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CHAPTER - I
ALIENATION IN KARL MARX

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

'Alienation' is one of the greatest problems, which is confronting us even today. The concept has gained its popularity in current appraisals of man's situation inside the society. These appraisals widely refer to the writings of Karl Marx where 'alienation' (Entfremdung) has taken the central place.

In this chapter we would like to discuss the issues concerning 'alienation' in the Dialectical and Historical Materialism of Karl Marx. The main focus in this chapter would be on the concept of 'alienation' as discussed in Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of, 1844*.

Their term 'alienation' in our opinion, is Marx's major concern not only in his book *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of, 1844* but also in his entire writings.

In our view Marx is regarded as not only as an economist or political theorist; not only known for his theory of Surplus Value or for the theory of state but also regarded as a philosopher who first laid bare the estrangement of men from an oppressive society.

---

1 Written in Paris in 1844 but unknown and unpublished until 1932.
In this chapter we will discuss the concept of man as developed by Karl Marx under section 1.2. We will discuss the relationship of man with nature in the section 1.3 and the role of labor in the section 1.4. We will also trace the historical aspect of ‘alienation’ from G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1830) and Feuerbach (1804-1872) in the section 1.6 and finally we will compare these two philosophers view by giving an exposition on Marx’s concept of alienation. Though in this chapter we have given more importance to the book Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, yet we have also taken the other writings of Karl Marx to discuss his theory of alienation. In our opinion, whatever their substantive philosophical differences may be, all of them (Hegel, Feuerbach, Karl Marx) have developed this concepts in their own perspective. Both Hegel and Feuerbach started their philosophical quest with the concept ‘alienation’. But where as Hegel has given an idealistic interpretation to the concept ‘alienation’, Feuerbach has given a mechanical materialist interpretation to it. In contrast to both the philosophers’ view, Marx has given a Dialectical and Materialistic interpretation of the term ‘alienation’. For Marx, the problem of “alienation” is a major problem of class divided society where one section of people has been exploited by another section. Concepts like ‘exploitation’, ‘power’, ‘money, ‘human need’ are inherently present in Marx’s alienation. Marx’s concept of alienation is closely associated with his concept of man and his freedom. We cannot talk of Marx’s notion of
alienation and freedom without knowing his concept of man. Marx's concept of freedom we have discussed in the chapter three of our thesis. In this chapter we will discuss Marx's concept of 'man' and 'alienation'.

The central epitome of Marxism is vested with the concept 'man' and his relations with other human being inside the society. Marx concept of 'alienation' can not be talked of without taking his views on man, society, nature and freedom as we have said earlier. All these are inseparable concepts in a consistent philosophical system. Thus in our next section 1.2 we will discuss the concept of man as developed by Karl Marx.

1.2 Concept of Man:

Marx's concept of man is different from idealistic conception of man that we have already discussed in our introductory chapter. Man for Marx, is a Socio-concrete-historical being. For Marx, "the root of man is man himself." Marx intention is to bring together the whole humanity in such a manner that there should be no exploitation and man can experience himself as truly human. Marxist understanding of man differs from others in the sense that man is the human being as the product and subject of labour activity. Marx writes:

---

"The essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations."³

Significance of Marxism lies in Man’s social relation. And this social relation can be possible through the masses. Marx has refuted the anti-scientific theories, which down graded the role of masses in social development. Progress of a society depends on its masses. In this connection A.P.Sheptulin writes:

"The masses are mainly made up of those classes and social groups whose labour ensures society’s existence and development. These are in the first place, the working people who can create the material goods, the scientific and technological intelligence related to the production process, the workers in the service industries, scientists, those working in the fields of culture and art and those who are engaged in the upbringing and training of the rising generation."⁴

This passage reveals that the development of a society depends on the individual. Marx is talking of individual with special importance to the labour class. The mass represents the major productive force, set the means of labour in motion and helps in the production of material wealth. Production of material wealth is required for the existence of development of society. For Marx, man is a conscious being. And it is this conscious character, which helps man to distinguish himself from other human beings.

as well as from the animal. It helps man to enter into the process of production.

1.2 (I) Man as a Species Being:

In his book *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx speaks of man in terms of ‘species’ and its ‘essence’. Marx writes: “Man is a *species-being*⁵, not only because in practice and in theory he adopts the species (his own as well as those of other things) as his object, but and this is only another way of expressing it- also because he treats himself as the actual living species; because he treats himself as a *Universal* and therefore a free being.”⁶

Species character of man implies that he is a conscious being. And it is this species character which helps man to establish a social relation. And it also helps to develop the language, speech and finally the development of personality. In his earlier writing Marx has talked of the necessity of both man and woman in the act of procreation, for human existence. Thus, man from the very beginning a social animal.

When Marx says, man is a *species being* this implies that man has self-awareness of himself pursuing his own ends. Not only his ends but also

---

⁵ The term “Species Being” (*Gattungswesen*) is derived from Ludwig Feuerbach’s Philosophy where it is applied to man and mankind as a whole.

for the entire community. Man is a conscious being, who is very much aware of his past as well as the possibilities of the future.

In this connection, Alok Tondon writes, "Marx provides a list of species power which each individual possess as a member of human species. It includes seeing, hearing, smelling, testing, feeling, thinking, being aware, sensing, acting, loving. Acting here does not mean activity but in the sense of 'acting as'. In other statements, Marx views willing, procreating, sex, knowing and judging also as species powers. Man with his species powers establishes particular relationship between himself and nature...."\(^7\)

Marx has talked of species character of man having in the mind the social essence of man. Man is not fully a natural being. Marx says, ".... He is a human natural being; that is to say, he is a being for himself. Therefore, he is a species being."\(^8\)

Man, in Benjamin Franklin's profound definition, whose significance Marx has stressed in his philosophy, is a tool-making animal. Man through his conscious activity develops not only speech and language


\(^8\) Marx, Karl. *Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, op. cit. P.146
but transforms the objective material reality which the transformation of

nature. Marx in his book *German Ideology* writes:

"Language is as old as consciousness. language is practical, real
consciousness that exists for other men as well and only therefore does it
also exists for me; language, like consciousness, only arises from the
need, the necessity of intercourse with other man⁹.... Consciousness is,
therefore, from the very beginning a social product, and remains so long
as men exist at all."¹⁰

A human being can develop himself by living inside the society. He
can satisfy his specific needs and develop his individual qualities by
interacting with other human being and being a member of that society.
Without these neither his consciousness will develop nor his language and
necessary skills. Robinson Crusoe- a figure, Marx remarks else where, dear
to the bourgeois eighteenth Century- is not proof of the contrary because he
is isolated as an already fully humanized being, a product of contemporary
capitalist society, and hence carries within his brain all the skills, habits,
thoughts and ideas of that society. He immediately starts book keeping and
enters in his ledger all his passions and looses, his working hours and
consumption. In the philosophy of Karl Marx we will find that Marx
through his Dialectical Materialism establishes an interconnection between

⁹ The following words are crossed out in the Manuscript: My relation to my surroundings
is my consciousness.

¹⁰ Marx, Karl & Engels, Frederick. *German Ideology*, Moscow: Progress Publishers,
man and man, man and nature, knowledge and reality, existence and essence etc. Marx believes that, man as a product of society can not live in isolation. The physical as well as mental development of a person requires social interaction. In the philosophy of Karl Marx, we will see that logic, language, epistemology and ontology are intrinsically related.

German Ideology has written by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. This book is the continuation of previous work of Karl Marx’s Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of the 1844 and The Holy Family. In this book Marx and Engels have developed not only the theory of society but also the method to understand the socio- historical phenomena. ‘Both of them have developed science as a powerful weapon for the knowledge of social life. Knowledge is a means of social development and existing social relations.’

1.2.2. Man and Animals:

Marx believes that it is the conscious activity of man that distinguishes man from rest of the animals. Marx, in his earlier as well as latter writings has described how man differentiates himself from the rest of the animal.

We will begin with Marx’s conception of ‘man as a tool-making animal. T.I. Oizerman says that “this definition of man can be shown to be incorrect, since it includes a patent contradiction: animals do not make tools, which means that an animal that does is not an animal. The paradox, however, is that this contradiction is not so much of definition as of life itself. Man is, indeed, an animal and at the same time is no longer an animal. And this contradiction cannot be resolved by saying that he is an animal in one respect and not animal in another.”¹² In our opinion when Marx has used ‘Man is a tool making animal’. He has used it in a special sense. Man is having consciousness so also the animal. But while man through his conscious effort by the application of ‘human Labour’ can be able to produce beautiful things, transform the nature, animal does not produce things nor can transform the nature. Marx writes in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844:

“An animal forms objects only accordance with the standard and the need of the species to which it belongs, whilst man knows how to produce in accordance with the standard of very species, and knows how to apply every where the inherent standard to the object. Man, therefore, also forms objects in accordance with the laws of beauty.”¹³ Man in our opinion at the beginning is not a social being. Rather he is a biological being. The social character of man comes to him later on. So, in our opinion as Prof. Suman Gupta has said, man is a bio-socio-concrete-historical being.’ T.I. Oizerman has said, it is the social character of man,

---


which differentiates him from the rest of the animal. And he has explained it through definite social relations of production. Production means a social production and also the production of society.\textsuperscript{14} How man distinguishes himself from the animal.\textsuperscript{1} To answer this question Marx has been said it is the conscious life activity of man, which differentiates him from the rest of the animal. For example, construction of a building, or dam. Man through his labour produces beautiful palaces that the animal can not do. In this Marx writes in the \textit{Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844}:

"The animal is immediately one with its life activity. It does not distinguish itself from it. It is its life activity. Man makes his life activity itself the object of his will and of his consciousness. He has conscious life activity.... Conscious life activity distinguishes man immediately from animal life activity. It is just because of this that he is a species being or it is only because he is a species being that he is a conscious being.\textsuperscript{15}\textsuperscript{15} (Italics in original).

