

## Alienation in social contexts

**Key words:** Alienation # Anomie # social contexts #  
Marx # Durkheim # Max Weber

**Dr. Sajjad Ahmad**

Assistant Professor, Department of Educational  
Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi-25

**Abstracts:**The present paper discusses Karl Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber in contexts of alienation. These social scientists have conceptualized alienation in social context. Reconsidering the works of them are much needed as it provides a principal frames of reference to understand in terms in modern sociological aspects and broaden the cognitive horizon. The objectives of the paper is to set out a precise but comprehensive analysis of these authors with regard to alienation and to examine some of the main points of divergence between Marks's characteristics views on the one hand, and those of the later writers on the other.

.....

**Introduction:**Marx influence on 'alienation' is greater than any of other writers. Marx generated a powerful synthesis of the stream of thoughts which had developed in addition to the social, economic and

political differences between the three leading western European countries. Marx's works reunite the intellectual consciousness of the diverse experience of Britain, France and Germany and at the same time offer a basis for the theoretical interpretation of these differences in social, economic and political structure. After the death of Marx in 1883, the social structures of all the three major countries of Western Europe had changed considerably from the time at which Marx had developed his basic views. Durkheim and Weber consolidated their views which informed their life works. Thus, Marx's works are the primary source of various forms of contemporary neo-Marxism. Durkheim's writing may be identified as the dominant inspiration behind structural functionalism and some of the modern phenomenology derives directly or indirectly from the writings of Max Weber. Thus, the influence of these writers in the study of alienation and related issues of discrimination, marginalization, social stratification and so on are fundamental.

**Alienation:**

The term 'Alienation' has remained an ambiguous term with elusive meanings. Etymologically, in broader sense alienation is the act or result of the act, through which something, or somebody, becomes alien to something or somebody else. It has often been used by philosophers, psychologists, sociologists to refer an extraordinary variety of psycho-social disorders, including loss of self, anxiety state, anomie, despair, de-personalization, rootlessness, apathy, social disorganization, loneliness, atomization, powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, pessimism and the loss of beliefs or values. The most common among several meanings of the term are

'powerlessness', the feeling that one's destiny is not under one's own control but is determined by external agents, fate, luck or institutional arrangements; 'meaninglessness', in a generalized sense of purposelessness in life; 'normlessness i.e. the lack of commitment to shared prescription for behaviour; 'cultural estrangement' i.e. the sense of removal from established values in society; 'social isolation' in the sense of loneliness or exclusion in social relations and 'self estrangement', which is the most difficult term to define but the understanding that the individual is out of touch with himself. Theorists of alienation have generally distinguished between social condition and the response of individuals to these conditions. Alienation usually refers to the later, while the term 'anomie' has been used to describe a social state in which conditions of normlessness or the breakdown of social rules is identifiable. Sociologists have distinguished between anomie and alienation. Anomie has been described as purely a social phenomenon-a condition of society at a particular stage of social change, whereas alienation is purely a subjective phenomenon concentrated within the individual framework.

We do not find the utilization of the term in major reference books of social sciences until as late as 1935. However, the concept existed implicitly or explicitly in the classical sociological works of Marx, Durkheim, Tonnies, Weber and Simmel. Karl Marks in his early philosophic writing 'The Economic and Philosophic Manuscript of 1844' describes alienated labour. However, the manuscripts are a set of preliminary notes rather than a finished work. The discussion of alienated labour, till 1844, groping

towards the clear formulation of a distinctive perspectives of its own. Marx at that time was thinking in terms of an abstract conception of 'man' as being alienated from his biological characteristics as a species. So, it is presumed, at this initial stage in the evolution of his thoughts, that Marx believed that man is essentially a creative being whose 'natural' tendencies are denied by the restrictive character of capitalism. Due to the early treatment of the concept by Marx it is dedicated to him.

