

The Sociology of Karl Marx
by Frank Elwell
Rogers State University

Marx is a difficult theorist to teach. A good deal of the problem is that he has become a major figure in history. As such, he has inspired social movements and individual revolutionaries--some of whom have been faithful to his work, while many more have misused his name and writings. In the not too distant past the professor teaching Marx had to deal with the cold war and anti-Communist attitudes that students would bring to class. Not only would these students have many misconceptions of Marx's thought and theory--equating it with the Communist Parties of the old Soviet Union and other totalitarian societies-- many would be actively hostile to learning anything about it. Since the cold war students are usually not active anti-Communists but they still tend to equate Marx with Communism, thus assuming that his thought has been thoroughly rejected and relegated to the dustbin of history.

In this web essay, I do not want to deal with the issue of historical Communism. Marx died well before the revolution in Russia. While he inspired many of the revolutionaries, he bears little of the responsibility for the totalitarian regime that emerged (to explain the Soviet government, look to the Czarist regimes). Marx is not Stalin.

A related problem with teaching Marx are the multiple roles he played during his life time. Marx is a socialist prophet, a political organizer, and a social theorist. As a prophet he forecast the eventual revolution of the working class, the destruction of capitalism, and the establishment of a stateless, socialist society (Note 1). As a political organizer (and propagandist) Marx wrote to inspire men and women to immediate action rather than thought. While he wove his prediction and calls to action into his analyses of capitalist society, the revolution and its socialist aftermath are clearly the most speculative parts of his theoretical structure--prophesized perhaps more in hope and faith than in rigorous analysis. Rejecting this vision of an inevitable and workable socialist society, there is still much of value and use in Marx's analysis of Capital.

This essay will focus almost exclusively on Marx as a social theorist. As a theorist, his writings have had an enormous impact on all of the social sciences. His most significant contribution is in establishing a conflict model of social systems. Rather than conceiving of society as being based on consensus, Marx's theory posits the domination of a powerful class over a subordinate class. However, this domination is never long uncontested. It is the fundamental antagonism of the classes which produces class struggle that ultimately change sociocultural systems. The engine of sociocultural change, according to Marx, is class struggle. Social conflict is at the core of the historical process.

A second significant contribution is that Marx locates the origin of this social power in the ownership or control of the forces of production (also referred to as the means of production). The production of economic goods--what is produced, how it is produced, and how it is exchanged--has profound effect on the rest of the society. For Marx, the entire sociocultural system is based on the manner in which men and women relate to one another in their continuous struggle to secure needed resources from nature.

A third contribution to the social sciences lies in Marx's analysis of capitalism and its effects on workers, on capitalists themselves, and on the entire sociocultural system. Capitalism as an historical entity was an emerging and rapidly evolving economic system. Marx brilliantly grasped its origin, structure, and workings. He then predicted with an astonishing degree of accuracy its immediate evolutionary path.

Each of these contributions go beyond the narrow confines of formal Marxist theory. One need not accept Marx whole cloth in order to integrate his insights into a coherent world view. Much of his thought is essential in understanding sociocultural systems and thus human behavior.

SOCIAL THEORY

Mankind's need for food, shelter, housing, energy are central in understanding the sociocultural system. "The first historical act is," Marx writes, "the production of material life itself." Unless men and women successfully fulfill this act there would be no other. All social life is dependent upon fulfilling this quest for a sufficiency of eating and drinking, for habitation and for clothing. This is as true today as it was in prehistory. Do not be fooled, Marx is telling us, we are as dependent upon nature as ever. The quest to meet basic needs were man's primary goal then and remain central when we attempt to analyze the complexities of modern life.

However, men and women are perpetually dissatisfied animals. Our struggle against nature does not cease when we gratify these primary needs. The production of new needs evolve (secondary needs) when means are found to satisfy

our primary needs.

In order to satisfy these primary and secondary needs, Marx argued, men and women form societies. The first of these societies, communal in nature, were based on a very limited division of labor. These classless societies in which men hunted and women and children gathered vegetables, tubers and grains were egalitarian in nature.

With the domestication of plants and animals, the division of labor begins to emerge in human societies. That division leads to the formation of antagonistic classes, the prime actors in human history. From this point on, humans engage in antagonistic cooperation in order to meet their primary and secondary needs.

