individuals are never entirely alike two temporal phases of the same existing individual can never happen to overlap each other. For them man is not ration rather irrationality is an essential quality of man. Sartre’s concept of man is not an objective being where the particle life activities of man taken place and within which his social relations develop, is a conscious being where and his consciousness only exists. Whereas Sartre has given a subjective interpretation to the concept 'man', Marx of the concept 'man'.

The point of departure of the Karl Marx’s understanding of man from Sartre and all other philosophers (1 dualists, existentialist, empiricists etc.) is 'the human being as the product and subject of labour. For the first time Marx has explained the concept 'man' in terms of its social relations through the application of his dialectics. As we have already said in our chapter 1 that for Marx can is an ensemble of social relations. Man is in
intrinsically related with society, nature and other fellow being. Man through his application of labour also transforms the nature. Marx also said.

"History does nothing, it 'possess no immense with', it 'wages no battles'. It is man, real living man who does all that, who possess and fights; history is not as it were, a person a part, using man as a means to achieve its own aims; history is nothing but the activity of man pursuing his position." 34

Thus is our opinion Marx has given a true picture of man whereas:

Sartre fails to do so. Sartre's concept of man is similar to idealist interpretation of man's consciousness because of he has reprinted matter as the basis of consciousness.

Secondly, both Marx and Sartre has interpreted the term consciousness in their philosophy. Sartre's philosophy is based on 'consciousness so sometimes. Marx has criticised by then philosophers for not given a description of the independent nature of consciousness.

The question arises here is that what is the nature of consciousness and how it develops? In this regard Sartre will say the nature of

consciousness is subjective in nature. Consciousness is consciousness of something. This means Sartre has accepted the Husserlian nature of consciousness. And consciousness for Sartre is intentional. It has nothing to deal with social reality and other individual being. His consciousness is in our opinion is limited with 'I' which is free from ego. Sartre’s consciousness is something like Lockean that mind is a tabula rasa, (Here we have taken only the meaning of ‘tabul rasa’ not the philosophy of locke). Marx has given a different kind of interpretation which we have already said before. Again we would like to discuss it here in the context of Sartre. For Marx, the development of consciousness will possible being a member of the society and by interacting with other human beings. Consciousness is not nothingness like Sartre, rather it has its social, cultural, political and intellectual basis. According to Marx, Consciousness is the highest form of reflection. Reflection may be defined as the abilities of bodies to defined as the abilities of body as to reflect internally the abilities of bodies to reflect internally the properties of other bodies acting upon the."

Prof. Suman gupta describes, “reflection is possible only when the objective reality is causally interconnected, that is the various aspects of reality, inter penetrate into one another.”

Thus, in our opinion where as

---


Sartre has talked of individual consciousness; Marx has talked of Social and Dialectical consciousness.

3rdly where as Marx has explicitly defined man is a part of nature. And being a part of nature man trough his emissions effort can able to transform the objective reality. Man involves in the process of production for which he enters into social relation. To perform all this activities man needs labor. Hence, Marx in his philosophy has also applied the use value and exchange value of labor in terms of labour power. Where as Sartre in his philosophy neither has described the relationship of man with nature nor he has mentioned the role of labour. Here we would like to describe Sartre’s view regarding Marxism Sartre has written the article "Materialism and Revolution," in the year 1946. It is said that, in this article, Sartre has rejected all sorts of materialism and in his book search for a method he accepts Marxism as the true philosophy. Hazel. E. Barnes describes, “Sartre in 1946 claimed that Marxist implicitly offer a metaphysics when they reduced mind to matter and make of man, the of objects linked by universal relationships. Yet they deny that their theory rests upon metaphysical principles and reject all metaphysical principles and reject all metaphysics as idealist mystification. Instead, they lay claim
to a truth based on the observation of nature as it really is." Sartre quotes Marx: "The materialist conception of the world means simply the conception of nature as it is with. No extraneous addition." Sartre claims that the materialist first denies all subjectivity by proclaiming all human being as merely an object of nature on the same level as any other object constitutes the subject matter of science. This logical inconsistently turn materialist into irrationalist.

Sartre also claims that the validity of Lenin’s view of the relation between consciousness and being is also based on idealist philosophy. Lenin said of consciousness, It is only best of circumstances an approximately exact reflection." Sartre has most serious objection to dialectical materialism of that. He killed dialectic twice in order to be sure of its death,. The first time by claiming to discover it in Nature the seemed time by suppressing it in society...."