### **Historical roots of the idea of alienation:**

Historically, the roots of the idea of alienation can be found in the work of Plotinus and in the theology of St. Augustine and Martin Luther where he expressed that in the struggle to dissociate-or alienate-oneself from one's own imperfections by identifying with a transcendental perfect being. The most powerful pre-Marxian source, however, was Hegel, from whom Marx took the word 'alienation' while at the same time secularizing the conception of it. For Hegel, the term was an ontological fact rooted in the nature of man's existence in the world. The basic idea's of Hegel philosophy is that whatever exists have a basis of absolute idea and the absolute idea is neither a set of fixed things nor a sum of static properties but a dynamic self, engaged in a circular process of alienation and de-alienation. He says that it is an essential characteristics of finite mind (man) to produce things, to express itself in objects, to objectify itself in physical things, social institutions and cultural products and every objectification is an instance of alienation. He distinguished between man as a subject and man as an object i.e. man as a creative subject seeking to be and to realize himself and man as an object influenced and

manipulated by others, so that man's own creations (his art, language, sciences, and so on so forth) stand outside him as an alien objects.

In German idealism and metaphysical perspective, the concept, became the basis for a radical critique of society and its institutions by those philosophers who received Hegel's ideas and gave them scholastic interpretation. Responding to the social cries of 1840's, the German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1840-72) and Marx in particular transformed 'alienation' into a secular and materialistic idea. Since the idea was having specific forms of social organization therefore, it was inescapable and became prominent. For Feuerbach, the source of alienation lay in the institution of religion. He accepted Hegel's view that man can be alienated from himself, but he rejected both the view that man is absolute mind in the process of de-alienation. He says that man is alienated from himself when he creates and puts above himself an imagined alien higher being and bows before that being as a slave. The myths of divine powers were merely ways in which man projected his own humanity outside himself, locating his own capacities and sensibilities elsewhere.

For Marx, the alienation of man from his true being was grasped by neither Hegel's existential duality nor Feuerbach religious projection. He says that man not only alienates a part of himself in the form of God; he also alienates other products of his spiritual activity in the form of philosophy, common sense, art, morals and so on. He alienates products of his economic activity in the form of commodities, money, capital etc. and his social activity in the form of the state, law and social institutions. Thus, there are many forms in which

man alienates from himself and makes of them a separate, independent and powerful world of objects which he is related as a slave, powerless and dependent. It was man's nature to realize himself in work, but the possibility of doing so is denied to them by the economic system. Thus, the key problem lies in the form of alienated labour under capitalism where work is compelled rather than spontaneous and creative. The workers get little control over the work process and the product of labour is expropriated by others to be used against the worker, and the workers himself become a commodity in the labour market. Man not only alienates his own products from himself, he also alienates himself from the very activity through which these products are produced, from the natural world in which he lives and from other men. Thus, alienation consisted of the fact that man did not fulfill his 'species being' in work and the essence of man remain unrealized.

**Marx analysis of alienation:**

Marx analysis of alienation in capitalist production starts from a contemporary economic fact that the more capitalism advances, the more impoverished the workers become. The enormous wealth that the capitalist mode of production makes possible is appropriated by the owners of land and capital. The separation between the workers and the production of his labour is not simply a matter of expropriation of goods. The main point of Marx's discussion is that, in capitalism, the material objects which are produced become treated on par with the workers himself. Thus, the workers become an ever cheaper commodity the more goods he creates. The devaluation of the human world increases in direct

relation with the increase in value of the world of things. Through his labour, the workers act to modify the world of nature where as his production is the result of his interaction with the external world. Under capitalism, the worker gets assimilated to his products. The process of production thus, makes the worker 'a slave of the object'. The alienation of the worker in the capitalist economy is founded upon the disparity between the productive power of labour and the lack of control, which the worker is able to exert over the objects that he produces. As in the case of alienation in politics or other fields, this offers a parallel to alienation in religion. The qualities that are attributed to God are thereby removed from the control of men, and become as if imposed by an external agency. In a similar fashion, the product of the worker is alien to him and stands opposed to him as an autonomous power. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force. The product of labour is in other words, 'external' to the worker not only in an ontological sense but also in the much more profound and specific sense that 'what is embodied in the product of his labour is no longer his own.' The alienation of the worker from his product takes a number of distinct forms. The main dimensions of Marx's discussion of alienation are as follows:

**Lacks of control over the disposal of one's own products:**

The worker lacks control over the disposal of his products, since, what he produces is appropriated by others and the worker does not get benefited from it. It is the core principle of market economy that goods are produced for exchange. In capitalist production; the exchange and distribution of goods are controlled by

the operations of the free market. The worker has no power to determine the fate of what he produces.