In the \textit{German Ideology} Marx and Engles Writes:

"Man can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like. They themselves being to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organization. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their material life.\textsuperscript{16}\textsuperscript{16}"

\textsuperscript{14} Oiezerman, T.I., \textit{"The Philosophical Conception of Man"}, op. cit, p.43.
\textsuperscript{15} Marx, Karl., \textit{Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844}, op. cit., p.73.
In our opinion Marx has taken two things into consideration, one is conscious life activity and the other is produce activity. Animals have also their activities. Animals also produce. They build themselves rests, dwelling, like the bees, beavers, ants, etc. But an animal only produces what it immediately, needs for itself. It produces for himself while man produces for the whole society. Animal produces only for the fulfillment of his immediate physical, while man produces even when he is freed from physical needs.

So for Marx, the conscious activity of man helps him to think, act and judge in a proper way. He can imagine plan, and anticipate things in a beautiful manner.

In our next section 1.3 we will discuss how man as a species being has control over nature and can able to transform the nature. We will also analyse how the unity of man and nature has taken place in the philosophy of Karl Marx.

1.3 Man and Nature:

Nature plays a vital role in making human life. Man from the beginning of his life resides in the realm of nature. Human beings are constantly surrounded by it and interact with it. By interaction with nature man can able to transform the nature.
In this connection Prof. Suman Gupta writes:

"Man, thus, is a part of nature yet he is different from the rest of nature. Man is qualitatively different from the rest of nature. Man is a physical being constituted of physical, chemical and biological processes and subject to corresponding physical, chemical and biological Laws. But these do not express the essence of man— the essential aspects, which distinguish him from the rest of nature. Man is the only animal that learned to make use tools, developed consciousness, speech and language… thus resulting in the development of speech and language."\(^{17}\)

The stuff of nature, which Marx identified with matter, is already formed and it is subject to physical and chemical laws. And it is discovered by the natural sciences in constant co-operation with material production. Matter plays an important role in human life. Lenin in his book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* claims that the philosophical conception of matter is not affected by the historically changing view of physicists on the structure of matter. “For the sole “Property” of matter whose recognition philosophical materialism requires is its property of being an objective reality, of existing outside the mind.”\(^{18}\)

Lenin viewed it is not materialism in general which is become untenable but only in its traditional mechanical form. Lenin further says “Matter disappears” means that the limit within which we have hither to known matter disappears and that our knowledge is penetrating deeper;


properties of matter are like wise disappearing which formerly seemed absolute, immutable, and primary (impenetrability, inertia, mars, etc).\textsuperscript{19} and which are now revealed to be relative and characteristic only of certain states of matter.\textsuperscript{20}

This epistemological definition of matter suggests, matter suggests, matter as an objective reality can exist outside matter can exist independent of consciousness. This definition of matter has given by Young Marx in his book Holy Family. He has described this view from the point of view of social labor that is as follows:

"Man has not created matter itself. And he cannot even create any productive capacity if the matter does not exist before hand."\textsuperscript{21}

In the Paris Manuscripts he adopted a similar viewpoint:

"The fact that man is a corporeal living, real, sensuous, objective being has real, \textit{Sensuous objects} as the object of his being and the expression of his life, or that he can only express his life, through real sensuous objects. A being, which does not have its nature outside itself, is not natural being and does not share in the being of nature.\textsuperscript{22}

Nature is defined here is an entirely Hegelian manner as externality. Man, says Marx, objectifies himself in his labour. Man through his labour can be to transform the nature as well as objective materiality. Labor is

\textsuperscript{19} This refers apparently to mechanical mass, which classical physics regarded as an eternal and unchanging property of matter. V.I.Lenin, \textit{Materialism and Empirio Criticism} Moscow : Progress Publishers, First Printing 1947. 7\textsuperscript{th} printing, 1977, p.241.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p.241.


\textsuperscript{22} Marx, Karl., \textit{Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844}, op. cit., p.207.
the factor, which establish a relationship between man and nature.

Alexander spirkin in his book Dialectical Materialism writes:

"Man is constantly aware of the influence of nature in the form the air he breathes, the water he drinks, the food he eats, and the flow of energy and information... Human history offers any number of examples how environmental conditions and the relief of our planet have promoted or retarded human development."23

This shows that nature plays a tremendous role in the life of man. In our opinion Karl Marx is perhaps the first philosopher, who has brought the issued man and nature. Man being a part of nature with rapid growth of technology and scientific development starts controlling over nature. Man in Marx’s view not only an inhabitant of nature but he transforms nature. And transformation of nature takes place only through human labour. Labour acts as a connecting link between man and nature. Engels describes this as, "The mastery over nature, which begins by the development of the hand, with labour, widened man’s horizon at every new advance. He was continually discovering new, neither to unknown properties of natural objects."24

Man through his brain and hand are creating beautiful things in the society. In our time a rapid advancement has taken place in the field of


science. Man by putting their physical and mental effort creating beautiful things inside the society. But the worst part in a capitalistic system is its 'exploitation'. Those who are producing the things cannot have it. Such is the glaring contradiction of the 21st century.

Labour, for Marx itself is only the manifestation of a natural force. Marx has dealt with this natural basis of labour in systematic form in *Capital* also, precisely in his analysis of the two fold character of the commodity and labour embodied in it. The importance of Marxism lies in his conception of labor and the application of labor on a commodity Marx has given more importance on 'Labour power'. A thing is said to have use value only when the labor applies into it. The commodity is a unity composed of opposed of determination. Marx has applied his dialenation. Marx has applied his dialectical laws in case of labour. Labour and commodity are two different things. But they unite together to produce certain things. For example 'a piece of wood'. It has no use value.' When it turn to be table it has since use value. It is because of the application of the human labour that a thing has its use value. The same is applying to nature the material thing. The thrust of Marxism lies in 'human labor'. This view of labour has been criticised by many philosophers. But in our opinion Marx philosophers. But in our opinion Marx is rightly pointing out the role of human labour in transforming the nature. The exchange value of a commodity has no natural content what so ever. It is indifferent to its
natural qualities because it is the embodiment of human labour in general measured by the time outlaid, and all the determinations of nature are extinguished in it.  

Use Values are specific natural materials, mediated through specific purposive action. Marx defines the use value of a thing in the following ways:

"The use-values coat, linen etc., in short the bodies of commodities, are combinations of two elements, material and labor. If we subtract the total sum of useful labour embodied in the coat, Linen, etc., a material substratum is always left, which is furnished by nature without the help of man." Marx further says:

"The form of word, for instance is altered when one makes a table out of it. Yet, for all that, the tables continues to be a common, sensuous thing, wood."

The immediately of nature asserts itself at ever higher stages of the process of production, though now humanly mediated through men. Marx writes: "while the labourer is at work, his labour constantly undergoes a transformation: from the form of flux to that of being, from the form of motion to that of objectivity."

---


26 Marx, Karl., *Capital*, Vol I, op. cit., p.43. On the natural moment in labour, if also the critique of the Gothe programme, Mesw, vol.II, p.18, where nature is described as the primary sources of all instruments and objects of labour.

27 Ibid., p.71.

28 Ibid., p.189.
Man objectivity 29 the thing that is external to him. Objectification includes man's operation on nature and its effects take place on man. Man and nature are intrinsically related in the philosophy Karl Marx. Neither we can talk of 'man' in abstraction nor about 'nature'. Man is a part of nature. Men's dependence on nature is explained by Marx in his book *Economic and philosophic Manuscripts* of 1844, which is as follows:

"The worker can create nothing without nature, without the sensuous external world. It is the material on which his labor is realized, in which it is active from which and by means of which it produces." 30

Two thing follows from this quotation of Marx. One the one hand man cannot produced anything without Nature. On the other hand nature or matter has no meaning without the application of labour. Though man is different from nature, yet he is a part of it. Difference as well identity is there. Prof. Suman Gupta writes: "The interaction between man and nature may be stated thus- the subject of knowledge is a social man who is a part of nature yet different from the rest of nature. And he is intrinsically connected with nature not only because of the fact he is a physical being and consequently subject the laws of nature but also because it is only through nature that he obtains his means of subsistence as a living creature.

29 Marx calls production as a process of objectification. It is the activity by which man affirms himself. To objectify one self in something external to time is to consume or fashion or, otherwise use it to satisfy his needs.

He acquires the means of subsistence by moulding and transforming nature into objects of labour, into instruments of labour and finally into goods necessary for the satisfaction of his needs. Man can alter, transform and master nature due to the fact that he acquires knowledge of the laws of natural phenomena. Man thus realises his objectives by acquiring a world which is independent of his consciousness. 

Before going to concluding this section we would like to say that man and nature dialectical interrelated. Due to the scientific and technological advancement man and nature relationship has taken new shape. From the very beginning of human existence man has been dependent on nature for his means of livelihood. But today man starts controlling the nature and also able to transform the nature. Thus, in Marxism, man is a part of nature. Labour, which is the mediating link between man and nature, plays a dominant role not only in his writing but also in his entire philosophy.

In our next section we will discuss the role labour in the philosophy of Karl Marx.

---

1.4 Role of Labour:

In our previous section we have discussed how human perception is much wider than that of any other animal. Development of his activities leads to corresponding development of his ideas.

