

# ECONOMIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL MANUSCRIPTS OF 1844

Karl Marx

(1844)

These are also known as the "Paris Manuscripts" because they were written in the summer of 1844, during Marx's stay in Paris (October 1843–expelled in January 1845). From McLellan: "These manuscripts ... represent Marx's first draft of his "Economics" — the project to which he was to devote the rest of his life. The manuscripts fall into four main groups: firstly, there is a passage on alienated labor [reprinted below] — the most finished and readily comprehensible of the manuscripts, in which Marx details the ways in which the worker's relationship to his product result in his alienation. Secondly, in the manuscript headed "Private Property and Communism," Marx outlines his view of communist man and society. In the third section he discusses the relationship of capitalism to human needs; and in the final section he gives what is probably his fullest account of his view of Hegel's dialectic, praising him for having discovered man's world-creating capacities, but criticizing his abstract, philosophical portrayal.

Marx intended to write up this work for publication, but other problems distracted him. When they were first published in 1932, they were thought by many to portray a humanist and even an existentialist Marx — very different from the Marx of the later writings — and this discrepancy gave rise to a protracted debate on the continuity or discontinuity of Marx's thought. The 1844 manuscripts certainly show him under the influence of Feuerbach's humanism (though Marx's interest in politics, economics, and even history was foreign to Feuerbach), and he was soon to distance himself considerably from Feuerbach's ideas. Nevertheless, many of the positions taken up by Marx in 1844 were still present in the *Grundrisse* and even in *Capital*."

## Alienated Labor

1. [XXII] We have started out from the premises of political economy. We have accepted its language and its laws. We presupposed private property; the separation of labor, capital, and land, and likewise of wages, profit, and capital; the division of labor; competition; the conception of exchange value, etc. From political economy itself, using its own words, we have shown that the worker sinks to the level of a commodity, and moreover the most wretched commodity of all; that the misery of the worker is in inverse proportion to the power and volume of his production; that the necessary consequence of competition is the accumulation of capital in a few hands and hence the restoration of monopoly in a more terrible form; and that, finally, the distinction between capitalist and landlord, between agricultural worker and industrial worker, disappears and the whole of society must split into the two classes of property *owners* and *propertyless* workers.
2. Political economy proceeds from the fact of private property. It does not explain it. It grasps the *material* process of private property, the process through which it actually passes, in general and abstract formulae which it then takes as laws. It does not *comprehend* these laws — i.e., it does not show how they arise from the nature of private property. Political economy fails to explain the reason for the division between labor and capital. For example, when it defines the relation of wages to profit, it takes the interests of the capitalists as the basis of its analysis — i.e., it assumes what it is supposed to explain. Similarly, competition is frequently brought into the argument and explained in terms of external circumstances. Political economy teaches us nothing about the extent to which these external and apparently accidental circumstances are only the expression of a necessary development. We have seen how exchange itself appears to political economy as an accidental fact. The only wheels which political economy sets in motion are greed, and the *war of the avaricious, competition*.
3. Precisely because political economy fails to grasp the interconnections within the movement, it was possible to oppose, for example, the doctrine of competition to the doctrine of monopoly, the doctrine of craft freedom to the doctrine of the guild, and the doctrine of the division of landed property to the doctrine of the great estate; for competition, craft freedom, and division of landed property were developed and conceived only as accidental, deliberate, violent consequences of monopoly, of the guilds, and of feudal property, and not as their necessary, inevitable, and natural consequences. We now have to grasp the essential connection between private property, greed, the separation of labor, capital and landed property, exchange and competition, value and the devaluation of man, monopoly, and competition, etc. — the connection between this entire system of alienation and the *money system*.
4. We must avoid repeating the mistake of the political economist, who bases his explanations on some imaginary primordial condition. Such a primordial condition explains nothing. It simply pushes the question into the grey and nebulous distance. It assumes as facts and events what it is supposed to deduce — namely, the necessary relationships between two things, between, for example, the division of labor and exchange. Similarly, theology explains the origin of evil by the fall of Man — i.e., it assumes as a fact in the form of history what it should explain.
5. We shall start out from an *actual* economic fact. The worker becomes poorer the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and extent. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more

commodities he produces. The *devaluation* of the human world grows in direct proportion to the *increase in value* of the world of things. Labor not only produces commodities; it also produces itself and the workers as a *commodity* and it does so in the same proportion in which it produces commodities in general.