**Market promotes the interest of the capitalist:**

The workings of the market act in such a way as to promote the interest of the capitalist at the expense of the workers. Thus, the more the worker produces the less he has to consume, the more value he creates the more worthless he become.

**Worker gets alienated in the work task itself:**

The worker is alienated in the work task itself. The work task does not offer intrinsic satisfactions that make it possible for the worker to develop freely his mental and physical energies. This is due to the fact that the labour is imposed by force of external circumstances. Work becomes a means to an end rather than an end in itself. This is shown by the fact that as soon as there is no physical or other compulsion, men flee from labour like the plague.

**Alienated labour reduces human productivity:**

Since all relationships are social relationships therefore alienation of labour has direct social consequences. Thus, Alienated labour reduces human productive activity to the level of adaptation rather than active mastery of nature. According to Marx, what distinguish human being from animals are the human faculties, capacities and tastes that are shaped by the society. The 'isolated individual' is shaped by an on-going society. Each individual is thus the recipient of the accumulated culture of the generations which have preceded him and in his own interaction with the natural and social world, in which he lives, is contributor to further modification of that world as experienced by others. Marx says that individual human life and species life are not different. He asserts, '...though a

man is unique individual...he is equally a whole, the ideal whole, the subjective existence of society as thought and experienced'(Gidden: 158). Marx further says that in bourgeois society, men are estranged, in specifiable ways, from the ties to society which alone confer their 'humanity' upon them. Firstly, alienated labour 'alienates species-life and individual life', and secondly, 'it turns the latter, as an abstraction, into the purpose of the former, also in its abstract and alienated form'. The alienation of man from his 'species being' is couched in terms of his analysis of capitalism, and is, in considerable degree, asymmetrical. The effects of alienation are focused through the class structure, and are experienced in concentrated fashion by the proletariat. Marx does not hold, however, that alienation is wholly confined to the position of the wage-labourer.

#### **De-alienation and the mass society:**

The Marxian tradition, however, represents only one stream of thought concerning alienation. A second stream about the prospect of de-alienation is embodied in the theory of 'mass society'. Observing the dislocation brought about by the industrialization of C.19th–C.20th, Emile Durkheim and Ferdinand Tonnies and eventually Max Weber and George Simmel, regretted the passing of traditional society and the consequent loss of the sense of community. As a consequence of industrial revolution, modern man got isolated up to an extent as he had never been before-anonymous and impersonal in an urbanizing mass, uprooted from old values, faithless in the new rational and bureaucratic order. Durkheim has addressed the expression of this theme in his work 'Anomie' (from Greek 'anomia' i.e. lawlessness) where he address a social condition characterized by rampant

individualism and disintegration of binding social norms. The main proposition in the division of labour is that modern complex society in spite of declining significance of traditional social beliefs is not tending towards disintegration rather the 'normal' state of the differentiated division of labour is one of the reason of organic stability. The existence of contract presupposes general moral commitments without which the formation of such ties could not proceed in an orderly fashion. He says that moral rules develop in the society and are integrally bound up with the conditions of life in a given time and place.

**Division of labour:**

The main concern in the division of labour comes out from moral ambiguity concerning the relationship between the individual and society in the contemporary world. On the one hand, the development of the modern form of society is associated with the expansion of individualism. This is a phenomenon that is directly associated with the division of labour which produces specialization of occupational function and foster the development of specific talents. Durkheim says that these contradictory moral ideals can be understood only through historical and sociological analysis of the causes and effects of the expansion of division of labour. Durkheim refuses to accept that the division of labour is wholly a modern phenomenon and a result of individualism alone as various types of diversification in the division of labour exists. He says that in more traditional sorts of society it is rudimentary and usually confined to sexual division where as the diversification of division of labour can be observed in all sectors of contemporary society. This differentiation of the division of labour inevitably

produces a decline in the commonness of the conscience collective of the society and thus the growth of individualism is an inevitable associated expansion of the division of labour and progress at the expense of the strength of common belief and sentiments. These conflicts can be averted if the division of labour is coordinated with the distribution of talents and capacities and if the higher occupational positions are not monopolized by a privileged class. The progressive decline of inequality of opportunity is a definite historical tendency which accompanies the growth of the division of labour. It remains absent in the primitive society because solidarity in the primitive society is based upon community belief and sentiments where as the means as well as the need for equalization of talent and opportunity remain absent. Therefore, in order to analyze the significance of differentiation in the division of labour, we have to compare and contrast the principles according to which the less developed societies are organized with those which govern the **organization of the 'advanced' societies.**