"The Eagle sees much further than man, but the human eye sees considerably more in things than does the eye of the Eagle," wrote Engles, "The dog has a far keener sense of smell than man, but it does not distinguish a hundred part of the ordours that for man are definite features of different things. And the sense of touch, which the ape hardly possess its crudest initial form, has been developed side by side with the development of human land itself, through the medium of labour." 32

Labour is the self-expression of human life. In this section we would like to discuss the role of labour in the philosophy of Karl Marx. Marx has talked of the concept 'labour' talking into account the capitalistic society into consideration. For Marx, man through this labour creates the whole world. Man as we have discussed is a 'Bio-Socio. Concrete historical being. When man enters into social relation he involves himself in the social activities. Involvement in the social activities helps man to think and form new ideas. Man involves himself in the process of production.

The basis of man's social activity is labour. It is through labour that man first of all enlarges his perceptions. Labour also helps to form ideas and to communicate them. It helps man to use his brain and though which man can develop his speech, though. Engels writes, "Labour is the sources of all wealth, the political economists asserts. It is next to the nature is the primary basic condition of all human existence sense, we have to say that labour created man himself."33

The whole world history, for Marx, is nothing but the creation of man by his labour. Starting from the basic necessities of human life i.e. food, clothing and shelter to the luxurious life i.e. T.v, car, washing machine, beautiful palace etc., are the creation of human labour. Man makes history taking the circumstances into consideration. In the course of history man develops himself and transform himself. Man creates history and by creating history he creates himself. It is the self-creation of work through the process of production. Through 'Labour' man can express, develop his physical and mental powers. In this context Marx writes: ".... The entire so-called history of the world is nothing but the creation of man through human labour, nothing but the emergence of nature for man, so he has the visible, irrefutable proof of his birth through himself, of his genesis. Since the real existence of man and nature has become evident in practice,

33 Ibid., p. 228.
through sense-experience.... The question about an alien being, about a
being above nature and men has become impossible in practice.

When the evolution is started, Engels 34 point out, the first distinctive
posture taken by man is erect posture. This set free the hand. And when
men begin to fashion tools and change the external object with their hand
and producing the means of life, that is the real beginning of men and of
human society. In this connection Engels writes:

"Many hundreds of thousands of years ago, during an epoch, not yet
definitely determinable, of that period of the earth's history which
geologists call the Tertiary period, most likely towards the end of it, a
specifically highly developed race of anthropoid apes lived somewhere
in the tropical zone Darwin has given approximate description of these
ancestors of ours.... Covered with hair, they had searls and pointed
trees." 35

"Presumably as an immediate consequence of their made of life which in
climbing assigns different function to the hands than to the fact, these
apes when moving on level ground began to drop the habit of using their
hands and to adopt a more and more erect gait. This was the decisive step
in the transition from ape to man. "36 In this connection Mary writes:
"The first premise of all human history is, of course, the existence of
living human individuals,". Thus the first fact to be established is the
physical organisation of these individuals and their consequence relation
the rest of nature. 37

35 Engels, Frederick.. Dialectics of Nature. op. cit., p.228.
36 Loc. Cit.
37 Marx, Karl and Engeel Frederick. "Premises of the Materialistic Conception of
Both Marx and Engels try to interpret their philosophy in terms of human labour. Their basic thrust is to show how in the initial stage, when life start in the earth, on the human labour is there. Mary has given importance to history so also Engles. Thus, history shows 'Labour' as the prerequisite condition for development of society. The creation and production of things depends on human labor. When begins to produced certain things he enters into the process of production. Without labour a thing has its no use.

Maurice Conforth has described the distinctive feature of human labour which is as follows: "First, men fashion tools and implements, changing natural objects so as to use their properties to bring about desired ends.

The second distinctive feature of human labour follows from the first and lies in its conscious and co-operative character."38

From the Conforth's discussion on labour it follows makes tools and implements the tools. And in implementing the tools he can able to transform the nature. Transformation of nature and making of tools lies in its conscious and co-operative characters. Man produced beautiful things, powerful machines with the help his hand and brain. Engels in his book

Dialectics of describes the importance of hand in human life. He says that ".... The hand is not only the organ of labour; it is also the product of labour. Only by labour, by adaptation to ever new operations, by inheritance of the thus acquire special development of muscles, ligaments, and over longer periods of time, bones as well... has the human hand attained the high degree of..."39 Engels further says. “First labour, after it, and then with it articulates speech-these where the two most essential stimuli under the influence of which the brain of ape gradually changed into that of man.”40

In our view, Labour is a unique phenomenon in human life and it takes a central place in the philosophy of Karl Marx. And the, most remarkable feature of Marxian conception of ‘Labour’ is that, Labour is both physical as well as mental in nature.

The farmer as the worker who is producing rice for his landlord and the soldier who is fighting for his own country are using both mental as well as manual labour in order to complete their work. The bast part of philosophy of Karl Marx lies in his dialectical materialism and Dialectical laws where things are dialectically inter connected. Marx has emphatically described the Labour power in his book capital.

40 Ibid., p. 232.
Marx says! "The capitalist buys labour power in order to use it, and labour power in use is labour itself." Marx further writes:

"Labour is, in the first place, a process in which both man and nature participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates, and controls the material reactions between himself and nature. He opposes himself to nature as one of her. Own forces setting in motion, arms and legs, head and hands the natural forces of his body, in order to appropriate Nature's production in a form adopted to his own wants. By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he at the same time changes his own Nature." Man through his conscious activity controls the nature and transforms the nature. And this is possible because of human labour. Labor according to Marx is a "Process" where men and nature acts togetherly. 'Nature' and 'Man' are two different things. By acting on nature man becomes a part of nature. after that he starts controlling nature. And 'Labour' establishes a dialectical link between man and nature. And it is thing transforming nature of labourdifferentiates man from animal.

"We presuppose labour in a form that stamps it as exclusively conducts, operations that resembles those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the last of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it on reality."
Beret Alumna in his book on 'Alienation' comment on this passage as follows:

"Marx view of purposive action raises a wide variety of objections, central of which is the activity of the architect is not a prototype of all human work. Very few of a person’s productive activities are intended in this way, and there are many of which it is difficult to say they are intended at all. For Marx, these are "fine points" irrelevant to his chooses function in highlighting interrelations, and consequently he shows little concern. In Marx's defense, it must be added that the term's "purpose" and "PLAN" (design) are generally used in their weak senses. What he seems to have in mind is simply that man knows what it is he is going to produce. Which actions and implements will produce it? It is questionable, however, whether even this limited degree of purposeveness has much wide application.44

In our opinion this is a very misleading comet. Marx never imagine or conceive that every human being (in a modern class deviled society in very acts "with purpose and plan"), Marx does not talked labor in individual sense rather it is applicable for a group or class. Marx has described the human work in general.

What Marx is speaking of in the example of the architect is not the character of individual work in contemporary societies but the character of "species work or the "objective" character of human, work in general. For instance, an architect in a capitalistic society can not produce out of his own

choice because the capitalists who pay for it condition his works. Thus neither his action is “Purposive” nor neither his action is “purposive” nor he is having any “Plan” to perform certain action. Labour, for Marx, which is the self-expression of man, is distorted under capitalism. Marx rejects the bourgeoisie views of man. The social nature of man, which is based on co-operation, interaction no longer, exists in a capitalistic society.

Here we would like to quote Marx in order to show his inclination toward labor in a group or labour in general. Marx in his book Capital, vol.-I describes:

“Just as the offensive power of a squadron cavalry, or the defensive power of a regiment of infantry, is essentially different from the sum of the offensive or defensive powers of the individual cavalry or infantry soldiers taken separately, so the sum in such cases the effect of the combined labor could either not be produced at all by isolated individual labour or it could only be produced by a great expenditure of time, or on a very dwarted scale. Not only have we here an increase in the productive power of the individual, by means of co-operation but the creation of a new power, namely, the collective power of masses.” Marx further says:

“A part from the new power that rises from the fusion of many forces into one single force, mere social contacts begets in most industries

an emulation and a stimulation of animal spirits that lighten the efficiency of each individual workman. Hence, it is that a dozen persons working together will in their collective working day of 144 hours produce for more than 12 isolated men each working 12 hours, or than one man who works 12 days in succession. The reason of this is that a man is, if not as Aristotle contends, a political, at all event a social animal.\textsuperscript{46}

This passage reveals that Marx has given importance to three things, namely, 'collective work', 'social relation' interaction and finally 'planned action'.

Labour, which is the self-expression of man, is distorted under capitalistic system. Marx in his book \textit{The communist Manifesto}, 1848 writes, the history of all society including past, present (except the history of the primitive community Engels added) has been the history of class struggle. The issue we have taken in our next chapter. The concept of freedom in Karl Marx. Marx demanded of social sciences as regards an objective analysis of the situation of every class in modern society as well as an analysis of the conditions of development of every class. The worker class is the most exploited class under capitalism whatever things the worker will be produced it well to the hands of the capitalist. Capitalist are

\textsuperscript{46} Loc. Cit.
the owners of the production. Looking into the class conflict in a
capitalistic system Engel's in his book Anti-Duhring interprets:

"The new forces of production have already out grown the bourge is
form of using the; and this conflict between productive forces and mode of
production is not a conflict which has arisen in men's heads, as for example
the conflict between original sin and denine justice; but it exists in the
denie justice; but it exists in the facts, objectively outside of us,
independently of the will or purpose even of the men who brought it about.
Modern socialism is nothing but the reflex in thought of this actual conflict
its ideal reflection in the minds first of the class which is directly suffering
under it the working class."47

Marx's theory of man is closely related with his concept of
'alienation', 'freedom' and society. In our next section we will analyse
Marx's concept of 'alienation'.

First, we will illustrate very briefly the historical development of the
concept of alienation. Then we will discuss how the concept of alienation
has been used in the philosophy of G.W.F.Hegel and Ludwig Feuerback.

