CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF ALIENATION: CONCEPT AND THEORIES

The debate over the theoretical and empirical significance of the concept of "alienation" for sociology continues (Kon, 1967; Bell, 1962; Hallen, 1970; Throop and MacDonald Jr., 1971; Seeman, 1971, 1972, 1975; Lystad, 1972; Geyer, 1980; Ludz, 1973; Sharma, 1973; Plasek, 1974; Fischer, 1976; Holmes, 1976). Contemporary usages of the term "alienation" reflects diverse roots leading to the philosophical and sociological writings of Calvin, Grotius, Hobbes, Rousseau, Pitche, Schiller, Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Durkheim, Tonnies, Weber, Simmel, Mannheim, Fromm, MacIver, etc., and as might be expected, these philosophical writers and the sociological practitioners have not agreed with each other as regards the precise conceptualization of the phenomenon. This lack of a precise conceptualization has manifested itself in the several methodological problems faced by scholars in empirically testing the concept of "alienation" and various of its dimensions. Moreover, the earlier philosophical and sociological writings as also subsequent empirical researches by some leading scholars have brought to light several dimensions of the phenomenon of alienation namely, to mention a few of them, powerlessness, anomie, normlessness, social isolation, meaninglessness,
self-estrangement, cultural estrangement, valuelessness, homelessness,aloneness, etc. The great variety of the dimensions or alienation available in sociological literature has posed another problem for researchers in regard to the selection of those dimensions which really relate significantly and relevantly to the phenomenon of alienation in a given population under study. The selectivity of these dimensions has also varied in studies conducted from culture to culture, and from one particular type of social system or sub-system to another type of social system or sub-system. Nevertheless, in spite of occasional suggestions that owing to the theoretical and methodological confusions prevailing in the usage and practice of the term "alienation" and its "dimensions" it be completely striken of from the scientific vocabulary of sociology (e.g., Feuer, 1964; Kaufman, 1965; Israel, 1971; Lee, 1972), it still continues to be a significant focus of theoretical and empirical activity. The deliberations of Eighth, Ninth and Tenth World Congresses of Sociology, organized by the International Sociological Association, during 1974, 1978 and 1982 respectively, further go to confirm this increasing theoretical and empirical concern with the phenomenon of alienation in recent times. It is also worth to note in this connection that the bibliography on Alienation recently brought out by Geyer (1980) contains about 7,074 relevant scientific studies.
The term 'alienation' has a long sociological history. The Marxian theory of alienation has perhaps received a large amount of sociological attention from a variety of perspectives. Marx's use of the term 'alienation' has had a major influence on twentieth century usage, even though present-day sociologists have considerably extended the scope of this concept. For Marx, the history of mankind is one of increasing development, and, at the same time, of increasing alienation. For him, the problem of alienation arises among factory workers with technological developments and with the increasing pace of specialization, formalization, bureaucratization and division of labour. Other nineteenth and early twentieth century sociologists, who have concerned themselves with the problem of alienation of man from varied aspects of urbanized industrialized society, may be mentioned as Weber, Durkheim and Simmel. Weber (1928) has shown greater concern with the relationship of religion with a world created by modern science and industrial bureaucracy. For Durkheim (1951), the essence of modernization lies in growing individualism and in the increasing level of alienation that arise from the growth of mass society. Simmel (1964) blames metropolitan life for the progressive fragmentation of the 'individual self' into routinized roles, the blunting of recognition of others, and/or of one's self. For him, this is the essence of alienation in modern society.
But the contemporary interest in alienation differs from the historical treatment of the subject in three ways: (1) it involves a concerted effort to clarify the meaning of the term; (2) a broader conceptualization of the courses and consequences of alienation; and (3) considerable empirical research on its prevalence in modern society, (Lystad, 1972).

So far as the clarification of the concept and meaning of the term "alienation" is concerned, a good deal of effort has been made by social scientists during the past two decades. Most scholars today, Marxist and non-Marxist alike, recognize and often address themselves to both the subjective and objective dimensions of alienation. A major controversy has arisen in the last two decades, however, concerning the legitimate point of departure for conceptualizing, analyzing and then responding to alienation. To emphasize one dimension over another in one's conceptual approach implies a more fundamental epistemic choice with ideological and practical implications.