Weber carried the Durkheimian ideas further. Weber emphasized the fundamental drift towards rationalization and formalization in social organization. Personal relations became fewer and impersonal bureaucracy became larger. He says that the relationship between the existence of similar class interests and the occurrence of class conflict is historically dependent. Class conflict is likely to develop only where unequal distribution of life-chances are perceived as not an 'inevitable fact', in many periods of history; the negatively advantaged classes accept their position of inferiority as legitimate. According to Weber, class consciousness develops more readily in

circumstances where (1) the class enemy is a group in visible and direct economic competition and in modern capitalism, (2) the number of people who share the same class situation is large, (3) communication and assembly are simple to organize and (4) the class in question is provided with leadership which supplies clear and comprehensive goals for their activity.

The influence of class upon social action operates independently of any valuation these individuals might make of themselves or others. Weber rejects the notion that economic phenomena directly determine the nature of human ideal and says that such valuation have to be conceptualized independently of class interests. Thus, Weber distinguishes class situation from status situation and says that status situation of an individual refers to the evaluations which others make of him of his social position attributing to him some form of social prestige or esteem. A status group thus is a number of individuals who share the same status situation and are always conscious of their common position. For Weber, status group conflicts are no more important in history than conflicts between political associations and nation-states. Therefore, the concept of divergent sectional 'interests' can not be limited to economic interests, but must be extended to other spheres of social life.

**Another stream of influence:**

The third stream of influence retained the existential emphasis of Hegel. Soren Kierkegaard, stressing the importance of subjective experience over objective knowledge, held that attaining an adequate sense of self in a world dominated by purposelessness and despair was the central problem of alienation. This

theme of Kierkegaard continues in the work of Martin Heidegger, Jean Paul Satre, and other existentialist philosophers.

**Oppressed and the oppressor:**

Paulo Freire has tried to analyze the situation in terms of the relation between the oppressed and the oppressor. He says that the whole education system is one of the major instruments of silence and hence freedom of the oppressed is possible only with the transformation of the society since education never remains as a neutral educational process but it functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it. On the other hand it becomes 'the practice of freedom'- the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. In the diverse society the prevalence of sectarianism makes myth and turns reality into false reality and thereby alienates where radicalization is critical and thereby liberates. Radicalization involves increased commitment to the position one has chosen and therefore, it involves greater engagement in the effort to transform concrete objective reality. He further says that the dominator attempts to domesticate the present and keep a region or area broken down into local communities without the studies of these communities so that the future will reproduce this domesticated present and the dominance can be preserved. Therefore, the oppressor does not favour promoting the community as a whole because the more alienated people are, the easier it is to divide them and keep them divided so as to dominate them. By preserving the state of alienation

the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in a total reality will not be possible where as without critical intervention it is always difficult to achieve the unity of the oppressed as a class. Such a situation creates an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressed which in turn dehumanizes the oppressed. Being less human leads the oppressed to struggle against those who made them so and hence the behaviour of the oppressed is a prescribed behaviour. Thus, the very structure of oppressors and the oppressed are conditioned by the contradictions of the concrete, existential situation by which they were shaped.

To overcome the situation of oppression, critical recognition of the situation and analysis of the causes are essential so that through transforming action the oppressed can create a new situation. Since the oppressed suffer from duality which has established itself in their innermost being therefore they discover that without freedom they can not exist authentically. Although they desire authentic existence, they fear it as well. At one and the same time they themselves act as the oppressor whose consciousness they have internalized. Thus, the conflict lies in the choice between being wholly themselves and being divided; between ejecting the oppressor within and not ejecting him, between human solidarity and alienation. This is the tragic dilemma of the oppressed which their education must take into account. Giving way out for the divided, unauthentic oppressed to participate in the pedagogy of their liberation Freire says that the oppressed must perceive the reality of oppression not as a closed world from which there is no exit but as a limiting situation which they can transform. Solidarity