In our opinion, all these charges leveled against Marxism, according to Sartre is false. Marxism has never reduced mind to matter though they are giving primary importance to matter, rather it tries to establish a dialectical link between mind and matter. When it tries to interpret

---


40 Ibid., p. 143.

41 Ibid., p. 670.
everything in terms of matter, Marx has in the mind the liberation of the oppressive classes. So Marx's philosophy centers on the concept man first than the matter Marxism has not developed a idealistic philosophy.

Sartre's criticism of man and nature relationship is also false. Rather Sartre's philosophy has full of inconsistencies starting from his earlier writing to latter writings. To substantiate our position what Sorts of inconsistencies lies in Sartre's philosophy we would like quote:

"The only monism which Starts with the human world, and which situates man in nature, is the monism of material one resists the purely theological temptation to contemplate nature with no extraneous addition; it alone makes of man neither a molecular dispersion nor a being apart; it alone defines him first of all by his praxis in the general environment of animal life; it alone is able to encompass those two equally true and contradictory assertions in the universe, every existence is material, in the world of man everything is human." 42

Pure matter, he observes, exists for us solely as an abstraction. 43

In our opinion Sartre has misinterpreted Marxism. Though he claims that in his later writings his philosophy accepts

42 Ibid., p. 248.
43 Ibid., p. 247
Marxism in our opinion, in his later writing is still a continuation of his earlier writing. The same existentialist position is still retained there.

Fourthly, where as Marx in his philosophy of man, alienation and freedom has given importance to the role of history, Sartre on the other hand has ruled out the possibilities of history as a forward march to achieve something. Sartre has described the supreme paradox historical materialism as "the totalizing thought of historical materialism as "the totalizing though of historical materialism ahs established everything excepts its own existence." Marx starts from history taking total human being into account where as Sartre starts with individual consciousness neglecting the role of history in human life. In our opinion existentialist position is similar to post modernist position. Unlike post-modernist philosophy Sartre's philosophy is also text based. If we go out of the exit we will find nothing. Has described in his book Dialectics of nature and we have already discussed it i.e., Transition of Ape to Man. History is moving towards a more human social order.

Fiftly, both Marx and Sartre has talked of man is a being of praxis. In case of Marx this refers to free, conscious, self-creative activity (labour) by which he makes and changes his social environment. Praxis, for Sartre is more emphasis is on the act of knowing than of doing something. In his

---

later writing he claims he has given weightage to doing also. It includes need project and transcendence.

Sixthly both Marx and Sartre have talked of human alienation. But whereas alienation, for Marx, is a concrete issue which arise but of exploitation of man by man, for Sartre, it is the alienation of self-consciousness which arise out of the presence of others inside the society. Sartre in his earlier writings has explicitly stated that even "the look" of other is a threat to my subjectivity because of which, I feel alienated of myself. The existence of others is a necessary condition of my alienation.

Marx talked of alienation in terms of man. Alienation for Marx has a definite socio-historical context. Alienation is a worst phenomena in a capitalistic society than any other less advanced society. The worker gets alienated from the process of his work, from the product of his nature, from the species being and from himself. Thus, for Mark economic alienation is the major alienation which gives rise to other alienation. Marx has also said that in a capitalistic society, private property and the division of labour are the two causes, which responsible for the alienation of man form man etc.

Sartre, in his later writings said that, alienation is the condition of man in which free praxis is taken over and controlled by other participation is accompanied by alienation because the things produced by praxis
confront men with their power. Sartre asserts that alienation born of human praxis is capable of being suppressed by that praxis.

Comparing these two views we will see that Marx’s analysis of alienation is more profound, and deeper than Sartre. Marx has taken in alienation socio-political situation and the concrete problem of man, facing inside a capitalistic society. Where as Sartre’s concept of alienation has nothing to do with society and human being in general. Therefore, his concept of alienation is an abstract concept.

Both Marx and Sartre have talked of freedom. Freedom is a central issue in the entire philosophy of Sartre. Where freedom of Sartre is limited within the sphere of consciousness, nothingness Marx’s concept of freedom is restricted by social necessities. For Sartre, ‘man’ regardless of all the circumstance is freed. In other words, man for Sartre is absolutely free. His freedom cannot be restricted by society. Choice and responsibilities are involved in Sartre’s concept of freedom. Where as Sartre has talked of the individual freedom. Marx has talked of freedom of the whole society.