6. This fact simply means that the object that labor produces, its product, stands opposed to it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labor is labor embodied and made material in an object, it is the objectification of labor. The performance of labor is at the same time its objectification. In the sphere of political economy, this performance of labor appears as a loss of reality for the worker, objectification as *loss* of and *bondage to the object*, and appropriation as *alienation*.
7. So much does the realization of labor appear as loss of reality that the worker loses his reality to the point of dying of starvation. So much does objectification appear as loss of the object that the worker is robbed of the objects he needs most not only for life but also for work. Work itself becomes an object which he can obtain only through an enormous effort and with spasmodic interruptions. So much does the appropriation of the object appear as alienation that the more objects the worker produces the fewer can he possess and the more he falls under the domination of his product, of capital.
8. All these consequences are contained in this characteristic, that the worker is related to the *product of labor* as to an *alien* object. For it is clear that, according to this premise, the more the worker exerts himself in his work, the more powerful the alien, objective world becomes which he brings into being over against himself, the poorer he and his inner world become, and the less they belong to him. It is the same in religion. The more man puts into God, the less he retains within himself. The worker places his life in the object; but now it no longer belongs to him, but to the object. The greater his activity, therefore, the fewer objects the worker possesses. What the product of his labor is, he is not. Therefore, the greater this product, the less is he himself. The *alienation* of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an *external* existence, but that it exists *outside him*, independently of him and alien to him, and beings to confront him as an autonomous power; that the life which he has bestowed on the object confronts him as hostile and alien.
9. [XXIII] Let us now take a closer look at *objectification*, at the production of the worker, and the *alienation*, the *loss* of the object, of his product, that this entails. The workers can create nothing without *nature*, without the *sensuous external world*. It is the material in which his labor realizes itself, in which it is active and from which, and by means of which, it produces.
10. But just as nature provides labor with the *means of life*, in the sense that labor cannot *live* without objects on which to exercise itself, so also it provides the *means of life* in the narrower sense, namely the means of physical subsistence of the *worker*. The more the worker *appropriates* the external world, sensuous nature, through his labor, the more he deprives himself of the *means of life* in two respects: firstly, the sensuous external world becomes less and less an object belonging to his labor, a means of life of his labor; and, secondly, it becomes less and less a means of life in the immediate sense, a means for the physical subsistence of the worker.
11. In these two respects, then, the worker becomes a slave of his object; firstly, in that he receives an *object of labor*, i.e., he receives *work*, and, secondly, in that he receives *means of subsistence*. Firstly, then, so that he can exist as a *worker*, and secondly as a *physical subject*. The culmination of this slavery is that it is only as a worker that he can maintain himself as a *physical subject* and only as a physical subject that he is a *worker*.
12. (The alienation of the worker in his object is expressed according to the laws of political economy in the following way: the more the worker produces, the less he has to consume; the more value he creates, the more worthless he becomes; the more refined his product, the more crude and misshapen the worker; the more civilized the product, the more barbarous the worker; the more powerful the work, the more feeble the worker; the more the work manifests intelligence, the more the worker declines in intelligence and becomes a slave of nature.)
13. *Political economy conceals the alienation in the nature of labor by ignoring the direct relationship between the worker (labor) and production*. It is true that labor produces marvels for the rich, but it produces privation for the worker. It produces palaces, but hovels for the worker. It produces beauty, but deformity for the worker. It replaces labor by machines, but it casts some of the workers back into barbarous forms of labor and turns others into machines. It produces intelligence, but also idiocy and cretinism for the worker.
14. *The direct relationship of labor to its products is the relationship of the worker to the objects of his production*. The relationship of the rich man to the objects of production and to production itself is only a consequence of this first relationship, and confirms it. Later, we shall consider this second aspect.
15. Therefore, when we ask what is the essential relationship of labor, we are asking about the relationship of the *worker* to production.
16. Up to now, we have considered the alienation of the worker, only from one aspect — i.e., *the worker's relationship to the products of his labor*. But alienation manifests itself not only in the result, but also in the *act of production*, within the *activity of production* itself. How could the product of the worker's activity confront him as something alien if it were not for the fact that in the act of production he was alienating himself from himself? After all, the product is simply the *résumé* of the activity, of the production. So if the product of labor is alienation, production itself must be active alienation, the alienation of activity, the activity of alienation. The alienation of the