requires that one enter into the situation of those with whom one is identifying, as the oppressor shows solidarity with the oppressed only when he stops regarding the oppressed as an abstract category and sees them as persons who have been unjustly dealt with, deprived of their voice and cheated in the sale of their labour. Without political power the implementation of a liberating education is not possible. Therefore, in the first stage, the pedagogy must deal with the problem of the consciousness of the oppressed and the oppressor. It must take into account their behaviour, their view of the world and their ethics. Because for the oppressors, human being refers only to themselves and there exists only one right i.e. their right to live in peace and worthwhile is to have more even at the cost of the oppressed having less or having nothing which is an inalienable right, a right they acquired through their own efforts with their courage to take risks. If other do not have more, it is because they are incompetent and lazy and due to their ingratitude towards the dominant class. Freire says that when alienated the oppressed want to resemble their oppressor and in doing so they imitate and follow them and remain unaware of the causes of their condition. Such a situation validates their exploitation. On the contrary, education working as a banking system serves the interests of the oppressors who do not care for the world nor want to see it transformed. The oppressors use their 'humanitarianism' to preserve a profitable situation and therefore, they react instinctively against any experiment in education which stimulates the critical faculties. This makes the oppressed dependent emotionally upon the oppressor in complete manner. The phenomenon is referred by Eric Fromm as

'necrophilic behavior' i.e. the destruction of own life or that of their oppressed fellows. Thus, the interest of the oppressors lies in changing the consciousness of the oppressed rather than the situation. The oppressors regard the oppressed as the pathology of the healthy society which must therefore, adjust these 'incompetent and lazy' folk to its own patterns by changing their mentality. They need to be 'integrated', 'incorporated' into the healthy society that they have 'forsaken'.

Freire emphasize that the solution is not to 'integrate' them into the structure of oppression but to transform that structure so that they can become 'being for themselves'. Many political and educational plans have failed because their authors designed them according to their own personal view of reality and not taken into account the men-in-a-situation towards whom their programme was ostensibly directed. On the other hand, the oppressors always divide the oppressed so as to remain in power. This is done by various means from the repressive measures of governmental bureaucracy to the forms of cultural action and invasion with which they manipulate the people by giving them the impression that they are being helped where as the fact is that they never promote the community as a whole but rather through the selected leaders and by preserving the state of alienation. Since it is necessary to divide the people in order to preserve the status quo and thereby the power of the dominators, it is essential for the oppressors to keep the oppressed from perceiving their strategy and try to confuse them by showing themselves as their protectors. Therefore, in order to communicate effectively, educators and politicians must understand the structural conditions in which the thought and

language of the people are dialectically framed. He says that when the majorities are denied their right to participate in history as a subject that they become dominated and alienated. For an alienated person possibilities of success are hindered and alienated person are not able to develop authentically when they recognize his situation as unfavourable. Therefore, transformation is essential to undermine the oppressors' purpose.

The classification of modern definitions i.e. powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, cultural estrangement, social isolation and self-estrangement serve only a rough guide because contemporary writers often develop radically different conceptions within any one of the categories and define it in the ways in which they understand it. Some authors think that the concept can be applied both to man and to non human entities but most writers insist that it is applicable only to man. Some of those who apply it only to man insists that it can refer only to individuals and not to the society as a whole. Thus, with respect to self estrangement, one can be 'out of touch' with oneself in several ways.

The phenomenon of alienation is slow and systematic at the affective level. It may have some specific psychological reinforcers which might be present in certain type of personalities. However, at the social level, when certain situations come into direct confrontation with the conformed norms of behaviour, it flourishes. Psychologists observe that alienation grows as soon as the feeling of 'significant others in comparison to one's own feelings of insignificance emerges'. Thus, there may be cultural, economic, educational, structural, ethno-racial and power oriented

inequalities which make an individual feel inferior and worthless. Another cause of alienation has been found to be social segregation. The psychologists working in the field of organizational psychology like Kline (1989), Cohen (1973), Peter (1980), and Porter (1974) have come to the conclusion that the phenomenon of alienation is accelerated along with the increased complexities and rules of a particular organization. They have also observed that alienation sets in when traditional goals or distribution of facilities and services are replaced. Alienation among youths may differ in important ways; some aspects of alienation are relatively widespread in a particular culture; others tend to be limited to smaller sub groups.