Finally we will discuss Marx's concept of 'alienation'.

This quotation has taken from Howard selsam and Harry Martel's book 'Reader in
Marxist Philosophy: From the Writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, New Work'.
1.5 Historical Perspective of the Concept Alienation

In this section we will discuss the historical perspective of the term 'alienation'. The term 'alienation' is a very old which has its origin in a very old idea, which has its origin in religion also. It has taken over by all most all the classical philosophical trends in the west as well as in the East.

The very alienate, like the German equivalents, literally means "to make stage, to make another's". But the noun “alienation”, like the German Entfremdung and unlike Entausserung, used in a special context where it functions as a technical term. Our primary association with the term. Our primary association with the term “alienation” and Entfremdung as a human state of being the state of being alienated or estranged from something or somebody. 48

The Latin origin of “alienation” is alienation. This noun derives its meaning from the very alienare (to make something’s another, to take away or remove).

One of the principal Latin alienare (and alienation) is in connection with property. In this sense alienare means transfer of the ownership of something to another person. 49

The term has gained its popularity during the cold war as a meeting place for East and west, for Marxism and Existentialism. Hegel in his book ‘Phenomenology of the Spirit’ 1807, has devoted one chapter more than hundred pages to discuss the concept ‘alienation’. The chapter bore the title “Spirit alienated from itself.”

Prior to Hegel in a similar ways the term ‘alienation’ and Entrfremdung has already been used in earlier philosophy and theology.

Lewis Fever interprets that Hegel “imbibed the concept of alienation from pessimist Protestant theology.” In the earlier theology the term ‘alienation’ has been used in connection with God or Christ etc. man in earlier theology, alienated from God. The term occurs in the Bible, in Ephesians 4:8 Paul Speaking of the Gentiles says:

“They are darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them, due to their hardness of heart.”

Thus, in earlier theology alienation has used as a spiritual concept. They believe that spiritual health is nothing but the alienation of the soul from the God. Once the ignorance will remove they will merge with God. They will attain the liberation. Thus, they have used the concept alienation

& freedom in terms of God. Hence their freedom and alienation is spiritual in nature. In our opinion, Idealists thinkers including Hegel is the follower of the same path. They have interpreted `alienation' in terms of `spirit', God, idea etc.

However, this concept has been used extensively in the philosophy of G.W.F. Hegel. In our next section we will analyse Hegel and Feuerbach concept of alienation.

1.5(I) Hegel & Feuerbach’s Views on Alienation:

In this section we will anlayse Hegel and Feuerbach’s concept of alienation. G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) is said to be on objective idealist. Or we may say as the founder of idealist dialectics. Hegel has incorporated and developed many of his doctrines from Kant.

According to Hegel, all that exist originated from the Absolute idea. Initially, it is “Pure being”, i.e. devoid of any content, which is equivalent to “nothing” or non-being. The, “Pure-being and “nothing” engage in a struggle with one another an produce a new concept i.e., becoming. The latter lead to another concept being there and the process goes on. Hegel believes that consciousness,” or absolute idea or spirit is primary, while nature is secondary derives from consciousness.
Hegel claims that development proceeds through the struggle and resolution of internal contradiction, which results in the emergence of new ones. Hegel in his book the 'Phenomenology of Spirit (1807)', describes that estrangement inters or independence and dependence of self-consciousness. For him man is essentially a spiritual being. He keeps on saying that individuality is only one aspects of human nature.

'For him, human nature can be explained in a better way inters of 'spirit."

"Spirit is the nature of human beings generally, and their nature is therefore, two fold: at one extreme explicit individuality of consciousness and will, at the other, universality which knows and will what is substantive."52

Hegel has strongly object to the particularly of nature. Rather he claims that human nature must take into account his reason. Therefore he attaches great importance to "Universality" (Allgemein heit).

For Hegel, the modes of estrangement are located in the 'Absolute idea' or 'Spirit' because it is the absolute idea that sustains throughout different stages of estrangement. Hegel conceives men as essentially spirit, and that Universality is essentially to anything, which is spiritual. Therefore, it is the loss of universality, which results into one "thereby

52 Hegel, G.W.F., Philosophy of Right, Trans T.M.Knox. Oxford : clarendon, 1942, paragraph no. "264". In references to this work I shall give paragraph rumber ("264"), which are the same in Knox’s English translation.
alienates from his in her nature and reaches the extremity of discord with himself.”

Prof. Bhuban Chandel has described Hegel’s concept of alienation by saying “Hegel cases to look at alienation as act of achievement. For him it is a defiance of the substantive characteristics. In the second context, Hegel uses the notion of alienation for the philosophy of nature. Nature is understood as the idea estranged from itself. He speaks of nature in the sense of powerlessness Ohnmacht – as lacking the power to contain the concept. Nature as the domain of alienation is a necessary step in the development of idea, through it does not the elevated sphere of achievement as had been suggested by the former meanings of the word alienation.”

For Hegel, the social substance is not merely the creation of spirit rather it is the objectification of spirit. This means that the substance is spirit, in objectified form. From this it follows that when the substance is alienated from the individual it is nothing but the objectified spirit alienated from him.


The German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872) has given importance in describing the material reality. His mission is to criticise and revolt against Hegelian idealism, which is based on the university and absoluteness of "Spirit".

He says that the role that the Absolute idea plays is nothing but the role of God in theology. Fever back describes "He who does not reject the Helena philosophy, neither rejects theology. The Hegelian teaching that nature, reality is posited by the idea is merely a rational expression of the theological precept that nature has been created God..." 55

Feuerbach is of the opinion that instead of nature realizing itself in the 'Absolute Spirit' man became the highest realization of nature. Feuerbach says, Hegel did not realise that man, being part of nature, is at the same time a product of social life. And his consciousness is shaped not only by the physiological processes occurring in his body, particularly in his brain but also by the social environment within which lived and acted by the material conditions of his life Feuerbach interprets:

"We have shown that the substance and objective of religion is altogether human. We have shown that Devin wisdom is human wisdom; the secret theology is anthropology- the necessary turning of history is therefore the open confession that the consciousness of God is nothing else than the

55 Ludwig, Feu rbach., philosophische Kritiken und Grundsitze (1839-1846)m Keuozugm, s.185.
consciousness of the species – *Homo Homini Deus est*.; ... This is the greatest practical principle....”

Feverback shows that god has nothing supernatural about him and has been emanated by men in their own image. According to Feuerbach, Men, who are able to think and imagine in abstract terms, separated themselves from their own essence, which they begin to imagine as supernatural being God.

In his back *Essence of Christianity* Fever back writes: “Where a man is shown to embody each one of his main faculties – mind, will and heart – in a superior being. In positing his aspirations as fulfilled in Deity, man deems himself to be by contrast weak and powerless. This conception of a being, which exists at a great distance in the splendour of his isolation, results in alienation for man. In an attempt to overcome this alienation, man loves God and through belief in the in carnation of his son, finds a means of sermon with the distant Deity. All this is in Feverbach’s opinion, not only deceitful but actually harmful. Man must confront the earth and makes his happiness there, rather than live in the vain desire of a non-existent God. *Homo Homini Deus*’ – Man is God for himself.”

---


Marx has interpreted the concept of alienation in a different way.

Marx criticises Hegel's notion of dialectics and Hegel's identification of labour with alienation. Marx says that this is because of Hegel's idealistic interpretation of man, where man is essentially regarded as consciousness and spirit.

Marx also criticised Feuerbach by saying that unlike Hegel, Feuerbach neglects the active side of man and the human practice as the world changing in terms of human self-worship. Whereas for Feuerbach alienation is to be found in the essence of Christianity, for Marx, alienation is the essence of a capitalistic society.

In our next and final section, we will discuss Marx's concept of alienation.

1.6 Alienation as Developed by Karl Marx

In this section, we will analyse the concept of alienation as developed by Karl Marx. We will give more emphasis in his Book *Economic and philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. By criticising his predecessors in their application of the ideas of alienation, Marx ahead of them. Marx is basically interested in man as a socio-concrete historical being who is essentially producing the means of his subsistence. The type of 'alienation' that Marx was interested is the alienation of man from his personal activity, his labour, and not the speculative and idealistic alienation consciousness. Here
we would like to give a brief exposition of his earlier writings (Economic and philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, and his later writings.

Marx’s book Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts in our opinion is a monumental work of Karl Marx where his philosophical career begins. It was first published in 1932 nearly after one hundred years of its written. Much of discussion and debate has been going in economics as well as philosophic circles about his earlier writings as well as his later writings. When Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts were published in 1932 for the first time, a bring controversy arises around these issues. Some believes that there is a contradiction, which Marx himself has accepted between his earlier works and later works. And the other groups believe that the same ideas are contained in his early as well as his later works.

In our opinion all of there opinions are wrong. An important evolution not an identical repetition, in Marx’s thought has taken place from decade to decade. Karl Marx of twenty and Karl Marx at the age of sixty obviously will not say exactly the samething though the basic concepts remain same. Obviously there would be some change and some progress. Marx himself has accepted the concept of change. In this work Theses on Feuerbach he declares which we have already said that the philosophers has interpreted the world in various ways the point is to change it.
Another major work of Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen okonomie* (fundamental outlines of a critique of political economy), a thirteen hundred page work written in 1857-58. In this book he has elaborated and discussed all the major ideas of *Capital* which published two years after the publication of the book *Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen* has not published until a century after it was written. Its first publication occurred at the beginning of the second world war in Russia, but most of the copies are destroyed as a result of the world.

Marx’s theory of alienation exists even in his later wrings such as *Grudrisse Capital, German Ideology etc.*. Marx has used three different terms interchangeably in his earlier as well as later works; one is the concept ‘estrangement’ or ‘reification’ and 3rd is the concept of commodity of fetishism.