If one were to understand the term 'alienation' within the Marxist frame of reference, it may be observed that Marx has stressed both the objective conditions for and the subjective manifestations of alienation. Several scholars working within a Marxist frame of reference have also taken a dual stance of the objective-subjective issue. The Polish philosopher, Schaff(1981), has recognized both the objective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Neurit City Residency</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Urban Socialisation (Neurit City Residency)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Urban Socialisation (Places Resided)</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child/hood Socialisation</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spatial Mobility (Neurit City Residency)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spatial Mobility (Places Resided)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Neurit City Residency (Apartments)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13: Community assimilation indicators related to political alienation while all other variables and indicators are held constant (beta-coefficients).
with Marx's theory of alienation. Archibald et al., (1981), for example, claim that while there is some overlap between some of Seeman's (1959) varieties of psychological alienation or certain psychological aspects of Marx's conceptualization, an important gap between theory and research nevertheless remains. The issues at hand are theoretical, conceptual and empirical. The call is for theoretical analysis, conceptual refinement or empirical measures, which remain true to Marx's classical theory of alienation in general and to his concept of alienated labour in particular. The vigorous response among French sociologists and critics adds another important dimension to the debate (Touraine, 1977; Vidal, 1969; Lefebvre, 1961). They have argued that the subjective emphasis on the actor's state of mind usually takes the problem out of the domain of sociological analysis and understanding.

What is at stake here is a strategic epistemic choice between competing paradigms and departure points in the study of alienation: a choice which determines not only the way questions and answers about alienation are formulated and researched, but also the strategies for change, action and de-alienation. The starting point for the empiricists is the isolated individual rather than the organization of special relationships.

While the accent has been on sociological and socio-
psychological approaches to alienation, social scientists also drawn from the longstanding traditions of psychiatry, phenomenology, existentialism and ontology have concerned themselves with it. One of the current trends in the interdisciplinary field of alienation is characterized by recent theoretical efforts which draw on these traditions towards a merger or synthesis with Marxist theories of alienation, reification and false consciousness.

One of the continuing trend in the evolution of the alienation theme in the social sciences is the empirico-psychological reduction and value neutralization of the altruistic concept according to the specifications and requirements of mainstream survey research methods. By reducing alienation to psychological variates and attitudinal measures, the emphasis in the meaning of alienation has shifted from its normative evaluation to reductionism, i.e., to produce a scientific empirico-analytical tool devoid of evaluative pretensions. Researchers in this tradition are consequently unable to make grounded judgements about the determining structural conditions of alienation in the wider society.

In the realm of sociology, most research scholars today prefer to treat alienation as a subjective attitude, rather than as a strictly objective, social and ethical situation. External social conditions are extremely
important in producing these personal attitudes, but alienation occurs only when an individual consciously experiences discomfort or discontent in his social relationships. Because of inadequate or undesirable ties with parts or all of his social world, the alienated person feels separated or estranged from one or more social objects. Although he remains in society and continues to abide by its norms and plays necessary social roles, he psychologically withdraws from total involvement with the sources of his disenchantedment. In sociologists, thus, define alienation as an attitude of separation or estrangement between oneself and some salient social object.¹

Several elements of this definition require further elaboration: first, the word "attitude" is used in its technical social-psychological meaning, referring to a cognitive state which is infused with affectivity. That is, alienation is composed of both cognitive perceptions and emotional feelings. There has been much debate in the literature over this point. Some writers, such as Seeman (1959) and Neal (1964), stress the cognitive aspect, and describe alienation in terms of expectancies or probabilities held by the individual concerning the outcomes of his actions.

¹Fairly similar definitions of alienation have been proposed by Clark (1954), Kettler (1967, and Pearlin, 1962).
They even go so far as to state that, "In our view, ......... alienation is an expectancy construct regarding personal control, not an omnibus synonym for feelings of despair, maladjustment, unhappiness, or generalized negativism" (Neal and Seeman, 1964). Others, such as Srole (1956) and Meier and Bell (1959), primarily emphasize strong affectivity, and speak of alienation as "a feeling of despair, resignation, and hopelessness, with strong elements of ........ underlying anger" (Meier, 1963). Therefore, to be alienated, we suggest, a person must both hold certain cognitive views or expectancies concerning his social world, and also experience emotional feelings as a result of these views.