For Marx freedom is the basic appreciation of human necessities. He doesn't talk of absolute freedom. Marx calls freedom as the essence of man. Marx regards free, creative activity as species character of man, which differentiates him from animal's capitalistic society, curtails freedom of the
majority of the people. Marx's concepts of freedom will not possible so long as bourgeois are not changed their positions so long as private property and division of labour is there.

Freedom for Sartre is onto logical in nature. For Marx, it is the species character of man. Freedom in Marx view depends on the extent of human kind's domination over nature and the degree of rational, conscious control over social relations.

Thus in our opinion Marx concept of freedom is prevailing inside the society. And it is the true freedom Sartre has used the concept freedom which is abstract and cannot be possible where majority of people are dying without food, the society where child labour, and exploitation of rich section to the poor section is there. Freedom should not be limited within the sphere of conscious activity, choice responsibility. In our opinion Sartre's concept of freedom has lost its meaning because of its use and applicability within the sphere of consciousness and denying the social and objective reality.

Comparing the two eminent philosophers we will see that the philosophy of Karl Marx has much more developed and which has a scientific basis so far as human life is concerned. Sartre's philosophical works in our opinion limited within the sphere of his textual work. Both the philosophers have rejected the existence of spiritual reality. Man, alienation and freedom are
the major concern of both the philosophers. But where as in Marx there three terms are closely associated with each other through the application of their dialectical laws, or Sartre there three are identical concept and the argument of Sartre is circular in nature. Marx has criticized by the idealistic and existentialist thinker in defining the concept of freedom, man and alienation.

Most of them criticized Marx by saying that his earlier writings are nothing but the development of Hegelian philosophy the Sartre Sartre’s concept of freedom alienation has nothing to deal with the society. These concepts are its meaning because of their use. Sartre’s opinion towards other is also a very negative one. In his play no exist he has used the term “Hell is the other people” and in the being and nothingness. He said, “Men is a use less passion”. Thus, in our opinion the concepts man, alienation, and freedom used by Sartre is idealistic one. His philosophy still retains the poison of Cartesian dualism.

To conclude we can say that Sartre’s man consciousness, freedom will be meaningful if he will take social reality into consideration. And if their concepts will crippled I the day to day life of man.

Inspite of the criticism, in our opinion Marx is the towering, eminent figure still today. Marx is the genius who for the first time has developed a scientific philosophy where not the consciousness of man is important rather socio-concrete consciousness is important. In our opinion Marxism and its philosophy is relevant still today.
CONCLUSION

The Primary concern of our thesis was to compare and critically analyse the concepts like man, alienation and freedom; as propounded by Karl Marx and Jean Paul Sartre. We found, though there are lots of differences between Marx and Sartre on these issues, yet these concepts constitute the centre of their writings. Or in other words, though the two-philosophers approach the same problem, yet their analysis through light almost different angles because of their adoption of different methodological tools. Therefore, their comparative study was undertaken to bring new dimensions on the relationship between individual and society and the notion of alienation.

The main difference, as far our study goes, lies in the fact that, whereas Marx's conception of Man, Alienation and Freedom are intrinsically related with the history of development of society, Economic and Natural necessities, and a conception of Man as a socio-historico-concrete-Being; for Sartre man is a pure conscious being, whose existence does not involve social process. Again consciousness for Sartre has nothing substantial, it is something which is clearly empty. Neither the object nor the self can reside in it.

Our study started with a brief analysis of the concepts like Man, Alienation and Freedom showing how vigorously these issues had been
debated by ancient and modern thinkers, starting from Greek philosophy till present day. The questions like what is man, what is man's ultimate destiny, whether or not man can control his own destiny, have been a matter of discussion from Ancient Greek Philosophy to till date. That means in each phase of history, these questions have been raised in different manners with the changing socio-economic conditions. Our study focussed mainly on the contribution of Karl Marx and Jean Paul Sartre for understanding of the problem on these issues.

Our discussion of Marx's views brought out basic components of his concept of man. Marx undertakes full analysis of socio economic structure of capitalist society to find out the causes of alienation and ways of overcoming them.

We adopted Dialectico-historical methodology to bring out the implicit assumptions of the above mentioned thinkers of our study, to have an effective comparative study of them. We not only analysed and compared their concepts but attempted to trace their historical background to show how these types of philosophies developed and how far they are effective in solving concrete social problems.