Whatever, it may be, in our opinion concept to alienation plays a central role in his book *Economic and philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. In this book in the chapter “Estranged Labour Marx has developed the theory in terms of economic alienation. He has mentioned how in capitalistic system the worked how in a capitalistic system the worked is exploited and alienated from his work. He has also discussed how ‘private property’ and
division of Labours' are two basic causes which gives rise to alienation we would discuss all there issues one by one.

Paris Manuscripts has embraced various fields of social science. In all their fields Marx has applied materialistic dialectics as an instrument of knowledge. He has discussed the structure and development of society. In this book Marx has first time emphasizes the decisive role of production in the social process. He has also pointed out that private property and division of labour are the material basis, responsible for the division of society into classed.

Marx rejected Hegel's extensive used of the concept alienation where he has discussed it is not the real living people but the absolute idea that undergoes alienation. In a similar manner he rejects Feuerbach's views on alienation where he has reduced his theory of the origin of religion to the alienation of the universal (generic) qualities of abstract man.

Marx has used the concept alienation by giving a profound analysis of social relation. It is mentioned in Economic and philosophic Manuscripts that "For Marx alienation was characteristics of those social relations under which the conditions of people's life and activity, that activity itself, and the relations between people, appear as a force which is alien and hostile to people. So in Marx's interpretation alienation is by no means a supra historical phenomenon. Marx was the first to link alienation with private
property and the social system it engenders. He was that alienation could be over come only by abolition of private property and all its consequences."

As we know that economic alienation is a one part of alienation so far as human life is concerned. But it is the most decisive alienation from which all other alienation follows. Marx has given importance to the economic alienation. According to Prof. Bhuvan Chandel, "Marx defined alienation as a fact of political economy- a phenomenon of economic life. For him labour and capital were not only economic categories but also anthropological postulates imputed with value judgements. There are two aspects of labour; first is the alienated labor which gives rise to private property and second is the free creative labour which is the true expression of human life and essence. The first kind of labour Marx seeks to abolish and second he wants to realize. The passage from one to another is the passage from "is" to "ought". In its second context, Labour is the self-expression of man's individuality and his mental qualities. It is in its essence a self-activity not a commodity."  

Labour holds a central position in Marx's concept of man as well as his concept of alienation. Marx has regarded labour as the primary force of historical development. It is through conscious and practical life activity

---

man distinguishes himself from animals. The social and human nature of man can be expressed through labour. But the question arises here is that why Marx has given so much importance to the 'Labour'? The answer of the question lies in the fact that human need. To satisfy the basic needs of human life i.e. food. Clothing, shelter, labour is essentially required. Robert Tucher has described. “In Marx’s definition labour is an abstract universal which is the historical process, symbolizes man’s productive power.”

We have already discussed the role of labour in the section 1:4 we have also discussed how the transition of ape to men has taken place.

Earnest Mandel has described three stages of economic alienation where alienation of labour takes place. The first most striking stage of economic alienation is the “separation of men from, free access to the means of production and means of subsistence.” This is an example of feudal society. The producers of that society, the peasants and serfs are not free people. They could not move freely. They cannot enjoy their means of production. It is the landlord who is the owners of the means of production of history. There are not single acres of unprompted spot of land where people con cultivate as free farmers.

60 Loc. Cit.
The historical factor is the starting point for any theory of alienation. Because of the institution of wage labour men are forced to sell their labor power to another person, to their employer, can come into existence on a large scale where free access to the means of production is denied. Thus, the first precondition of alienation arises when labour becomes separated from the basic means of production and subsistence.

The second stage of in the alienation of labour comes out of according to Earnest Mandel is, “When part of society was driven off the land, no longer has access to the means of production and means of subsistence and inorder to survive, was forced to sell its labor power on the market.”

This also happens when migration takes place from rural to the urban areas. Marx says, the worker sells its labour power, and part of their time to the capitalists. The worker is not free to do what he wants to do. It is the capitalists who willdictates you in our work. He will dictate how you will produce it and where you should produced it. That means he is the sole authority. In this situation worker feels alienated not only from the society but also from his work.


When a wage earner has sold his labour power for a certain part of his

63 Ibid., p.347.
life to his employer, the products of his labour are not his own. The products of labour becomes the property of the employer.”

For Marx, under capitalism not only does the workers lose possession of the product of his labour, but the product itself. Thus Marx viewed ‘economic alienation’ as the major form of alienation from which all other alienation follows.

In *Economic and philosophic Manuscripts* of 1844, under the chapter “Estranged Labour,” Marx gives four kinds of alienation, which is as follows.

1. “The relation of the worker to the *product of labour* as an alien object exercising power over him. This relation is at the same time the relation to the sensuous external world to the objects of nature, as an alien world, inimically opposed to him.

2. The relation of labour to the *act of production* within the *labour* process.”

3. Man’s *Species being, both* nature and has spiritual species property into a being *alien* to him, into a means for individual existence. It estranges from man his own body as well as external nature and his spiritual aspect, his *human aspect*.

---

64 Loc. Cit.

4 An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labour, from his life activity, from his species being is the *estrangement of man from man*.

5 In a capitalistic society worker is alienated because he feels deprived of the condition set by the bourgeoisie's.

6 Marx says that 'alienation' is worse under capitalism than any economically less advanced society.

Marx has identified four characteristics of man's alienation which we have already said i.e. man's alienation from nature, from himself (from his own activity), from his species being and from other men. We will discuss these four features one by one.

1.6(I) Man's Alienation from Nature: (Alienation from his own products i.e. to the objects of nature).

This refers to the relation of the worker to the product of his labour and also his relation to the objects of nature. These two issues we have already discussed. Here we will discuss how man in a capitalistic society is alienated from his labour, nature etc.

Marx has conceived labour as the self-confirming essence of man. Labour is men's expression of his physical and mental powers. Man

---

66 Ibid, pp. 74-75.
produced beautiful things out of nature. And labour the medium through which man can be to produce beautiful things. Labour is man’s coming to himself i.e. labour is man’s proper channel through which man can express is real life. It is only through this conscious activity on nature man develops himself, changes his own nature and can able to transform the nature. Erich Fromm in his book *Marx’s concept of man* has described, “Work (or labour) is, therefore, not only a means to an end the product- but an end in itself, the meaningful expression of human energy; hence work is enjoyable.”

It is important for us to recognize that, Marx consider neither production to constitute alienation, nor holds production as such to result in the products alienation. Marx explicitly states that it is alienated from its producer only when,” it exists independently, outside himself, i.e., outside of his control and alien to him, and…. Stands opposed to him as an autonomous power.”

Man through his productive activity puts his own life into the objects of his own creation, objectifies himself. In this context Marx writes:

“The product of labour is labour which has been embodied in object, which has become material: it is the objectification of labour. Labour’s realization is its objectification. Realization of labour appears as *loss of*..."
Here we would like to discuss Marx's 'Objectification of Labor'. Labor itself has taken a central place in Marx's philosophy man though its labour our of raw-materials produces commodities. Through labour man creates beautiful houses. And the invention of steam engine is a nothing but the product of labour. And this is called the 'objectification of Labour'. In our opinion Marx has developed a scientific theory by giving importance to human labour. He establishes a dialectical inter connection between 'hand' (which is a product of labour as described by Engels in his book (Dialectics of Nature) and brain. He has also applied labour through which quantitative changes leads to qualitative changes. And the production of table, chair, food, cloths, machine is nothing but the objectification of human labour. Marx explicitly states that in a capitalistic society the objectification of labour turns out to be its loss of objectification. Thereby man alienate from his own products. The worker in a capitalistic society puts all his efforts to produce things. But his labor has no meaning as soon as it has transfer into a thing. Marx believes that alienation is a common feature of all societies.

69 Marx, Still using Hegel's terminology and his approach to the unity of opposites, counterpoises the term “Verwirklichung”

70 Marx, Karl., Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts. In this manuscript Marx frequently uses to similar German terms “Entausserung” and “Entfremdung”, to express the notion of alienation. In the present edition the former is generally translated as “alienation” the latter as estrangement”, because in the later economic words (Theories of Surplus valued Marx himself used the word alienation as the English Equivalent of the term “Entiusemng"
But capitalist economy brings alienation to its highest pitch. Capitalism alienates man from his own activity and from the product of his own activity and from the product of his labour. Labour, which is the self-confirming essence of man, turns hostile to him and alienates him productive activity. Under a capitalistic system the worker is so much exploited that he does not feel like to work. His spontaneous activity becomes a forced activity.

If the production will go up in a capitalistic society, than it is the capitalist who will get more benefit out of it. And the markers looses more. Marx writes in the Economic and philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.

"The worker need not necessarily gain when the capitalist does, but he necessarily looses when the latter losses."\(^7^1\)

The more they wish to earn the more must they sacrifice their time and carry out slave-labour complete losing all their freedom, in the service of greed. Thereby they shorten their lives.\(^7^2\)

The misery of the worker characterises with the power a values of his production. The deviation of the world of men is in direct proportion to the increasing value of the world of thing. In these condition, the labour of the

\(^7^1\) Ibid., p.22
\(^7^2\) Ibid., p.23
worker not only produces the commodities in general, but also produces
marker himself as a 'commodity' in his later work Capital, (Vol. 1)

Here, we would like define Marx's concept of 'Commodity'.
'Commodity' is the major concept as far as Marx's theory of alienation is
concerned. Marx explicitly stated that. The wealth of those societies in
which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as "an
immense accumulation of commodities." Commodity is, in the first place,
an object outsides, a thing that by its properties satisfies human wants some
sort or another ..... 74

Marx's major concerned was not to know how the object satisfies
these wants rather his concerned was to know the things in terms of its use.
For Marx, "Every useful thing as iron, paper, may be worked from the point
of view of quality and quantity... To discuss the discover the various uses
of a thing is the work of history." 75

Marx states that a commodity has both use value as well as exchange
value. He says that: "The Utility of a thing make its use value.... Use value
become a reality only by use or consumption: they also constitute the

73 Marx, Karl, Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Berlin, 1859, p.4., This quotation
has collected from capital. Vol. 1, Trans. From the third German edition by Samull
Moore Edward Aveling & ed., by Frederick Engles, London: George Allen & Unwin
Ltd., 1946.