object of labor merely summarizes the alienation in the activity of labor itself.

17. What constitutes the alienation of labor? Firstly, the fact that labor is *external* to the worker — i.e., does not belong to his essential being; that he, therefore, does not confirm himself in his work, but denies himself, feels miserable and not happy, does not develop free mental and physical energy, but mortifies his flesh and ruins his mind. Hence, the worker feels himself only when he is not working; when he is working, he does not feel himself. He is at home when he is not working, and not at home when he is working. His labor is, therefore, not voluntary but forced, it is *forced labor*. It is, therefore, not the satisfaction of a need but a mere means to satisfy needs outside itself. Its alien character is clearly demonstrated by the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists, it is shunned like the plague. External labor, labor in which man alienates himself, is a labor of self-sacrifice, of mortification. Finally, the external character of labor for the worker is demonstrated by the fact that it belongs not to him but to another, and that in it he belongs not to himself but to another.
18. Just as in religion the spontaneous activity of the human imagination, the human brain, and the human heart, detaches itself from the individual and reappears as the alien activity of a god or of a devil, so the activity of the worker is not his own spontaneous activity. It belongs to another, it is a loss of his self.
19. The result is that man (the worker) feels that he is acting freely only in his animal functions — eating, drinking, and procreating, or at most in his dwelling and adornment — while in his human functions, he is nothing more than animal.
20. It is true that eating, drinking, and procreating, etc., are also genuine human functions. However, when abstracted from other aspects of human activity, and turned into final and exclusive ends, they are animal functions.
21. We have considered the act of alienation of practical human activity, of labor, from two aspects: (1) the relationship of the worker to the *product of labor* as an alien object that has power over him. The relationship is, at the same time, the relationship to the sensuous external world, to natural objects, as an alien world confronting him, in hostile opposition. (2) The relationship of labor to the *act of production* within labor. This relationship is the relationship of the worker to his own activity as something which is alien and does not belong to him, activity as passivity, power as impotence, procreation as emasculation, the worker's own physical and mental energy, his personal life — for what is life but activity? — as an activity directed against himself, which is independent of him and does not belong to him. This is *self-alienation*, as compared with the alienation of the *object* mentioned above.
22. [XXIV] We now have to derive a third feature of *alienated labor* from the two we have already examined.
23. Man is a species-being [*Gattungswesen*], not only because he practically and theoretically makes the species — both his own and those of other things — his object, but also — and this is simply another way of saying the same thing — because he looks upon himself as the present, living species, because he looks upon himself as a *universal* and therefore free being.<sup>1</sup>
  1. Species-life, both for man and for animals, consists physically in the fact that man, like animals, lives from inorganic nature; and because man is more universal than animals, so too is the area of inorganic nature from which he lives more universal. Just as plants, animals, stones, air, light, etc., theoretically form a part of human consciousness, partly as objects of science and partly as objects of art — his spiritual inorganic nature, his spiritual means of life, which he must first prepare before he can enjoy and digest them — so, too, in practice they form a part of human life and human activity. In a physical sense, man lives only from these natural products, whether in the form of nourishment, heating, clothing, shelter, etc. The universality of man manifests itself in practice in that universality which makes the whole of nature his inorganic body, (1) as a direct means of life and (2) as the matter, the object, and the tool of his life activity. Nature is man's inorganic body — that is to say, nature insofar as it is not the human body. Man *lives* from nature — i.e., nature is his *body* — and he must maintain a continuing dialogue with it if he is not to die. To say that man's physical and mental life is linked to nature simply means that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature.
24. Alienated labor not only (1) alienates nature from man and (2) alienates man from himself, from his own function, from his vital activity; because of this, it also alienates man from his species. It turns his *species-life* into a means for his individual life. Firstly, it alienates species-life and individual life, and, secondly, it turns the latter, in its abstract form, into the purpose of the former, also in its abstract and alienated form.
25. For in the first place labor, *life activity*, *productive life itself*, appears to man only as a *means* for the satisfaction of a need, the need to preserve physical existence. But productive life is species-life. It is life-producing life. The whole character of a species, its species-character, resides in the nature of its life activity, and free conscious activity constitutes the species-character of man. Life appears only as a *means of life*.
26. The animal is immediately one with its life activity. It is not distinct from that activity; it is *that activity*. Man makes his life activity itself an object of his will and consciousness. He has conscious life activity. It is not a determination with which he directly merges. Conscious life activity directly distinguishes man from animal life activity. Only because of that is he a species-being. Or, rather,