Our methodology also enabled us to trace the development of both the philosophies from their predecessors. As a part of it we found that Marx's method is itself historical because his philosophy is a historical
account of the development of the society and evolution of nature. In this
case we discussed in the relevant sections in our thesis that Marx's
philosophy was developed on the philosophies of Hegel, Feuerbach,
Proudhan, and Adam Smith etc. through the process of negation of
negation.

Similarly we discussed, how Sartre's philosophy owe a lot for its
development to the Philosophies of Husserl, Heidegger, Jaspers, Marcel,
Albert Camus. We saw though Sartre was influenced by Hegel, Marx,
Husserl and Heidegger, yet as a Cartesian, he never deviated from
Descartes's aspect of human consciousness which is taken as free and
distinct from the physical universe in which it inhabits. We discussed that
Sartre as a student was fascinated by Husserl's new philosophical method,
*Phenomenology*. His first essays were direct responses to Husserl and his
applications of phenomenological method. In the *Transcendence of the Ego*
(1937) he reconsidered Husserl's central idea of a "phenomenological
reduction" (The idea of examining the essential structures of consciousness
as such) and argued (following Heidegger) that one cannot examine
consciousness without at the same time, recognizing the reality of actual
objects in the world. In other words, there can be no reduction.

In the *Transcendence of the Ego* Sartre also reconsiders the notion of
the self, which Husserl (and so many earlier philosophers) had identified
with consciousness. But the self, Sartre argues, is not 'in’ consciousness, much less identical to it. The self out there “in the world, like the self of another.”

As far our study on Marx is concerned we find, the central epitome of Marxism is vested with the concept of man and his relations with other human beings inside the society. We discussed how Karl Marx’s notion of man presupposes his relationship with nature and the historical development of society. His freedom is not conditioned by free will rather it depends upon the necessities of natural and social laws. The first step towards freedom was achieved when man produced his ‘Means of subsistence’. So the process of production, we observed in the context of Marx, is the first achievement in the direction of differentiating man from the animal.

We found that Karl Marx’s notion of man, freedom and alienation are intrinsically related with his conception of Nature, Social evolution and the economic base of the society. Marx observes that Man is a part of nature, hence he is limited by and dependent upon it.

Our observation was that, for Marx, both the natural and social realities have some laws, which refers to the inner connection of things. Man can control natural and bring changes in social sphere, if and only if, he correctly understands the inherent objective conditions of Natural and Social reality. Hence, for Marx knowledge lies in the understanding of the
causes behind the appearances. He recognised the inner governing principles of social and natural reality as the causal laws of historical necessity. The other point which we noticed, in the context of Marxism, is that rigid social and natural laws operate independent of our will and consciousness, hence the knowledge of these necessities actually leads to freedom. We also discussed, Marxian freedom consists in the possibility of de-alienated labour in a truly free society.

Marx's notion of man and freedom is completely different from the idealistic conception of the same. In the thesis we discussed that for the idealists, freedom lies in the recognition of free will. Whereas, Marx gives a scientific and objective explanation of freedom, with reference to the natural, social and political conditions of man's actual existence. Hence, we found, all the conceptions of freedom which are not rooted in the history and moral struggle of man and which came to bestow freedom on men without giving all men the power to master natural and social relations are empty and abstract concepts, for Marx. Hence, freedom and necessity are not two incompatible notions, but freedom is obtained by the knowledge of the necessity of natural and social reality.

We revealed that for Marx the first step for freedom began when man controlled nature. The other important step, by which man differentiated
himself from animals is, when he began to produce the means of his subsistence.

As our study revealed, production of material life occupies such an important part of Marx’s conception of man and freedom that he traces its history from the inception of mankind. Even he writes that it is because of the ability to produce the requirements of subsistence man distinguishes himself from animals. We found, the uniqueness of Marxian conception of history lies in the assertion that the ultimate determining element in history is the production of real life.

In the *German ideology*, Marx and Engels asserts that their views of history are based on the observation and exact description of actual conditions.

Marx’s idea of evolution of society and stages of freedom are determined by the material conditions of Society in which production process plays a vital role. That’s why Marx’s theory is known as Historical materialism meaning there by the materialistic interpretation of history. The economic structure of society determines the legal and political superstructure of society.

In our thesis, we observed that Marx’s conception of man, alienation and freedom is intrinsically related with the historical development of society. Hence we extensively traced the evolution of society showing its
different stages in terms of the changes in the material conditions of society to draw a perfect picture of Marxian philosophy.

As we observed, Marx identified four stages of the history of the development of society. He remarked there has been exploitation of one class by the other in each stage of the society except primitive communism.