Oppenheimer (1968) has suggested five kinds of alienation on the basis of the usages of alienation suggested by Seeman (1959) as being the individual's response to a specific social condition. These are as follows:

**Alienation from decision making:** This type of alienation focuses on separation from power or control of the decision making process. This alienation is antecedent to self estrangement, for separation from the decision making process over what one produces is theoretically the most important factor leading to alienation from self. This leads to two separate but interrelated areas of further alienation i.e. personal alienation and social alienation. Alienation from the self and alienation from the meaning of existence are the alienation which is a part of personal alienation.

**Alienation from Self:** This is loss of pride in one's work, hence loss of satisfaction. It involves a failure to find self- rewarding, self consumetry activities. Beyond this, it involves as even wider idea of worth, lack of

which may lead to the playing of self destructive and neurotic roles in the effort to find substitute satisfaction. It involves, too, the idea of not being 'true to one self'. Alienation from the meaning of existence: This is the feeling that the existence of self is meaningless. Durkheim (1966) addresses this alienation in the following words, 'life is said to be intolerable unless some reason for existence is involved, some purpose justifying life trial... when, therefore, we have no other object than ourselves, we can not avoid the thought that our efforts will finally end in nothingness, since we ourselves disappear.' Under these conditions, one would loose courage to live, to act and struggle. Meaning seems to be closely dependent upon 'self' which in turn very much depends upon the power to affect decision over oneself.

Alienation from society's means-ends system: This has been derived from Durkheim's (1966) and Merton's (1938) use of the term 'anomie', which refers to a social condition to which individuals adapt. Individuals are alienated from either society's means or its ends system.

Alienation from the system: This is a conscious rejection of which society stands for as a whole. Whatsoever be the account of alienation it becomes clear that regardless of the types, alienation is a dependent variable in sociological terms, and that specific conditions give rise to specific kind of alienation. Seeman (1959) has differentiated five meanings of alienation: Powerlessness i.e. the perception that one can not control what is happening to him; meaninglessness i.e. the perception that one is unclear as to what one ought to believe; normlessness i.e. a high expectancy that socially unapproved

behaviour is required to achieve given goals; isolation i.e. the assignment of low reward value to goals or beliefs that are usually highly valued in a society and self-estrangement i.e. the failure to find self-rewarding activities. Going through the whole conception of alienation and the theorists it can be said that there are at least five casual theories concerning alienation viz.a.viz. The Economic, Technological, Sociological, Philosophic-existential and Psychological.

The economic theory is identified with Marx for whom the epitome of alienation was property system and especially private ownership of the means of production. Those who emphasize technological sources of alienation such as Lewis Mumford in US and Jacques Ellul in France are concerned not simply with the direct impact of automation but with the ascendance of technological spirit. The argument is that man becomes alienated by being forced to adjust his lifestyle to the machine. The sociological thesis speaks that the decline of local community based on tradition and the corresponding emergence of a secular society based on large scale mass action leads to a sense of alienation which in turn find a large variety of disorders including political apathy, inter-group hostility, and volatile social movement and so on. The philosophic-existential theories associated with Martin Buber and Paul Tillich, Satre, Albert Camus emphasize that alienation is inherent in finite and isolated character of man's existence as a stranger in the world. On the psychological side two basic elements in Freudian theory combine to form an explanation of alienation. First, there is the principle of Oedipus conflict, denoting a boy's unconscious hostility towards his father whom he feels to be competitor for the

affection of his mother. Second, there is the frustration inherent in civilized society.

**Alienation and anomie:**

It appears that the primary differences between the concepts of alienation of Marx and anomie of Durkheim rest upon divergent implicit views of man in a 'state of nature'. It is asserted that Marx's concept of alienation is founded upon the premise that man is naturally good but has been corrupted by the society where as the notion of anomie rest upon the assumption that man is naturally a disobedient being whose egoism must be rigidly restrained by society. The first view is assumed to be close to that of Rousseau and the second to that of Hobbes. However, it must be kept in mind that both the thinkers separate there position from that of abstract philosophy, which stands outside of history. Durkheim emphasizes that the meaning which he gives to the term 'constraint' is quite different from that of Hobbes. For Durkheim, the growth of the division of labour is portrayed in terms of the integrating consequences of specialization rather than in terms of the formation of class systems. He distinguishes between 'forced' division of labour and 'anomic' division of labour and agrees that alienation is 'a debasement of Human nature'. This dehumanization of productive activity is a phenomenon which derives from the anomic moral position of worker. In other words, the dehumanization of the labour process has occurred because the individual worker has no clear conception of a unity of purpose which binds his work activity together with the collective productive endeavour of society. This situation thus may be remedied by providing individual with a moral awareness of the social importance of his particular

role in the division of labour. He then will be no longer stay as an alienated human being but will be a useful part of an organic whole. This view of Durkheim demonstrates that organic solidarity is the normal type in the modern societies.