Second, implicit (if not always explicit) in the idea of estrangement is a continual process of interaction between the individual and his social environment. Alienation is not seen as simply a Pavlovian reaction by the individual to stimuli impinging upon him, but rather as an on-going relationship between himself and some social situation. As he interacts with others their demands and actions toward him influence his attitudes of estrangement, which, in turn, affect his behavior toward the other people, who then modify their future actions with him, which again influences his alienated attitudes, ad infinitum. A corollary to this process view of

---

2 Meier is here defining anomia, not alienation, although both she and Srole treat these two concepts as virtually synonymous.
alienation is that, like all other attitudes, estrangement varies in intensity among different people and within the same person in different situations. This variable aspect of alienation should be kept in mind at all times, even though (for reasons of expediency in research) one may sometimes dichotomize people into "alienated" and "non-alienated" categories.

Third, the phrase "salient social objects" requires considerable explanation. By "salient" is meant "of direct concern to oneself". In complex societies containing many sub-systems with sub-cultures and a proliferation of component groups, any individual can participate in (or even be aware of) only a small fraction of the total system, so that in one sense he is unassimilated into most aspects of his society. Potential bases for feelings of estrangement surround him on all sides. It would be pointless, though, to speak of this person as either socially isolated or alienated from all of these other parts of the society to which he did not belong or was not oriented. One must at least know of a social object and hold feeling toward it before he can be alienated from it. Groups and organizations or sub-cultures to which a person actually belonged would clearly qualify as salient social objects in this sense, but so would any other social or cultural phenomenon with which he identified himself in any way. Furthermore, one need not engage in interaction with a social object in order to feel alienated from it, as long as he was knowledgeable about it.
and felt some emotional concern toward it. For operational purposes, "saliency" might be determined in terms of either membership groups or reference group and their respective cultures.

By "social object" is meant any interactional, organizational, or cultural phenomenon. Most users of the concept of alienation assume, but rarely discuss, the fairly evident fact that this attitude may be directed toward many different kinds of event, situations, organizations, or ideas. Thus, it is a gross over-simplification simply to say that "John Doe is alienated". What? Is he alienated from his friends, his family, his job, his religion, his community, the economic system, the political system, dominant cultural values, the total society, or all of mankind? Most researchers in this field have been primarily concerned with alienation from the total society, but they have often failed to make this focus explicit. They have, therefore, ignored the fact that a person might be highly assimilated into one type of social organization (such as his family or community) even though at the same time he felt extremely alienated from another sphere of social activity (such as the political system). A tendency may exist

---

3Two recent studies of alienation (Clark, 1959; and Pearlin, 1962) have been limited to specific bureaucratic organizations rather than the total society, but no empirical work has been done on most other possible objects of alienation. A major exception to this generalization is estrangement from the political system.
for some social objects to be especially common focal of alienation, and for this attitude, to them, be generalized to other related objects (such as Marx's theory that alienation from work in turn produces alienation from others and oneself), but the existence of such a tendency should always be made problematic. Furthermore, by speaking of alienation as a generalized condition of the individual, without specifying what he is alienated from, we are tempted to view estrangement as a static personality trait rather than as an attitudinal dimension of one's social relationships.

Frequently implicit in the notion of a theoretical explanation of alienation is the idea of causal analysis, or the establishment of cause-and-effect sequences of events. Although a theory may explain the causes of the phenomenon under investigation, it need not take this approach. Theories can also explain how a process occurs, conditions necessary for its occurrence, or its consequences for other phenomena. All of the currently existing social theories of alienation might be interpreted as causal explanations, but should not be viewed entirely in this light.

A social theory of alienation, then, can explain which social factors are particularly associated with attitudes of estrangement, and perhaps why these relationships occur.

\[\text{Browning, et al., (1961), discussing Seeman's (1959) five types of alienation, also suggests that these attitudes may tend to generalize in a sequential process from one type of alienation to another.}\]
but it cannot give an unequivocal answer to the question of "what causes alienation?". This point must be particularly stressed in relation to the "political isolation theory" of alienation from politics which has been attempted in this work; it attempts to describe some demographic, social, and political conditions under which political alienation is especially likely to occur, but it is not specifically a causal explanation.²

Our overall goal in this study is to formulate a general social theory of political alienation. Unfortunately, none of the previously developed theories of alienation deal specifically with estrangement from politics. They have been intended as general explanations of all alienated attitudes. There is no reason to believe, though, that they are not applicable to political alienation, so we shall proceed on the assumption that they are relevant for this analysis. Whether in fact they are adequate to explain political alienation will be one of the major empirical questions under investigation in this study.

The following general social theories of alienation appear especially more relevant for the analyzing political

²Abbott (1966) has defined political alienation as a psychological state of rejection of or disidentification from a political system that is perceived by the individual as failing to meet his expectations of it.