All social institutions are dependent upon the economic base, and a thorough analysis of sociocultural systems will always reveal this underlying economic arrangement. The way a society is organized to meet material needs will profoundly affect all other social structures, including government, family, education and religious institutions. "Legal relations as well as the form of the state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called development of the human mind, but have their roots in the material conditions of life..." (Note 2).

The means of production is the most powerful factor influencing the rest of the social system. Like all the great macro social theorists, Marx regarded society as a structurally integrated system. Consequently, any aspect of that whole, whether it be legal codes, systems of education, art, or religion, could not be understood by itself. Rather, he believed that we must examine the parts in relation to one another, and in relation to the whole.

Forces & Relations of Production

The forces of production are the technology and work patterns men and women use to exploit their environment to meet their needs. These forces of production are expressed in relationships between members of the society. The relations of production are the social relations people enter into through their participation in economic life. They are socially patterned, independent of the wills and purposes of the individuals involved.

While industrialism is a particular means of production, capitalism represents a particular relation of production. How much independence does Marx accord the two factors? In Marx's analysis the two are independent but in close interaction with one another (Braverman, 1998). While Marx did give primacy to the means of production, he never conceived of it as a simple case of the means of production determining the relations. Rather, there is an ongoing and continuous interplay between technology and the relations of production throughout social evolution.

The close interactions of the forces and the relations of production are especially apparent in Marx's analysis of the transition between economic systems--a subject of critical importance to Marx (Note 3). The rise of capitalism precedes the industrial revolution by at least a century (Note 4). At first, capital production was closer to the handicrafts of feudal society than to industrial methods (Braverman, 1998). The structure of the capitalist system, with its drive toward profit and expansion, stimulates technological development, the factory system, and a more detailed division of labor. In turn, this industrial development clearly has had effect on the continuing development of capitalism itself. "Social relations are closely bound up with productive forces. In acquiring new productive forces men change their mode of production; and in changing their mode of production, in changing the way of earning their living, they change all their social relations. The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill, society with the industrial capitalist" (The Poverty of Philosophy, p. 92).

For Marx, the forces and relations of production were the most important factors in understanding any social system. But it is not the case that Marx simply explains everything with reference to economic production. "Political, legal, philosophical, and artistic development all depend upon the economic. But they all react upon one another and upon the economic base." And again: "It is not the case that the economic situation is the sole active cause and that everything else is merely a passive effect...There is, rather, a reciprocity within a field of economic necessity which in the last instance always asserts itself."

Class

Men and women are born into societies in which their relation to the means of production have already been determined by birth. This relationship to the means of production gives rise to different class positions (Note 6). Just as a person cannot choose her parents, so to she has no choice as to her social class. Once a man is ascribed to a specific class by virtue of his birth, once he has become a master or a slave, a feudal lord or a serf, a worker or a capitalist, his behavior is prescribed for him.

By being born into a specific class his attitudes, beliefs, behaviors are all "determined." The class role largely defines the person. In his preface to *Capital* Marx wrote: "Here individuals are dealt with only as fact as they are personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class-relations and class interests." Social classes have different class interests flowing from their position in relation to the mode of production.

These class interests are primary determinants of attitudes, ideologies, political views and behavior. In saying this, Marx does not deny the operation of other factors in affecting human beliefs and behavior. But his theory is that an individual's objective class position, whether an individual is aware of their class interests or not, exerts a strong influence on human behavior.

Ruling & Oppressed Classes

According to Marx, "the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles" (Note 7). All social systems are fundamentally divided between classes who clash in the pursuit of their individual interests. There are but two classes of concern in every society, the ruling and the oppressed class. Relationships between people are shaped by their relative position in regard to the forces of production, that is, by their differing access to needed resources.

The ruling class dominates the sociocultural system. "The ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling ideas; the class which is the dominant material force in society is at the same time its dominant intellectual force" (Note 8). Marx goes on to say that "(t)he class which has the means of material production at its disposal has control at the same time over the means of mental production." This is not done through conspiracy, but as a dominant and pervasive viewpoint. Because it controls the means of production, the ruling class is able to dominate (seemingly) non economic institutions as well. Through influence (if not outright control) over key institutions such as the government, media, foundations and higher education the viewpoint of economic elites becomes the widely accepted view of the society. This viewpoint, of course, emphasizes maintaining the status quo.