1. \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> [In this passage Marx reproduces Feuerbach's argument in *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1841).]

he is a conscious being — i.e., his own life is an object for him, only because he is a species-being. Only because of that is his activity free activity. Alienated labor reverses the relationship so that man, just because he is a conscious being, makes his life activity, his *essential being*, a mere means for his *existence*.

27. The practical creation of an *objective world*, the fashioning of *inorganic* nature, is proof that man is a conscious species-being — i.e., a being which treats the species as its own essential being or itself as a species-being. It is true that animals also produce. They build nests and dwelling, like the bee, the beaver, the ant, etc. But they produce only their own immediate needs or those of their young; they produce only when immediate physical need compels them to do so, while man produces even when he is free from physical need and truly produces only in freedom from such need; they produce only themselves, while man reproduces the whole of nature; their products belong immediately to their physical bodies, while man freely confronts his own product. Animals produce only according to the standards and needs of the species to which they belong, while man is capable of producing according to the standards of every species and of applying to each object its inherent standard; hence, man also produces in accordance with the laws of beauty.
28. It is, therefore, in his fashioning of the objective that man really proves himself to be a *species-being*. Such production is his active species-life. Through it, nature appears as *his* work and his reality. The object of labor is, therefore, the *objectification of the species-life* of man: for man produces himself not only intellectually, in his consciousness, but actively and actually, and he can therefore contemplate himself in a world he himself has created. In tearing away the object of his production from man, alienated labor therefore tears away from him his *species-life*, his true species-objectivity, and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his inorganic body, nature, is taken from him.
29. In the same way as alienated labor reduces spontaneous and free activity to a means, it makes man's species-life a means of his physical existence.
30. Consciousness, which man has from his species, is transformed through alienation so that species-life becomes a means for him. (3) Alienated labor, therefore, turns *man's species-being* — both nature and his intellectual species-power — into a being *alien* to him and a *means* of his *individual existence*. It alienates man from his own body, from nature as it exists outside him, from his spiritual essence, his *human existence*.
31. (4) An immediate consequence of man's alienation from the product of his labor, his life activity, his species-being, is the *alienation of man from man*. When man confront himself, he also confronts *other* men. What is true of man's relationship to his labor, to the product of his labor, and to himself, is also true of his relationship to other men, and to the labor and the object of the labor of other men.
32. In general, the proposition that man is alienated from his species-being means that each man is alienated from the others and that all are alienated from man's essence.
33. Man's alienation, like all relationships of man to himself, is first realized and expressed in man's relationship to other men. In the relationship of alienated labor, each man therefore regards the other in accordance with the standard and the situation in which he as a worker finds himself.
34. [XXV] We started out from an economic fact, the alienation of the worker and of his production. We gave this fact conceptual form: *alienated labor*. We have analyzed this concept, and in so doing merely analyzed an economic fact.
35. Let us now go on to see how the concept of alienated labor must express and present itself in reality. If the product of labor is alien to me, and confronts me as an alien power, to whom does it then belong? To a being *other* than me. Who is this being? The *gods*? It is true that in early times most production — e.g., temple building, etc., in Egypt, India, and Mexico — was in the service of the gods, just as the product belonged to the gods. But the gods alone were never the masters of labor. The same is true of *nature*. And what a paradox it would be if the more man subjugates nature through his labor and the more divine miracles are made superfluous by the miracles of industry, the more he is forced to forgo the joy or production and the enjoyment of the product out of deference to these powers.
36. The *alien* being to whom labor and the product of labor belong, in whose service labor is performed, and for whose enjoyment the product of labor is created, can be none other than *man* himself. If the product of labor does not belong to the worker, and if it confronts him as an alien power, this is only possible because it belongs to *a man other than the worker*. If his activity is a torment for him, it must provide pleasure and *enjoyment* for someone else. Not the gods, not nature, but only man himself can be this alien power over men.
37. Consider the above proposition that the relationship of man to himself becomes *objective* and *real* for him only through his relationship to other men. If, therefore, he regards the product of his labor, his objectified labor, as an *alien*, hostile, and powerful object which is independent of him, then his relationship to that object is such that another man — alien, hostile, powerful, and independent of him — is its master. If he relates to his own activity as unfree activity, then he relates to it as activity in the service, under the rule, coercion, and yoke of another man.
38. Every self-alienation of man from himself and nature is manifested in the relationship he sets up between other men and himself and nature. Thus, religious self-alienation is necessarily manifested in the relationship between layman and priest, or, since we are dealing here with the spiritual world, between layman and mediator, etc. In the practical, real world, self-alienation can manifest itself