Mass Society Theory: Although mass society theory has a long history of its own, going back at least to de Tocqueville (1961) and Durkheim (1933). Rosenberg (1951), unmistakably, places it within the general family of theories which sees contemporary society as too large and complex for man to control.

Most discussions of mass society theory can be placed into one of the two categories, depending on whether they focus on the structure or the culture of mass society. Examples of writers whose analysis is primarily structural would include Greer and Orleans (1961), Guasfield (1962), Kornhauser et. al. (1971), Mills (1956), Asch (1962), Selznick (1951), and Shils (1963). A few of the scores of writers who have theorized about various aspects of "mass culture" are MacDonald (1957), Shils (1960), van den Haag (1967), and Milensky (1964), Cutler (1973), Koenig (1974), Carbach (1974), Etzioni (1974), Isfjot (1974), etc.

As an illustration of mass society theory, we shall examine what is undoubtedly its best known representation: William Kornhauser's The Politics of Mass Society (1959). A mass-or "atomized"-society, he defines as "a situation in
which the aggregate of individuals are related to one
another only by way of their relations to a common authority,
especially the state" (p. 32). Two structural features of
such an atomized society are particularly important: lack
of meaningful and binding interpersonal relationships, and
lack of independent and viable "mediating" groups between
the individual and the total society. In a mass society, first
of all, individuals are relatively socially isolated from one
another, and interact only in segmented and highly impersonal
functional roles. The breakdown of the extended kinship
and stable community ties which existed in simpler societies
leaves individuals without secure "social roots" of any
kind. "The chief characteristic of the mass......is isolation
and amorphous social relationships" (pp. 31-31). Each
individual is adrift alone in a vast sea of anonymous
humanity.

Individuals are also said to be relatively unassimilated
into the total society because few or no organizations exist
between the nuclear family and the complex bureaucracies and
political power structures which dominate society. To avoid
a mass social structure and culture, Kornhauser argues, a
society must contain a vast, overlapping and interlocking
network of "mediating groups" to fill the gap between

6 Kornhauser admits that the nuclear family may remain as a
structural unit in mass societies, but does not see it as strong
enough to counter all the other forces producing individual
isolation.
interpersonal relationships and the remote and centralized total society.

According to Rose (1962), "Mass society is objectively the atomized society, and subjectively the alienated population" (p. 33). Modern "mass man" is denied the sense of "community" which gave purpose and meaning to life in simpler societies. He becomes estranged from a social world which he cannot understand, in which he cannot achieve the goals he seeks, in which the people he interacts with, do not share his attitudes and values, in which his daily activities provide him no satisfactions, and in which he even has no control over his own social destiny.  

One of the most common objects of these alienated attitudes in mass society is the political system. In the words of Kris and Leites (1950): "Individuals in the mass societies of the twentieth century are to an ever-increasing extent involved in public affairs; it becomes increasingly difficult to ignore them. But 'ordinary' individuals have even less the feeling that they can understand or influence the very events upon which their life and happiness is known to depend."

A limited amount of empirical evidence is available to support the basic contentions of mass society theory that lack of primary relationships and of memberships in voluntary

---

7 Rose (1962) has discussed at some length the various ways in which alienation may arise as a consequence of participation in mass society.
mediating associations is related to alienation. Using Srole's anomia scale as a measure of alienation, Bell (1957) found a slight inverse relationship between anomia and both formal association membership (especially among persons who attended meetings frequently) and informal group relationships. Rose (1959) reports a "significant" relationship between anomia and participation in clubs and organizations among his sample of Minneapolis residents. In the small city, he studied, Mizruchi (1960) discovered a "marked and significant inverse association" between anomia and scores on the Chapin Social Participation Scale (measuring participation in formal associations) which remained when socio-economic status was controlled. Anomia was only slightly related to participation in informal recreational activities and informal friendship groups; however.

Stronger evidence for the mass society theory is provided by two very recent studies. First, Neal and Seeman (1964) found in Columbus, Ohio, that persons who belonged to labor unions or business or professional associations expressed significantly fewer attitudes of powerlessness (as measured by a scale which they devised) than did non-members. It remained significant when occupational prestige and the respondent's history of occupational mobility (both upward and downward) were controlled. Second, Erbe (1964), in a study of factors influencing political activity in three small Iowa communities, also discovered a moderate inverse association ($d= - .32$) between alienation (as measured by
Dean's scales for powerlessness, guidelessness, and social estrangement) and involvement in both "instrumental" and "expressive" voluntary organizations. The observed relationship between attitudes of alienation and political apathy virtually disappeared when organizational involvement was held constant, however, which led him to conclude that such attitudes were only an intermediate factor between voluntary association participation (and also socio-economic status) and political activities. Yarrow (1968) has recently made an attempt to apply mass society theory to cleavage group models of political alienation. But, Chazel (1974) has presented a critical appraisal of the mass society theory and of the linkage it establishes between alienation and extremist political movements.