The oppressed class, those who do not control the means of production, normally internalize these elite ideologies. However, under certain conditions, the oppressed class can generate and widely internalize ideologies that undermine the power of the dominant class. Marx terms these conditions as "revolutionary," conditions we will turn to in the next section.

Evolution & Revolution

According to Marx, every economic system produces counter forces that, over time, lead to a new economic form. The process begins in the forces of production with technological development. Over time, these changes in technology become so great that they are able to harness new resources to satisfy human needs. As a consequence it sometimes happens that "the social relations of production are altered, transformed, with the change and development...of the forces of production."

In the feudal system, for example, the market and guild system emerged, but were incompatible with the feudal way of life. The market created a full-time merchant class, and the guilds and towns created a new working class, independent of the land. As a consequence, a new class structure emerged with wealth increasingly based on the new economic form. This created tensions with the old feudal institutions; the newly wealthy merchants wanted power and prestige to further their economic interests.

The emerging bourgeoisie become revolutionary in character because their interests are thwarted, they expect to gain by a change in property relations. This revolutionary class begins to view existing property relations (feudalism) as a "fetter" (a restraint or shackle) upon the further development of their interests (trade and the production of goods through the factory system).

New social relationships based upon the new forces of production begin to develop within the old social order. The merchant class, which amassed great wealth, began to challenge the hold of the classes that had dominated the feudal order. Conflict resulted, feudalism was eventually replaced by capitalism, land ownership as the basis of wealth was replaced by trade and eventually the ownership of capital. "The economic structure of capitalist society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter sets free elements of the former."

The potential for class conflict is present in any society with a division of labor. The emergence of a self-conscious revolutionary class, a class that recognizes that its condition is due to the systematic domination and exploitation of elite, depends on the emergence of a critical mass of people within the exploited class, a developed network of communication, organization, and an ideology that identifies a common enemy as well as a program of action.

THE NATURE OF CAPITALISM

As an economic system ideal capitalism consists of four major characteristics:

Private ownership of capital to produce goods and services in all potentially profitable markets.

Individuals striving to maximize profit.

Market competition between companies which assures high quality and the lowest market price.

Government laissez faire or refraining from interfering in the economic system.

The way of maximizing profits, according to Marx, is to produce and sell goods and services for more than it costs to manufacture and provide those goods and services. And the way to do that, Marx adds, is through the creation of surplus value.

Surplus Value

It all begins with labor power, specifically the purchase and selling of labor power. This, according to Marx, is fraught with consequences for the entire sociocultural system. The value of all goods and services (all commodity value) is created by human labor. Capitalism is a system built around the drive to increase capital. In order to expand his capital, the capitalist invests some in the purchase of labor. He then attempts to get more value out of this labor than he has invested in it. The more surplus he can expropriate from his workforce, the greater the profitability, the greater his capital.

According to Marx all commodity value is created by human labor. Suppose, for example, that a person in business for herself making picture frames pays \$10 for the material to make each frame, and sells each for \$20. Suppose further that she can comfortably make one frame in one hour. She needs \$40 a day for the necessities to live on (food, clothing, shelter), so she only needs to work 4 hours a day to make a living. This is called simple commodities production.

Now, suppose this same individual decides to become a capitalist. She hires a man at \$5 per hour. This man can also make one frame per hour. The material for each frame still costs \$10, she still sells each for \$20. Minus the material and labor costs, her profit is now \$5 per frame. This profit is possible only because there is a difference between the cost of the labor (\$5 per hour) and the amount of value added by that labor to the raw materials (\$10). In this case, the worker adds \$10 to the value of the materials in the course of his hour's work, but is only paid \$5 for his efforts. This surplus value of \$5 per hour created by the worker is taken by the owner, and is called profit.

Continuing the example, in order for the capitalist to live she still needs at least \$40 a day. To get this in profit she will have to work her employee at least 8 hours a day. In order for the employee to live he also needs \$40, and therefore he has to work the capitalist's required 8 hours a day. Where she had to work only 4 hours a day to live through simple commodities production, he has to work 8 hours a day under capitalist production to do the same. This is because his labor is now supporting both himself and the capitalist.