only in the practical, real relationship to other men. The medium through which alienation progresses is itself a *practical* one. So through alienated labor man not only produces his relationship to the object and to the act of production as to alien and hostile powers; he also produces the relationship in which other men stand to his production and product, and the relationship in which he stands to these other men. Just as he creates his own production as a loss of reality, a punishment, and his own product as a loss, a product which does not belong to him, so he creates the domination of the non-producer over production and its product. Just as he alienates from himself his own activity, so he confers upon the stranger an activity that does not belong to him.

39. Up to now, we have considered the relationship only from the side of the worker. Later on, we shall consider it from the side of the non-worker.
40. Thus, through **estranged** [*entfremdete*], alienated [*ent-täußerte*] labor, the worker creates the relationship of another man, who is alien to labor and stands outside it, to that labor. The relation of the worker to labor creates the relation of the capitalist — or whatever other word one chooses for the master of labor — to that labor. *Private property* is therefore the product, result, and necessary consequence of *alienated labor*, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself.
41. *Private property* thus derives from an analysis of the concept of *alienated labor* — i.e., alienated man, estranged labor, estranged life, estranged man.
42. It is true that we took the concept of *alienated labor* (*alienated life*) from political economy as a result of the *movement of private property*. But it is clear from an analysis of this concept that, although private property appears as the basis and cause of alienated labor, it is in fact its consequence, just as the gods were *originally* not the cause but the effect of the confusion in men's minds. Later, however, this relationship becomes reciprocal.
43. It is only when the development of private property reaches its ultimate point of culmination that this, its secret, re-emerges; namely, that private property is (a) the *product* of alienated labor, and (b) the *means* through which labor is alienated, the *realization of this alienation*.
44. This development throws light upon a number of hitherto unresolved controversies —
45. (1) Political economy starts out from labor as the real soul of production and yet gives nothing to labor and everything to private property. Proudhon has dealt with this contradiction by deciding for labor and against private property.<sup>2</sup> But we have seen that this apparent contradiction is the contradiction of *alienated labor* with itself and that political economy has merely formulated laws of alienated labor.
46. It therefore follows for us that *wages* and *private property* are identical: for there the product, the object of labor, pays for the labor itself, wages are only a necessary consequence of the alienation of labor; similarly, where wages are concerned, labor appears not as an end in itself but as the servant of wages. We intend to deal with this point in more detail later on: for the present we shall merely draw a few [XXVI] conclusions.
47. An enforced *increase in wages* (disregarding all other difficulties, including the fact that such an anomalous situation could only be prolonged by force) would therefore be nothing more than *better pay for slaves* and would not mean an increase in human significance or dignity for either the worker or the labor.
48. Even the *equality of wages*, which Proudhon demands, would merely transform the relation of the present-day worker to his work into the relation of all men to work. Society would then be conceived as an abstract capitalist. Wages are an immediate consequence of alienated labor, and alienated labor is the immediate cause of private property. If the one falls, then the other must fall too.