**Social Disadvantages Theory:** The generalization that has emerged from almost all empirical studies of alienation is that attitudes of estrangement—however, they are measured—are inversely and fairly strongly related to socio-economic status—regardless of how status is determined. Empirical support to this generalization is provided by the findings of Srole (1956) about the relationship between income and anomia; of Bell (1957) and later by that of Meier and Bell (1959), about the strong relationship between occupation, education, and subjective class-identification and anomia; of Mizruchi (1960) about the marked association between low status.
education, class-identification and anemia; of Killian and Grigs (1962) between education, occupation, and class identification and anemia; of Dean (1961) between occupation, education and income and estrangement; of Middleton (1963) between education and race and estrangement; of McGlosky and Schurman (1965) between education, occupational status and alienation.

Of all students of alienation, Irbe (1964) has most directly utilized socio-economic status as one of the theoretical explanations of estranged attitudes. More directly relevant to political alienation are the findings reported by Campbell, et al. (1964) from their national-sample survey of political behavior. Political efficacy and responsibility were both markedly associated with high education, high income, and non-manual occupations—although the trends were more evident for efficacy than for responsibility. Thompson and Horton (1960) also discovered similar inverse relationships between their measure of alienation and education and occupation.

Personal Failure Theory:—Whereas the first two general explanations of alienation focus mainly on social structural factors—the complexity of society and lack of viable social ties, or the social stratification system—personal failure theory is concerned primarily with the nature of the individual's own social experiences. The contemporary starting point for
all thinking along these theoretical lines is Robert Merton's (1938) classic essay on "social structure and anomie", although in a larger sense it all stems from Durkheim's (1951) writings on anomie and suicide.

Merton began with the assumption that cultural values and goals often vary somewhat independently of legitimate institutionalized norms and courses of action. The result of this situation may often be social disjunction, conflict, and anomie. Anomie thus results from a social situation in which there is "an acute disjunction between the cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accordance with them". (p. 162).

In a series of research reports, Neter and Bell (1959, 1963, 1965), have outlined and tested a more refined version of the "personal failure" theory of alienation. The resulting thesis begins with a proposition that is very similar to the previously outlined social disadvantages theory: if an individual continually lacks access to legitimate means for achieving his personal life goals, as the result of his positions in the social structure, he will likely feel discouragement, hopelessness, and despair. They comment, "anomia results when individuals lack access to means for..."

---

For extensions of Merton's basic theory, see (a) Rubin (1971), which illustrates the importance of differentiating between institutionalized norms and organizational means for achieving cultural goals, and (b) Cloward (1969), who suggests that despite serious incongruence between goals and means, deviant behaviour will not occur unless individuals have opportunities to learn such activities.
the achievement of life goals. Such lack of opportunity follows largely as a result of the individual's position in the social structure....The relative opportunities to obtain particular social statuses and the relative control over resources characteristic of them, as embedded in their rights and duties, are most important in evaluating the degree to which a person can achieve or has achieved his major life goals" (Meier and Bell, 1967).

One additional feature of the theory is the insertion of subjective perceptions of personal success or failure between objective social opportunities, or "life chances", as determined by one's social positions, and attitudes of alienation. Actual failure in attaining one's goals, that is, may not produce alienation unless one perceives oneself as a failure.

To summarize the personal failure theory, it begins with the idea that occupancy of disadvantaged social positions limits an individual's actions, but then goes on to specify that alienation tends to occur only when these limited opportunities prevent a person from attaining his major life goals and when he perceives himself as a failure in these endeavors. It is clear that the personal failure theory borders on the social disadvantages theory, in that socially imposed limitations on one's actions are undoubtedly a major obstacle preventing many people from achieving their
life goals. There is, however, a crucial difference between the two theories. The social disadvantages theory stresses means of action, and says that occupancy of socially restricted positions may be associated with attitudes of alienation regardless of whether or not the individual achieves whatever goals he seeks. The personal failure theory, on the other hand, stresses the ends of actions, and sees alienation arising only when a person clearly fails to attain his major life goals.