Under the system of capitalism, of course, the capitalist has great incentive to increase her profit. Assuming a constant demand for her picture frames, she can increase her profit in several ways (Note 5). She can hire more workers to make more picture frames. She can pay her workers less per hour, while still requiring them to make the same number of frames. She can get her workers to work faster or more efficiently by dividing and simplifying the tasks that go into making the frame. Or finally, she can introduce tools and machinery to increase their output. Again, she has great incentive to take any or all of these steps.

The worker, of course, has interests and therefore incentive to minimize expenditure of energy and effort, and to maximize rewards (or, to minimize the exploitation). Therein lies the conflict.

The Dialectic

Like all hitherto existing economic systems, Marx maintained, capitalism carries the seeds of its own destruction. The structure of the capitalist system itself has several internal contradictions which become exacerbated with its continued development. The literature enumerates at least four such contradictions:

Competition, the lifeblood of capitalism, implies winners and losers. Over time, competition (and government laissez faire) causes the rise of monopoly capitalism, which seek to control the market in terms of cost and quality.

The lack of centralized planning under capitalism results in the overproduction of some goods and the underproduction

of others, thus causing economic crises such as inflation and depression.

The control of the state by the wealthy eventually tends to overreach, the effect of which is the passage of laws favoring their interests and incurring the wrath of a growing number of workers.

The quest for profit leads corporations to adopt ever more sophisticated technology, to reorganize labor into ever more detailed divisions of labor for the sake of efficiency, and to squeeze wages to the lowest amount possible. As capitalism develops it must create enormous differences in wealth and power. The social problems it creates in its wake will mount. The vast majority of people fall into the proletarian class, the wealthy become richer but ever fewer in number. With its continued development, these contradictions become worse. Over time, capitalism brings into being a working class (the proletariat) who have a fundamental antagonism to the owners of capital.

Because of the dynamics of capitalism, society will be polarized into a few wealthy capitalists, and a great mass of workers. The capitalist, constantly in search of expanding his capital, is prone to the adoption of every more sophisticated technology and employing an ever more detailed division of labor. In an attempt to maximize profits, capitalists will automate factories, send jobs overseas, break jobs down to simple unskilled components requiring little training or skills. Workers will be forced to accept lower wages or worse, become structurally unemployed. Thus they will be pauperized by an economic system that views all labor as simply a cost and all costs are to be controlled.

Existing property relations (capital goods in the hands of private interests) will restrain the further development of productive technology. Needed social goods and services will not be created because there will be no profit in it for the capitalists. The masses will be impoverished amid exorbitant wealth for the few--and the unfulfilled potential to supply the many.

The proletariat becomes more progressive, the middle class is eliminated through the growth of monopolies, and the state is blocked from providing real structural change because of the dominance of the capitalists and their organization, money, and power. Eventually, Marx says, these contradictions of capitalism will produce a revolutionary crisis.

PROPHECIES OF REVOLUTION & SOCIALISM

Capitalism will then have produced a class of oppressed people (the proletariat or the workers) who are bent on destroying it. With the development of communication, the spread of a counter ideology which identifies the existing corporate structure as the enemy, the workers will organize and revolt. Taking control of the means of production for the good of all, this revolt will mark the end of classes and the end of history as we know it. "The prehistory of human society will come to an end." A socialist system will be established in which the means of production will be employed to provide for human happiness rather than profit.

Marx was not predicting any imminent revolution. Contrary to his calls for immediate political action (as in such political tracts as *The Communist Manifesto*), his theory makes clear that any overthrow of capitalist society could only occur after capitalism fully develops the means of production (industrialism) therefore setting the material conditions for socialism. "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society." Marx, as an historian, recognized that capitalism was a relatively new economic system, that the industrial mode of production was just beginning. As the quote makes clear, Marx expected the transition to socialism to be a long term evolutionary process (Note 9).

© 2003 Frank Elwell

In his own Words:

On materialism:

"The first historical act is. . . the production of material life itself. This is indeed a historical act, a fundamental condition of all of history" (1964, p. 60).

"By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he at the same time changes his own nature (*Capital*, vol. 1, p. 174).

"Legal relations as well as form of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum total of which Hegel . . . combines under the name of 'civil society.' . . . The anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy" (1962, vol. 1, p. 362).