49. (2) It further follows from the relation of alienated labor to private property that the emancipation of society from private property, etc., from servitude, is expressed in the political form of the *emancipation of the workers*. This is not because it is only a question of their emancipation, but because in their emancipation is contained universal human emancipation. The reason for this universality is that the whole of human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all relations of servitude are nothing but modifications and consequences of this relation.
50. Just as we have arrived at the concept of *private property* through an analysis of the concept of *alienated labor*, so with the help of these two factors it is possible to evolve all economic *categories*, and in each of these categories — e.g., trade, competition, capital, money — we shall identify only a particular and developed expression of these basic constituents.
51. But, before we go on to consider this configuration, let us try to solve two further problems.
52. (1) We have to determine the general nature of *private property*, as it has arisen out of alienated labor, in its relation to *truly human and social property*.
53. (2) We have taken the *alienation of labor* as a fact and we have analyzed that fact. How, we now ask, does *man come to alienate his labor*? How is this alienation founded in the nature of human development? We have already gone a long way towards solving this problem by *transforming* the question of the *origin of private property* into the question of the relationship of *alienated labor* to the course of human development. For, in speaking of private property, one imagines that one is dealing with something external to man. In speaking of labor, one is

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>2</sup> [See Proudhon's 1840 pamphlet, *Qu'est-ce que la propriété?*]

dealing immediately with man himself. This new way of formulating the problem already contains its solution.

54. *ad (1): The general nature of private property and its relationship to truly human property.*
55. Alienated labor has resolved itself for us into two component parts, which mutually condition one another, or which are merely different expressions of one and the same relationship. *Appropriation* appears as *alienation*; and *alienation* appears as *appropriation*, alienation as true admission to citizenship.
56. We have considered the one aspect, *alienated* labor in relation to the *worker* himself — i.e., *the relation of alienated labor to itself*. And as product, as necessary consequence of this relationship, we have found the *property relation* of the *non-worker* to the worker and to labor. *Private property* as the material, summarized expression of alienated labor embraces both relations — *the relation of the worker to labor and to the product of his labor and the non-workers*, and the relation of the *non-worker to the worker and to the product of his labor*.
57. We have already seen that, in relation to the worker who *appropriates* nature through his labor, appropriation appears as alienation, self-activity as activity for another and of another, vitality as a sacrifice of life, production of an object as loss of that object to an alien power, to an alien man. Let us now consider the relation between this man, who is *alien* to labor and to the worker, and the worker, labor, and the object of labor.
58. The first thing to point out is that everything which appears for the worker as an *activity of alienation*, appears for the non-worker as a *condition of alienation*. Secondly, the *real, practical* attitude of the worker in production and to the product (as a state of mind) appears for the non-worker who confronts him as a *theoretical* attitude.
59. [XXVII] Thirdly, the non-worker does everything against the worker which the worker does against himself, but he does not do against himself what he does against the worker.
60. Let us take a closer look at these three relationships.  
[The manuscript breaks off unfinished at this point.]