We discussed how the material conditions of the society like the modes of production, relations of production and forces of production are dialectically interrelated. Again the transition from one stage of the society to another takes place because of the changes in the material conditions of the society like forces of production. We found how this change subsequently brings changes in the nature of class struggle and the strive for freedom.

We observed there is a dialectical interrelationship between the material conditions of society like the forces of production, relation of production and modes of production. Forces of production mean the ways in which production is done. According to Marx, the forces of production shape the nature of the 'relations of production. These are, in fact, the social relations found in production i.e. economic roles e.g., Labourer, Landowner, Capitalist etc. Whereas the mode of production refers to the general economic institutions i.e. the particular manner in which people produce and distribute the means that sustain life. The forces of production
and the relations of production together define the mode of production, e.g., Capitalistic mode of production, Feudal mode of production, etc.

We noticed, in every social order there is a continuous change in the material forces of production. Productive forces have an intrinsic tendency to develop, as human beings knowledge and mastery over nature increase. As these forces develop, successive social relations of production develop and consequently give way. At a particular point of development the productive forces and the production relations enter into conflict: the latter being unstable to contain the former society then enters into a period of revolution. The contradiction between the forces and relations of production accounts for history existing as a succession of modes of production. The contradiction leads to the necessary decline of one mode and its replacement by another.

We remarked Marx’s conception of man, alienation and freedom is essentially related with his account of the historical development of society. That is why we traced the whole history of the development of society in order to show what was the position of man with reference to his freedom and alienation in different stages of the development of society.

The other aspect of the Marxian Philosophy, which formed the substantial part of our discussion, is the concept of ‘Labour’. Marx holds that labour is the only means by which the worker expresses himself.
Engels attributes the evolution of mankind as a part played by Labour. He observed, as we noticed, Labour is the prime basic condition for all human existence, even he argues that labour created man. Marx analyses the role of labour in the process of production and as a source of wealth—next to nature. Nature supplies the material that labour converts into wealth. We also discussed, as Marx analysed, though labour is a source of wealth but it has become a means of 'alienation' in the class divided society. Marx viewed the 'objectification of Labour' has brought no benefit to the owners of the labour power. When the worker does not get the due price of his labour and the product of his labour is detached from him it result in the 'alienation of labour'. Marx sees, as we discussed, there are different forms alienation like 'alienation from nature' alienation from himself', alienation from the fellow beings. Marx view was that only in a classes socialistic society where labour gets its due price, alienation can be prevented.

We devoted two chapters namely Sartre's Alienation and Individual Authenticity and Concept of Freedom in Sartre, exclusively to discuss his views on Man, Alienation and Freedom.

---

1 Please Refer, Engels, Frederic, "The part played by Labour in the transition from ape to man" Selected Works, progress publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp.66-67. Here Engels analyses the vital role of labour and the production of tools in forming the human physical type and in creating human society; he shows how, as a result of long historical process, the ape was transformed into a qualitatively new being—man.
We find, Existentialists, in contrast to Marx and Engels, maintain that human existence is not something that can be analysed and studied objectively, rather it can be felt, intuited and lived through. And in doing so, to exist is to be free regardless of all circumstance.

Man, Alienation and freedom are the central issues of Sartre so far as his philosophy is concerned. Our research analysis shows that Sartre has explicitly stated that consciousness is something which is clearly empty. Neither the object nor the self can reside in it. Freedom, nothingness, existence, these are the attributes of man. Sartre has used this concept interchangeably in the sense that these are identical terms in his philosophy. The best way to explain his philosophy in terms of this equation, i.e. man is equal to Freedom is equal to existence is equal to nothingness and nothingness is equal to consciousness. For Sartre, man is not a social being. Neither Sartre has talked of man in terms of social interaction nor in terms of labour. Sartre’s philosophy presupposes that man’s existence precedes essence. Man has nothing to do with social production. His concept of man as an individual consciousness is free from social interaction. Sartre has never defined the use of consciousness. Consciousness of Sartre is free from the self or ego. Consciousness is something, which is selfless.
We observed the nature of consciousness is pre-reflective for Sartre. That means consciousness is always there and man is unaware of itself. Consciousness, freedom, existence are inborn quality of man. There is ‘I’ in pre-reflective consciousness. Sartre’s philosophy is more individualistic in nature. Man makes his world, society, his values by himself.