Some additional evidence for the personal failure theory has been provided by Kornhauser (1956), who reported an inverse relationship between anomia and feelings of life satisfaction; by MeClosky and Shaer (1965), whose "life satisfaction" scale showed a moderate inverse association with their "anomia" scale; and by Mizuchi (1964), who found that disadvantaged social positions, perceptions of cultural success symbols, perceptions of opportunities for advancement, and acceptance of the cultural goal of "getting ahead" all influence feelings of anomia; and by Faia (1967).

**Political Isolation Theory:** The basic presumption of this theory, a variant of the social isolation theory, is that the estrangement of an individual from politics results from his weak assimilation into the sphere of politics, not
into his community or society. A fair amount of empirical evidence is available from previous research to support the political isolation theory of political alienation, though none of it was intended for this purpose. Studies by Campbell, et al., (1954), Dean (1960, 1961), Erbe (1964), Kornhauser, et al., (1965), .McDill and Ridley (1962), Templeton (1964), and Thompson and Horton (1960) have consistently shown alienation - as measured by different scales in all but three instances - to be associated with such factors as the following: lack of interest in politics, failure to vote, shifting between political parties, little familiarity with political issues, low participation in political activities, ignorance of local power structures, and negativism toward issues which are strongly supported by the majority of the community. Although all of this research took alienation as an independent variable to explain these various political phenomena, the argument can just as well be reversed, since in reality the causal sequence

\[9\] A vague conception of the political isolation theory appears to lie behind Levin's (1960) suggestion that political alienation results from the inappropriateness of classical democratic theory for contemporary politics. He writes: "Feelings of alienation will arise in individuals who accept the classical democratic theory because it demands more of the individual citizen than he can realistically fulfill and promises more than can be delivered. Most citizens do not and cannot play an active role or display the sustained interest in politics required of them by the theory" (p. 73). In short, democratic political theory assumes a high level of assimilation into the political system throughout the entire population, but in reality this condition is rarely if ever met. Political alienation occurs that they are much more isolated from politics than they think they should be.
between action and attitude is undoubtedly almost always circular. From this viewpoint, most (if not all) of these factors may be seen as indicators of weak assimilation into the political system, which is, in effect, saying that political alienation tends to be associated with political isolation.

From the above discussion it may be concluded that the concept of alienation has to be understood either subjectively or objectively, or as a feeling or an attitude towards some salient object or as an interaction between the individual and his social environment or as an expectancy construct or as a causal relationship between some structural factors and behavioural consequences in a manner that allows empirical investigations and drawing of valid generalizations. In fact, the term alienation, whatever be its sociological history or usages by different social scientists, and whatever be the debate between the Marxists and non-Marxists, about the epistemological connotations of the term, it has situational and contextual referents. Unless the specific situation and context in which the term "alienation" is sought to be researched and the cultural phenomenon within it is sought to be analyzed, an appropriate theoretical model for empirical testing may hardly be constructed.

As has already been observed in a foregoing paragraph, the focus of the present study is the specific situation related
to politics or the political system in a given society, that is, India. Naturally, with the basic idea of alienation in mind as is apparent from the classical writings and from a variety of researches that have been conducted in modern times, a context-specific definition of alienation has to be constructed. In the next chapter an attempt has been made to review the theoretical and empirical work available on the subject down from Campbell et al. (1954) down to the present. It is on the basis of a critical review of current literature on political alienation, offered in the next chapter, an operational definition of political alienation shall be developed for purposes of the present study.

Furthermore, the foregoing discussion has also highlighted the fact that while drawing empirical generalizations from any study of alienation in any field of human life an effort must be made to offer a causal explanation of the phenomenon to be studied. This causal explanation requires the development of an adequate theory of alienation. We have briefly reviewed some of the known theories of alienation which, with all their drawbacks and criticisms, seem to compete with each other. If a study about the subjective feelings and objective conditions of the estrangement of the people from politics is sought to be properly made such factors must be taken into account that not only explain the phenomenon of political estrangement of the people and capable of theoretical
generation, as also through a comparative analysis of those variables an effort should be made to find out the validity of any one of the known theories of alienation or a unified theory of alienation as applied to the political system, particularly with reference to the estrangement of the people from the society or a given sub-system, say the political sub-system. This theoretical task is proposed to be undertaken in Chapters IV to VII, which deal with tests for each of the known theories of alienation as applied to the situation of political phenomenon.