74 Ibid., p.4.

75 Marx, Karl, Capital. vol. 1., op. cit., p.2.
substance the substance of all wealth, whatever may be the social form of that wealth... Exchange values at first sight present itself as a quantitative relation, as the proportion in which values in use of one sort are exchanges for those of another sort, a relation constantly changing with time and place.\textsuperscript{76}

The most essential element in Marx's philosophy is that we cannot talk of commodity of a thing in its abstraction. And labor is the centre of both use value as well as exchange value. \textit{A commodity has a value} only when \textit{labor} is a apply to it. Other wise it has no value. To quote Marx in this context: "A use value or useful article, therefore has value only because human labour in the abstract has been embodied or materialized in it."\textsuperscript{77}

Marx's interpretation of commodities is based on purely 'labor'. Properties are the products of labour. A thing has its meaning only when human labour is applied to it. A wood has no meaning unless until it serves some purposes of human being. In a capitalistic economy the worker produce things by his labour time, energy etc. But the result he gets out of it is something unbearably. Capitalists treats workers just like an animal.

To describe how human labour is an primordial aspect in human society, Marx has given an example of wood in his \textit{Capital,} Vol. 1 "The

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., pp.2-3.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., p.5.
form of wood, for instance, is altered, by making a table out of it. Yet, for all that, the table continues to be that common every day thing wood. But soon as it steps forth as a commodity, it is changes into something transcendent. It is not only stands with its fact on the ground but in relation to all other commodities, it stands on its head, and evolves out of its wooden brain grotesque ideas, for more wonderful than “Table turning ever was.”

......the world of commodities with the product of men’s hands. This I call Fetischim which attaches to the products of labour, so soon as they are produced as commodities....

In the industrial or we may say capitalistic society the man as he works becomes fragmented. His sense of belongings almost loses. The object, which the labour produces, the labours own product, confronts the labour as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. Since the worker puts his whole life into the objects, his life no longer belongs to him but the object. Under such economic conditions Marx writes. “We proceed from an actual economic fact. The worker becomes all the poorer, the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and range. The worker becomes an even cheaper commodity the. More

---

78 Ibid., p.42.
79 Ibid., p.43.
commodities he creates. With the increasing value of the world of things proceeds in direct proportion the devaluation of the world of men “Labor produces not only commodities: it produces itself and the worker as a commodity.”

The more the worker processes the less he has to consume, the more value he creates, the more valueless, the more unworthy he becomes, the more powerless becomes the worker....

Thus, in a capitalistic society whatever the workers produces it ultimately goes to the hands of the capitalists. Worker cannot enjoy the means of production. This is the reason why man is the capitalistic society feels alienated from his own products as well as from nature.

Division of labour as Marx observes is also another factor responsible for the alienation that workers from his own products. Division of labour simply means in the process of production of commodities one person does only a part of the work. We can take a very simple example to illustrate these points. For example, the process of shirt is making. When the division of labour is introduced in the big manufacturing factories person buts the cloth, B stitches it, C makes the hand stitching and D does the packing. When the division of labour is introduced in the large scale

---

80 Marx, Karl, *Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, op. cit., p. 79
industries the worker only does a part of the work. Sometimes his product is going to be utilized. He never gets the opportunity of seeing his final product of his work.

Marx observes man is not a machine. The creativity in the man's work gives him the satisfaction. This is the only way by which worker can express himself through his products. He gets lots of pleasure when his creativity of the work is appreciated by the other. That gives the workers enthusiasm to work. But in the large industrial units men are treated like machines and with the introduction of division of labour he gets alienated from his product because there he is forced to work only for his livelihood. So the *Division of labour* in Marx's opinion leads to alienation of the labour from his own products. In this context Marx said:

The division of labour on the other hand served the purpose of capitalist's attempts to gain as profit as possible. Because the division of labour helps in the production of commodities at a large scale. Hence in turn it destroys. The cottage industry, small manufacturing units, regarding explaining this point Marx write:

"It (Division of labour) altogether destroyed the natural character as far this is possible with regard to labour, and resolved all natural relations into money relations. In the place of naturally grown town it created the modern, large industrial cities which have sprung of every night. It
destroyed the crafts and all earlier stages of industry whatever it gained
mastery. It completed the victory of the town over the country......82

We have seen that the first aspect of alienation refers to the relation
of worker to the product of his labour as an alien power. The aspect is
relation of the worker to the act of the production within the labour process
where man feels alienated from himself. Marx explains that in capitalistic
economy the worker through his physical and mental effort produce things.
Production of thing depends on the worker who spends his time, energy to
make at thing. But the worker is not the owner of the means of production
ultimately, it goes, to the hands at the capitalist. In this context Marx writes:

"It is true that Labour produces wonderful thing for the rich but for the
worker it produces privation. It produces palaces but for the worker,
hovels..... produces beauty – but for the worker, deformity..... replaces
labour by machines, but it throws one section of the workers back to a
barbarous type of labour.....",83

In our opinion the above mentioned quotation of Marx indicates that
a worker in the capitalistic society suffers a lot. When he is saying that the
worker produces palaces for the capitalists and stays in hovels that does
means to he wants show the amount of exploitation which the worker is
facing inside a capitalistic society. That means if he will work 20 hours per

82 Marx, K. & Engels, F., German Ideology, Moscow; Progress Publishers. 1976, pp.81-
82.
day he will not get any benefit out of the profit of a thing goes to the capitalist but also the name and fame also.

This is the reason why the very act of production is estranging man from himself. Here we would like to say that Marx's conception of self-alienation is different from Sartre's concept of self-alienation. Marx's concept of Self-alienation is related with man and his social and economic relations.

In a capitalistic society the labour of a person is treated as commodity. Labour of a worker is said to be useful is determined by its market value. It is not the worker who will decide the use and application of things, which he produces rather it, depends one the buyer and the capitalists. Marx in this context writes:

"The labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal or a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of commodities, to all the fluctuations of the market."\(^{84}\)

Therefore, under the capitalist system the activity of the worker is not a spontaneous activity rather a forced activity. And this is rather a forced activity. And this is reason why man alienated from himself.

3. Alienation from Species:

In a capitalistic society the species activity man is not a spontaneous activity. He is not free in his work. Thus, it is something, which is side to be the forced labour. As we have discussed in the section that it is the species character of man, which distinguishes man from animals. Production of thing determines the species character of man. And the species character of man determines that he is a conscious being having free life activity. The production of a thing inside capitalistic society turns man’s species activity into animal activity. And man in that activity in our opinion can no longer able to distinguish himself from animal. In this context Marx writes:

“In tearing away from man the object of his production, therefore, estranged labour tears from his species, and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his organic body, nature is taken away from.” \(^{85}\)

Man as Marx conceived is a part of nature. And in participating nature man transforms and also controls the nature. This involves the species character of man. Under a capitalist system man lost his species character because of the exploitation. Therefore, man alienates from his species life.

\(^{85}\) Ibid., p. 74.
Alienation from other Man:

Alienation of man from its species life implies alienation man from men. Describing Man's relations to other man, Marx describes: When man confronts himself, he confronts the other man. What applies to man relation to his work, to the product of his labour and to himself, also holds of man's relation to the other man and to other man's labour and object of labour. 86

In a bourgeois society the relation between one individual with the other is the relation between class member and property holders, between worker and the capitalist and between lands lord and the formers etc.

Marx says that with the growth of industrial society, a stiff competition has been taken place between the owner of the means of production and the producing activity itself. As Marx describes:

"...Society becomes fiercely competitive and each man regards other men as means, degrades himself into a means and becomes the playthings of alien power." 87

Marx in his book The Poverty of Philosophy argues:

"If all the members of the modern bourgeois have the same interests in as much as they from a class as against another class, they have opposite,

---

86 Ibid., p. 75
antagonistic interests in as much as they stand face to face with one another.»

In the condition of the working class in England, Engels describes the perplexing status of the poor labourers. “Black, mutinous, discontent devours them; simply the miserablist feeling can inhabit the heart of man. English commerce,... makes all paths uncertain for them, all life a bewilderment; sobriety, steadfastness, peaceable continuance, the first blessings of man are not theirs. This world is for them no home but a dingy prison house, of reckless unthrift, rebellion, rancour, indignation against themselves, and against all men.” In the same book he described the miserable and wretched condition in which the industrial worker of the period has to work. He writes:

“...These Londoners have been forced to sacrifice the best qualities of their human nature, a hundred powers which slumbered within them have remained inactive, have been suppressed....The very turmoil of the streets has something repulsive something against which human nature rebels. The hundreds of thousands of all classes and ranks crowding past each other are they not all human beings with the same qualities and powers, and with same interest in being happy?... And still they crowd by

---


98
one another as though they had nothing in common nothing to do with one another, and their only agreement is the tacit one, that each keep to his own side of the pavement... while it occurs to no man to honour another with so much as a glance... this narrow self-seeking, is the fundamental principle of our society everywhere.... The dissolution of mankind into monads, of which each one has a separate principle, the world of atoms, is here carried out to its utmost extreme."^90

This passage of Engels clearly reveals the inhuman living conditions of the proletariat in a capitalistic society. The proletariat has to work as long as the last breath of his life in order to fulfill the bare necessities of his family. Here we will see that Marx has rightly pointed out that capitalist economy turned everything into commodities. Even the life of the proletariat becomes a commodity proletariat cannot desire anything what is truly human. Capitalistic society has reduced everything in the level of barter. It is not only the commodity which have an exchange value but also the very life of the people itself.