Sartre refuted the notion of humanistic individualism in La Nausea. His rejection of Husserl’s notion of transcendental ego and self, makes his consciousness a pure empty concept. In Being and Nothingness Sartre refused to accept any socialistic human nature. And in the Critique of Dialectical reason his “Man does not exist”. His rejection of ‘ego’ and self-shows that Sartre’s consciousness involves self nor ego inside in it. Self is an imaginary concept, which exists outside consciousness. We discussed, Sartre has given ‘ego’ the status ensoi which is a determined being. He claimed that it is not a being. Sartre’s consciousness is not a dynamic phenomena rather it is a static thing.

The separation of self and consciousness and the rejection of the self as simply self consciousness constitute the basic thrust of Sartre’s greatest philosophical treatise. L’etre et le neant (Being and Nothingness, 1943). For Sartre, conscious (Being-for-itself or Pour Soi) on the one side and the existence of mere things (Being-in-itself or en soi) on the other is unabashedly Cartesian in nature. But Sartre did not accept Cartesian
position of designating these two types of being as separate Substances instead, Sartre described consciousness as “nothing” – “not a thing” but an activity.

We find, for Sartre, it is through the nothingness of consciousness and its activities that negation comes into the world. And because consciousness is nothingness, it is not subject to the rules of Causality. In the Being and Nothingness Sartre insisted on the primacy of human freedom is there because consciousness cannot be understood in causal terms. It is always self determining, and as such, “it always is what it is not, and is not what it is” – a paradox Sartre used to refers to the fact that we are always in the process of choosing.

Another important concept, we discussed in the context of Sartre is ‘Bad faith’. Sartre viewed that it arises because we erroneously fixe and settle ourselves as something. But, Sartre also observed that it is also Bad-faith to view one-self as a being of infinite possibilities and ignore the always restrictive and circumstances within which all choices must be made. One the one hand, we are always trying to define ourselves; on the other hand we are always free to break away from what we are, and always responsible for what we have made of ourselves. But there is no easy resolution or “balance” between facticity and freedom, rather a kind
of dialectic or tension. The result in our frustrated desire to be god, to be both-in itself and for- itself.

We find, for Sartre, there is a third basic ontological category, on a par with the being in itself and being for itself and not derivative of them. He calls it being for others.

In his later works, notably his *Critique of Dialectical reason* (1958-59), Sartre turned towards a defense of Marxism on existentialist principles. But our observation was that the fundamental essence of latter Sartre is not Categorically different from the earlier Sartre, though he turns towards Marxism in the *Critique*. Thus in his later work he struggled to find a way of overcoming the conflict and insularity or the rather "bourgeois" consciousness he had described in *Being and Nothingness*.

When the Existentialists, maintain that human existence is not something that can be analysed and studied objectively, rather it is to be felt, Marxism on the other hand, maintains that human existence is something that can be analysed and studied objectively as well as subjectively. It is to be felt through human action and practice. And it can be possible through the human labour.

Our chapter on the comparison shows that the existentialists denounced the rational and scientific aspects of man. Therefore, their concept of man is something irrational, asocial, and ahistorical in nature.
They have not given importance to cognition. Rather they believe in an ontological inquiry of a thing. On the other hand Marxism has given importance to rational and scientific aspects of man. Man for Marx is a socio-concrete historical being. Marxism believes in the ontological inquiry as well as epistemological inquiry.

Secondly, whereas existentialist have interpreted every thing in terms of their ontology. Marxism on the other hand believes that in a particular philosophical system logic, language, epistemology, ontology and reality are intrinsically related. So our observation was that Marxism as philosophy is was holistic in nature, whereas Existentialism is an abstract Philosophy.

Thirdly, the “Consciousness” of existentialist thinkers is subjective in nature having no ‘ego’ and it is the consciousness itself, which presupposes nothing. Marxism on the other hand talked of consciousness in terms of its social background and with reference to the evolution of mankind. It is not the consciousness, which determines social existence rather it, is the social existence which determines the consciousness.

And finally, when for Marx alienation is an outcome of a particular social set up, where the worker does not get his due share; for Sartre alienation arises, ‘when I apprehend the other’s look… I experience a subtle alienation’. This shows the methodological gap between Marx and Sartre,
whereas the former is deals with the issues historically and objectively the latter is concerned with abstract and non-objective way of treating the problems. So, when Marxism as a philosophy, has social applicability, Sartre's philosophy (Being and Nothingness) can only be attributed that it is a masterpiece of literary work.