In Marx analysis of bourgeois society there are two directly related but separable sources of alienation rooted in the capitalist mode of production. The first of these is alienation in the labour process i.e. in the productive activity of the worker. The second is the alienation of the workers from his product i.e. from control of the result of the labour process. Both of these derive from the division of labour involved in capitalist production. For Marx both types of alienation are integral to the expansion of the division of labour and going beyond alienation is possible through the abolition of capitalism. Here it is important to mention that both Durkheim and Weber do not deny the possibility of the formation of socialist societies but both assert that the transition to socialism will not radically change the existing form of society. Weber insists upon tracing the nexus of social relationships which influence as well as get influenced by the growth of rationalization and says that delineating the factors promoting rationalization will provide an opportunity of conjunction of social relationship and institutions. Freire insists upon understanding of the structural conditions in which thoughts and language of the people are dialectically framed so as to communicate effectively towards de-alienation. He says that many of the political and educational planned have failed because their authors designed them according to their own personal view of reality and never once taken in to account the men-in-a-situation towards whom their

programme was ostensibly directed.

According to Marx analysis overcoming the alienation between the individual and the political community is through resolving the dichotomy between the 'egoistic' interests of individuals in civil society and the 'social' character of political life. This can only be achieved by effecting more concrete changes in the relation between state and society so much so that what at present is only ideal will become real. In the works of Marx and Emile Durkheim the concepts of 'alienation' and 'anomie' respectively provide the focal point of their critical interpretation of modern society. The conception of alienation is the main support of Marx's critique of capitalism. It does not merely represent an early utopian position which Marx later abandoned. The same is true of Durkheim's notion of anomie which is an integral to his whole analysis of the modern 'crisis' and the mode in which it can be resolved.

### **Conclusion:**

Alienation is not a free floating element or force but operates within the limits of social structure. It either, turns inward on the self (hence, the development of psychological stress symptoms, suicide or so on), generates the need for substitute satisfaction (hence, the search for 'community' in social movement), generalize out of the domain of its own origin into other spheres of life (for example, individual sense of low control at work may be expressed, powerlessness in politics or social life), operates as functional agent in the individual's behavioral economy (e.g. it causes those who feel powerless to avoid politically relevant information because in their views knowledge is not power since control is impossible). Alienation does not

operate differently in different societies. However, it generates different degrees and types of alienation and affects the manner in which alienation of one kind or another is behaviorally expressed. The de-alienation depends upon the nature of alienation. Once the cause of alienation is known it will become easier to transform the structure to de-alienate the individual. As for example, in Marxian description of the cause of alienation the economic revolution will de-alienate the affected individual or the group or society. Similarly, Paulo Freire says that the change in the power relation and the basic structure of the society will lead to de-alienation. The 'creative work' is the primary solution for the Marxist, 'commitment' is the key idea for the Existentialists who find solution in 'action' whereas 'awareness' for the Freudians who find solutions in the 'therapy'.

**References:**

Paul Edwards (ed.) (1967), The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, The Macmillan and The Free Press, New York. P.76.

Marx's early writings (p.122-123) in Giddens A., (1985), Capitalism and Modern Theory, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, P. 11.

Freire, Paulo, (1985), Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Penguin Books, p. 10

S.C. Cohen, (1973), Training Behaviour as a predictor of Trainability, Personal Psychology, Summer, p. 261-272

H. J. Klein, (1989), An Integrated Control Theory Model of Work Motivation, Academy of Management Review, April 1989, p. 150-172

S.C. Cohen, (1973), Training Behaviour as a predictor of Trainability, Personal Psychology, Summer, p. 261-272

L.H. Peters, (1980), The Behavioral and Affective Consequences of Performance-Relevant Situational Variables, Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, February, p. 79-96

L.W. Porter, (1974), Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians, October, p. 603-09