Man in capitalistic society started giving importance to money. So it is the money which creates all sorts of problem. In the next section we will discuss how money dehumanizes man.

^90 Ibid., p. 329
**Money Dehumanizes Man:**

Capitalist economy moving around the axis of money. Marx thought that money plays a vital role inside the society because of which dehumanization of man takes place. Possession of money not only satisfy the natural desire of man rather it gives power to the people. Therefore, money is a necessary medium through which a person who is rich can achieve anything in his life, which he didn’t even deserve. A deserving or a poor person prevented from having such things. Marx said, in a capitalist society it is this purchasing power of money creates self-alienation among the life of the proletariat. Marx that in a bourgeois society man can be judged in terms of money or how rich is. Man’s being and powers were determined by his wealth. Marx illustrated this idea by quoting Shakespeare in Timon of Athens:

"Gold? Yellow, glittering, precious gold? No, Gods, I am no idle Votarist!...

Thus much of this will make black which, foul fair, wrong right, base noble, old young, coward valiant.

...Why, this will lung your priests and servants from your sides, pluck stout men’s pillows from slave..."\(^91\)

---

This passage of Shakespeare clearly indicates the power of money. It shows how in a capitalistic society a person having can do any thing he likes in comparison to a person who is not holding money. In this connection Marx wrote in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* of 1844: "I am unable to do as a man and of which therefore all my individual essential powers are incapable..."\(^{92}\)

Marx said Shakespeare stresses especially two properties of money!

(1) "It is the visible divinity the transformation of all human and natural properties into their contraries, the universal confounding and distorting of things : impossibilities are soldered together by it.

(2) It is the common horde, the common procurer of people & nations.

"The distorting and confounding of all human and natural qualities, the fraternization of impossibilities – the devine power of money – lies in its character as men’s estranged, alienating and self-discoing species-nature. Money is the alienated ability of mankind."\(^{93}\)

\(^{92}\) Ibid., pp. 130-31

\(^{93}\) Ibid., pp. 130-131
Marx felt that money is the object of eminent possession. Money is not only the binding force between man & man, man & society but also acts as the "universal agent of separation." ⁹⁴ Describing the power of money Marx wrote "what, man! Confound it, hands and feet.

And head and backside, all are yours!

And what we take while life is sweet is that to be declared not ours. Six stallions, say, I can afford is not their strength my property? I tear along, a sporting lord, I tear along, a sporting lord, As if their legs belonged to a me." ⁹⁵ (Gothe: Faust)

Marx said, Goethe’s passage clearly reveals that "the extent of power of money is the extent of my power." ⁹⁶ Marx wrote; "....What I am and determined by my individuality I am ugly, but I can buy for myself the most beautiful women. Therefore, I am not ugly, for the effect of ugliness its deterrent power is nullified by money. I.... am lame, but money furnishes me with twenty for fact. Therefore, I am not lame. I am bad, dishonest, unscrupulous, stupid; but money is honoured, and hence its possessor. Money is the supreme good, therefore, its possessor is good. Money, besides saves me the trouble of being dishonest : I am therefore,

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 130  
⁹⁵ Gothe Faust, Part-I, Faust’s Study; ( The English Translation is Taken from Gothe’s Faust, Trans. by Philip, Penguin, 1949, p.91.  
⁹⁶ Ibid., 91.
perceived to be honest. I am brainless but money is real brain of all things and how then would its possessor be brainless? besides, he can buy clever people for himself, and is he who has power over the clever not more clever than the clever? Do not I who thanks to money am capable of all that the human heart longs for, possess all human capacities? Does not my money, therefore, transform all my incapacitates into their contrary?" 97

For Marx money is the coin that really separates as well as the real binding agent-- the chemical power of society. The present day society is a clear cut example of this. Of course, it is true that development of a society or a country depends on its social production & its investment. Thus can be measured in terms of money value. But that does not mean a section of people become the master of it this is what Marx dislikes, the bourgeoisie attitude towards the proletariat. For him those who produced the means of production may have the right to own the means of production. Discussing the role of money, Marx describes: "if I long for a particular dish or want to take the mail coach because, I am not strong enough to go by foot, money fetches me the dish and the mail coach; that is, it converts my wishes from something in the realm imagination translates them from their mediated, imagined or desired existence into their sensuous, actual existence--from

97 Marx, K., Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, op.cit., pp.129-30
imagination to life from imagined being into real being. In effecting this meditation, (money) is the truly creative power.\textsuperscript{98}

In a capitalist economy the whole money was taken by the capitalists because of which dehumanization takes place. In his discussion on the Jewish question, Marx attached the money system and wrote,

"Money is the universal self-established value of all thing.. It was therefore robbed the whole world.... of its value. Money is the estranged essence of man's work and man's existence, and this alien essence dominates him, and he worships it."\textsuperscript{99}

Marx has described money as the determined value of a society. Persons having more money can impose his ideas on others in a capitalist economy. Thus, because of money dehumanization takes place. Here we would like to discuss theory of surplus value, which is Marx's major concerned in his later work \textit{Capital Vol. 1}.

\textbf{1.6.5.1 Theory of Surplus Value}

The classical economists observed that all actual prices of a thing can be determined by the value of the commodity, measured in terms labour hours required to produce it. But Marx pointed out that by virtue of

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., p. 131.

his superior economic powers the employed was able to make an agreement with his workers which was not determined by the number of hours they worked for but was determined by their labour power. Marx in his Capital (vol.1) says “The fact that half a days labour is necessary to keep the labourer alive during 24 hours does not in any prevent him from working a whole day. Therefore, the value of labour power creates in the process are two entirely different magnitudes, and this difference of the two values was what the capitalist had in views when he was purchasing the labour power.”

Surplus value is the difference between the value created during the period of socially necessary labour and the value created during the period in excess of it.

When the capitalists employ the labourer on wages for fixed number of labour hours, they buy the entire labour power of the worker, which he set to work on the means of production. What in fact happens is that if x works ten hours, he produces all the value for which x receives wages, in the first five hours which, constitutes the socially necessary labour and 'x' gets nothing for what he produces the next five hours. This on the other hand goes to the employer. The difference between the value created during the period of socially necessary labour and value created during the period

\[\text{105 Marx, K., Capital (vol. 1), Op. Cit., P.522.}\]
in excess of it is what Marx calls surplus value. Surplus is the measure of the workers exploitation. And because of this exploitation man gets alienated from his activity and from himself.

Marx applies the term not only to the product of labour, but also to labour itself. According to Marx, labour is alienated, when one is related to his own activity as some thing alien not belonging to him. Marx wrote: "if the worker is related to his own activity as forced activity, then he is related to it as activity in the service, and under the domination, coercion and yoke, of another man." 101

The work of the labour is not a free or spontaneous activity. The worker feels as something imposed on him against his wish. By this Marx means that the worker does not feel at home. It is because the worker is related to the product of labour as alien object. Marx wrote ".......the more the workers spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself- his inner world becomes the less belong to him as his own.... The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labour becomes an object, an external existence but that it exists outside him, independently as something alien to him, and that becomes a power on its

own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien.\textsuperscript{102}

This passage clearly reveals the position of a worker in a capitalistic society. If we take the general psychic of a person, we will find that a person needs something in return out of his labour which he spends. If does not get anything out of it, he no longer feels to work for it. And this is what Marx wants to describe that in a capitalistic society the more the workers work, the less and even sometimes gets nothing out of his labour. And this creates alienation of man not only from his product but also from his species being which further gives rise to self-alienation.

Degradation of the worker is harmful not far the worker alone who is suffering rather it is harmful for the entire society and again it is dangerous for the class of people who is creating these kinds of suffering. Degradation of the workers gave rise to crime, theft, killing, suicide, insincerity inside the society. The present day society is a clear cut example of this.

If the consumption of a person is less than his production, than he will no longer show his interest to do that work. 'Interest', is a basic factor in order to produce certain things. Unless a person has interest he cannot do work properly. And this interest is not something forced rather by creating

\textsuperscript{102} Marx, K., \textit{Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844}. op. cit., p.69.
surrounding in such a way that that person will create the interest himself. And the most important fact in a capitalistic society is that the workers lose their interest to do a work.

Marx, in his book EPM has discussed the objectification of labor. Marx has body a distinction between *Objectification* and alienation. He criticizes Hegel for shuffling and using them as two identical concepts. Objectification is the (excrucency, process) gibbosity through which man objectifies himself in nature as well as in the society.

The concept of objectification explains the relationship between the money system and the process of alienation, between private property and avarice, capital and landed property, value and the devaluation of men and between monopoly and competition. The objectification is the realization of labour through the loss of the reality of the labourer.

Plamentar describes Marx concept of objectification as that corresponds more or less to Hegel’s externalization. Hegel says, spirit externalizes itself, and in doing so it realizes its potentialities, it reveals what it is in the world of its activities. So, too, for Marx man reveals his nature and realizes himself by objectifying himself.

---

103 Ibid., p.68.
Since alienation arises only under a particular form of labour process (specifically capitalist form of labour), it will not overcome until the workers collectively take over the control of production. In a socialist made of production, the act of objectification does not involve alienation of labour because of its socialized production. Alienation, therefore, is to be the ended, not by abolishing labour as such, but by making it human.