"The political, legal, philosophical, literary, and artistic development rests on the economic. But they all react upon one another and upon the economic base. It is not the case that the economic situation is the sole active cause and that everything else is merely a passive effect. There is, rather, a reciprocity within a field of economic necessity which in the last instance always asserts itself" (1962, vol. II, p. 304).

"In the social production which men carry on as they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society--the real foundation, on which legal and political superstructures arise and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness" (1964, p. 51).

"According to the materialist conception of history, the ultimately determinant element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. . . . Hence if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract and senseless phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure. . . also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggle and in many cases preponderate in determining their form" (1962, II, p. 488).

"M. Proudhon the economist understands very well that men make cloth, linen or silk materials in definite relations of production. But what he has not understood is that these definite social relations are just as much produced by men as linen, flax, etc. Social relations are closely bound up with productive forces. In acquiring new productive forces men change their mode of production; and in changing their mode of production, in changing the way of earning their living, they change all their social relations. The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill, society with the industrial capitalist" (The Poverty of Philosophy, p. 92).

On elites:

"The ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the dominant material force in society is at the same time its dominant intellectual force. The class which has the means of production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production" (1964, p. 78).

[We go astray] "if . . . we detach the ideas of the ruling class from the ruling class itself and attribute to them an independent existence, if we confine ourselves to saying that in a particular age these or those ideas were dominant, without paying attention to the conditions of production and the producers of these ideas, and if we thus ignore the individuals and the world conditions which are the source of these ideas" (1964, p.p. 79-80).

On social evolution:

"The economic structure of capitalist society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter sets free the elements of the former" (1964, p. 133).

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society" (1964, p. 52).

"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point however is to change it." (1845)

On class:

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (1962, vol 1, p. 34).

"The separate individuals form a class only in so far as they have to carry on a common battle against another class; otherwise they are on hostile terms with each other as competitors" (1930, pp. 48-49).

[The major modern classes are] "the owners merely of labor-power, owners of capital, and landowners, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit and ground rent" (1964, p. 178).

"The State is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests" (1964, p. 78).

"Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains."
(1848).

On alienation and religion:

"Objectification is the practice of alienation. Just as man, so long as he is engrossed in religion, can only objectify his essence by an alien and fantastic being; so under the sway of egoistic need, he can only affirm himself and produce objects in practice by subordinating his products and his own activity to the domination of an alien entity, and by attributing to them the significance of an alien entity, namely money" (1964b, p. 39).

"The commodity form and the value relation between the products of labor which stamps them as commodities, have absolutely no connection with their physical properties and with the material relations arising therefrom. It is simply a definite relationship between men, that assumes in their eyes the fantastic form of a relations between things. To find an analogy, we must have recourse to the nebulous regions of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relation both with one another and with the human race. So it is in the world of commodities, with the products of men's hands. This I call the fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labor, as soon as they are produced as commodities" (1964, pp. 175-176).

"Religious distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and the protest against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of an unspiritual situation. It is the opium of the people" (1959, p. 263).

On the sanctity of work:

"We are not now dealing with those primitive instinctive forms of labour that remind us of the mere animal. We presuppose labour in a form that stamps it as exclusively human. A spider conducts operations that resemble 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 best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. He not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works, but he also realizes a purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will" (Capital, vol. I, p. 174).

"The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors", and has left no other nexus between people than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment". It has drowned out the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless infeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom -- Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation (1846/1954)

"The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers (1848/1954)

On science and technology:

The machine proper is therefore a mechanism that, after being set in motion, performs with its tools the same operations that were formerly done by the workman with similar tools. Whether the motive power is derived from man, or from some other machine, makes no difference in this respect. From the moment that the tool proper is taken from man, and fitted into a mechanism, a machine takes the place of a mere implement. The difference strikes one at once, even in those cases where man himself continues to be the prime mover" (Capital, vol. I, pp. 353-354).