According to Herbert Marcuse, "Marx in his earlier writing has described the process of reification which is turn into Fetishism of commodities in his later writings. The essence of the theory is that the capitalist society makes all personal relation between men take the forms of objective relations between thing". Marx expounds this process in his Capital as the fetishism of commodities. In a capitalistic society commodity plays a vital role.

The relationship between man with the other men takes place with the help of the commodities, which they exchange. Individuals social status, freedom, at the standard of their living and their powers are all determined by values of their commodities. Marx is very much concerned about human suffering which arises out of prevailing mode of labour rooted in modern society.

---


According to Marx, alienation is allowed to go on unchecked in the grab of political economy.\textsuperscript{106}

Marx’s concept of dehumanization is intrinsically related with his conception of man which is different from other materialistic school of man. Marx conceived man as a socio-historico conscious being. The very word conscious has a reference to social action in a historical process. That means as individual is different from machine and animals. Any attempt to treat an individual along with or as a part of machine or animal result in dehumanization Marx observed the capitalistic system itself dehumanizes the individual. It always concentrated upon profit making and treats the individuals like machines, and put them to work in inhospitable atmosphere. In Marxian sense in the capitalistic system these are the following instances, where dehumanization of man’s takes place. Putting workers to work more than the stipulated time period in a bad working condition, without light, food and shelter the worker is forced to work, not recognizing the creativity of the worker. Here, the worker works like a machine and forced to work in a monotonous way. Profits making ends in dehumanization.

\textsuperscript{106} Marx, k., \textit{Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844}, op.cit., p.30
Till now we have seen, how man in a capitalistic economy gets alienated not only from his product and nature but also from his species being and from him. Karl Marx viewed that in a capitalistic economy there are two essential factors, which is mainly responsible for alienation. They are division of labour and private property. In our next section we will discuss Marx's views on division of labour and private property.

The capitalistic modes of production aims at profit making. Its essence is to get more work from the laborers and pay less for it

1.6.6. Division of Labour and Private Property:

**Division of labour & dehumanization:** Since the capitalistic mode of production aims at profit making it uses gigantic machine for large scale production. The joy of creating something by using small handmade tools, of which the worker is forced to be deprived of. The workers lost his identity before the gigantic machine. And moreover, with the division of labour a worker makes a part of some commodity sometimes he does not know what he is making and what for his work is meant for. He never sees the final product of his labour This is also one shorts of 'dehumanization' according to Marx.

**Capitalistic social structure:** The very social structure, which presupposes hierarchy, defies the dignity (specifically the worker class). The workers who produced every thing to meet the requirement of the
society are always forced to be at the bottom of hierarchy. Their requirements as an individual is never met. So the very structure of hierarchy that one class produces and other class consumes without doing any work is worst from of dehumanization. Prof. Bhuvan Chandel observes, "Marx has analysed three causal factors in this respect. The first is the labour extraneous to the worker. This implies the worker no longer finds any interest to continue his work. While doing the work he does not affirm himself rather denies himself, does not feel happy but discontented. Secondly, his labour is not voluntary but rather coerced. whatever works the worker does, he does it out of compulsion."\(^{107}\) It is not something that is called his spontaneous activity rather it is something forced. 'Division of Labour' as well as 'Private Property' is two basic causes, which give rise to alienation. Marx in the EPM has discussed that division of labour is also directly responsible for the moral impoverishment and degradation of the individual man.\(^ {108}\)

Labour turns into division of labour, which finally separates man from himself. There is a traditional belief that in every society division of labour exist. Whatever may be its form, division of labour has a cramping on the blossoming of individuality. Development of human history shows the division of labour is an important factor. The basic consequences of

\(^{107}\) Chandel, Bhuvan, *Marxian Ethics*, op. cit., p.73.

\(^{108}\) Marx, k., *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, op. cit., p.135.
these factors are, Firstly, irrespective of their interests and abilities individuals are forced to enter into different branches of production where work is distributed in various ways. Secondly a sharp social division takes place between physical and mental, between meter and the worker, ruler and the ruled etc. In the division of labour people are circumscribed to do one kind of work. For the requirement of their basic needs they depend on others. Thus, division of labour is a social expression, which shows the alienated state of man from its products. In a capitalistic society, the division of labour is much worse because it forces the worker to depend on a particular one-sided machine i.e. labour. Division of labour increases the productive power of the labour but at the sometime it impoverishes the worker and reduces him to a machine.

Marx has mentioned different kinds of division of labour. To quote Marx:

“There springs up naturally a division of labour caused by differences of sex and age, a division that is consequently based on a purely physiological foundation, which division enlarges its materials by the expansion of the community, by increase of population, and more specially by the conflicts between different tribes and the subjugation of one tribe by another.”

Marx has also talked of another kind of division which is knows as manufacturing division of labour where he has talked about modes capitalism. According to this division the capitalist gives a particular job to

---

every labourer which the organization of industry demands. Here the labourer is confronted with, the “intellectual potencies of the material process of production, as the property of another, and as a ruling power. As a consequence he is transformed into the ‘property of capital’"110. Intelligence in production develops in one branch of industry and is crippled in another. This separation between different powers of the labourer and the world of production and his self is artificially bridged over in the capitalist system. They are no more human beings capable of realising their freedom. According to Marx, the division of labour in a capitalistic society does not arise from natural and racial differences but it is created by the economic system. Due to this division society is fragmented and a division takes place between capitalists, lawyers, teachers, students, soldiers, and workers etc. Divisions of labour lead to the detailing of women on the one hand and child labour on the other hand by the capitalists. It also leads to a depreciation of worker’s labour power. Capitalism thus transforms machinery into a devil which devours and sucks the blood of working millions.”111 This again leads to physical deterioration of the worker, which in the long run creates intentional starving and poisoning of the children. Marx has quoted an extract from the report of the Barker, the factory inspector: Happy indeed, happy indeed will it be for the

---

110 Ibid., p.341.
manufacturing districts of England, when every married women having a family is prohibited from working in any textile works at all.\textsuperscript{112}

Marx said division of labour is directly responsible for the moral impoverishment and degradation of the individual man. It is a convenient and useful means a skillful deployment of human powers for social wealth

Marx speak of the extreme significance of the division of labour since he finds in it 'the perceptibly alienated expression of human activity and of essential human power' as a species activity and power.\textsuperscript{113} "It is the expression of social character of labour within the framework of estrangement."\textsuperscript{114} Taking into consideration how division of labour leads to alienation Marx writes: "The division of labour offers us the first example of how, as long as man remain in natural society... as long as their activity is not voluntary but naturally divided, man's own deed becomes an alien power opposed to him.... For as soon as labour is distributed each man has a particular sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisher man, a shepherd or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to loose his livelihood..."\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{112} Marx, K., \textit{Capital, (vol.1)}, op. cit., pp. 376-377
\textsuperscript{113} Marx, K., \textit{Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844}, op. cit., p. 134
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., p. 129
\textsuperscript{115} Marx & Engels., \textit{The German Ideology}, op. cit., p.53
Division of labour is the primary force that drives the process of wealth production. It is based on the human propensity to exchange and barter the human talents, conditioned by the use of reason and speech etc. Marx criticizes this exchange of human faculties as being motivated by self-interest & egoistic tendencies. He explains the diversity of talents as a product of division of labour rather than the cause of it. It is carried on without any consideration of the talents of individuals and the interests of the whole. It takes place entirely according to the laws of capitalistic economy.

Private Property:

Marx said division of labour is the basis, which gives rise to the growth of private property increased in production gives rise to private property, creates all sorts of disturbances inside the society. It make the life of the poopers miserable. The growth of private property bridges a gap between to argosies class and proletariat class.

The more the private property, the more the workers suffer. Marx wrote:

"Private property has made us so stupid and one sided that an object only ours when we have it exists for us as capital or when it is directly possessed earen, drunk, worn, inhabited, etc., in short, when it is used by us."116

Marx described that the derminance of alienated labour. Marx in the
Epmarte “Private property is, thus, the product, the result, the necked
labour of the external relation of worker to nature and to himself.”117

“Private property thus results by analysis form the concept of alienated
labour, i.e of alienated man, of estranged labour, of estranged life of
estranged man.”118

Marx said private proper is not the only cause which gives rise to
alienation. There are also important factors which are responsible for the growth
of alienation. Out of them private property is the main ingredients of alienated
labour His view of private property is clear from this passage:

“True it is as a result of the movement of private property that we have
obtained the concept of alienated labour in political economy. But analysis of this
concept shows that thought the reason, the cause of alienated labour, it is rather its
consequence, not the cause but effects of man’s intellectual confusion.”119

Marx was openly hatred the private life of bourgeois class. Marx said “just
as woman posses from marriage to general prostitution, so the entire world of
wealth the that is of man’s objective substance passes from the relationship of
exclusive marriage with the own of private prostitution with the community. This

117 Ibid., p.77.
118 Ibid., p.77.
119 Ibid., p. 77.
type of communism since it negates the personality of man in every sphere is but the logical expression of private property, which is this negation.\textsuperscript{120}

Marx viewed that private property makes woman a piece of communal and common property.\textsuperscript{121}

1.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, our attempt was to bring it out that, Marx’s notion of alienation is not an abstract one, rather it is an outcome of a particular social set up. In the process, we discussed that Marx’s concept of man is intrinsically related with the process of Natural and Social evolution. In the section 1.4 of this chapter, we found that, as Marx observed, ‘Labour is the source of all wealth’. But when the worker does not get his due share, alienation results. We also discussed in this context that alienation and dehumanisation is an outcome of capitalistic mode of production, where profit making is the only aim.

\textsuperscript{120} ibid., p.94.
\textsuperscript{121} ibid.