"Every kind of capitalist production, in so far as it is not only a labour-process, but also a process of creating surplus-value, has this in common, that it is not the workman that employes the instruments of labour, but the instruments of labour that employ the workman. But it is only in the factory system that this inversion for the first time acquires technical and palpable reality. By means of its conversion into an automaton, the instrument of labour confront the labourer, during the labour-process, in the shape of capital, of dead labour, that dominates and pumps dry, living labour-power. The separation of the intellectual powers of production from the manual labour, and the conversion of those powers into the might of capital over labour, is, as we have already shown, finally completed by modern industry erected on the foundation of machinery. the special skill of each individual insignificant factory operative vanishes as an infinitesimal quantity before the science, the gigantic physical forces, and the mass of labour that are embodied in the factory mechanism and, together with that mechanism, constitute the power of the 'master'" (Capital, vol. I, pp. 393-394).

"Modern Industry rent the veil that concealed from men their own social process of production, and that turned the various, spontaneously divided branches of production into so many riddles, not only to outsiders, but even to the initiated. The principle which it pursued, of resolving each process into its constituent movements, without any regard to their possible execution by the hand of man, created the new modern science of technology. The varied, apparently unconnected, and petrified forms of the industrial processes now resolved themselves into so many conscious and systematic applications of natural science to the attainment of given useful effects" (Capital, vol. I, pp. 456-457).

On alienation:

"Money is the alienated essence of man's work and existence; the essence dominates him and he worships it" (1964b, p. 37).

"The state is the intermediary between men and human liberty. Just as Christ is the intermediary to whom man attributes all his own divinity and all his religious bonds, so the state is the intermediary to which man confides all his non divinity and human freedom" (1964b, p. II).

"Religious alienation as such occurs only in the sphere of consciousness, in the inner life of man, but economic alienation is that of real life. . . . It therefore affects both aspects" (1964b, p. 156).

"The object produced by labor, its product, now stands opposed to it as an alien being, as a power independent of the producer. . . . The more the worker expends himself in work the more powerful becomes the world of objects which he creates in face of himself, the poorer he becomes in his inner life, and the less he belongs to himself" (1964b, p. 122).

"However, alienation appears not merely in the result but also in the process of production, within productive activity itself. . . . If the product of labor is alienation, production itself must be active alienation. . . . The alienation of the object of labor merely summarizes the alienation in the work activity itself" (1964b, p. 124).

"Work is external to the worker. . . . It is not part of his nature; consequently he does not fulfill himself in his work but denies himself. . . . The worker therefore feels himself at home only during his leisure time, whereas at work he feels homeless" (1964b, pp. 124-125).

"This is the relationship of the worker to his own activity as something alien, not belonging to him, activity as suffering (passivity), strength as powerlessness, creation as emasculation, the personal physical and mental energy of the worker, his personal life. . . . as an activity which is directed against himself, independent of him and not belonging to him" (1964b, p. 125).

"What is true of man's relationship to his work, to the product of his work and to himself, is also true of his relationship to other men. . . . Each man is alienated from others . . . each of the others is likewise alienated from human life" (1964b, p. 129).

"The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation into a mere money relation" (1848/1954).

On Capitalism:

But if a surplus labouring population is a necessary product of accumulation or of the development of wealth on a capitalist basis, this surplus-population becomes, conversely, the lever of capitalistic accumulation, nay, a condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production. It forms a disposable industrial reserve army, that belongs to capital

quite as absolutely as if the latter had bred it at its own cost. Independently of the limits of the actual increase of population, it creates, for the changing needs of the self-expansion of capital, a mass of human material always ready for exploitation (Capital, vol. I, pp. 592).

With accumulation, and the development of the productiveness of labour that accompanies it, the power of sudden expansion of capital grows also....The mass of social wealth, overflowing with the advance of accumulation, and transformable into additional capital, thrusts itself frantically into old branches of production, whose market suddenly expands, or into newly formed branches....In all such cases, there must be the possibility of throwing great masses of men suddenly on the decisive points without injury to the scale of production in other spheres....This increase is effected by the simple process that constantly 'sets free' a part of the labourers; by methods which lessen the number of labourers employed to the increased production. The whole form of the movement of modern industry depends, therefore, upon the constant transformation of a part of the labouring population into unemployed or half-employed hands" (Capital, vol. I, pp. 592-593).

"The more extensive, finally, the Lazarus-layers of the working class and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism" (Capital, vol. I, p. 611).

"A service is nothing more than the useful effect of a use-value, be it of a commodity, or be it of labour" (Capital, vol. I, p. 187).

Sources: