Introduction

One of the earliest objections to communism claims that 'the complete abolition of private property' makes no sense because people have an inalienable property in their own individuality, which comprises all those features that are peculiar to the person who has them (1). This objection flows from the fact that the bourgeois critic construes all personal relationships in terms of the language of property; but if he then marks off one sphere as inalienable property he misses the point of the property relationship; for, as Marx says: 'In reality I possess private property only insofar as I have something vendible, whereas what is peculiar to me may not be vendible at all.' (2).

This confusion illustrates the complexities in the relationship of property and personality. This paper takes up a tradition of discussion of this issue, especially in connection with property in a person's labour. We shall see that, according to Locke, property is founded on personal labour; according to Hegel it is the expression of the person's will; while, according to Marx, it is a realm of estrangement - in it is manifested the alienation of labour.

After a section on John Locke, I contrast Hegel's and Marx's fundamental ontological determinations before going on to deal more specifically with Hegel's account of wage-labour in his Philosophy of Right (3), and with Marx's theory of alienation in his 1844 Manuscripts. I will end by suggesting some clarifications of Marx's concept of alienated labour.

1. John Locke

Locke's justification of property right in his Second Treatise of Government trades on a confusion of two senses of 'property'. The first sense he employs is that in which property is inseparable from its possessor; it is essential to that person being the person he is; and, so far, inalienable. The second sense of property employed refers it to something immediately external to its possessor, held by him as a matter of right (rather than identical with his person) - hence disputable - and hence alienable.

Let us now consider Locke's argument, bearing this distinction in mind. He sets out from the problem: How can individuals legitimately appropriate materials to satisfy their needs if God gave the world to mankind in common? It would seem that one would have to await the consent of the rest of mankind before appropriating anything. Locke wishes to convince us that it is not necessary to await the constitution of a social process of allocation because there is a natural (pre-political) right to private property, rooted in our persons and labours:

"Every man has a property in his own person; this nobody has any right to but himself. The labour of his body and the work of his hands we may say are properly his. WHATSOEVER, then, he removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property... For this labour being the unuestionable property of the labourer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to.... He that is nourished by ... the apples he gathered from the trees in the wood, has certainly appropriated them to himself. Nobody can deny but the nourishment is his. I ask, then, When did they begin to be his? ... And 'tis plain, if the first gathering made them not his, nothing else could. That labour put a distinction between them and the common ... and so they became his private right....

Thus the grass my horse has bit, the turf my servant has cut, and the ore I have dug in any place ... become my property. The labour that was mine removing them out of that common state they were in, hath fixed my property in them.' (paras.27-28)

It is clear that Locke's intention here is to specify criteria whereby property (in the
second sense) may rightfully be held. Something in the state that nature left it in, that is, external to the individual, becomes 'his private right' (even though it was originally 'common' and could in principle have been appropriated as private property by someone else) in virtue of the fact that he has mixed his labour with it; 'for this labour being the unquestionable property of the labourer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to'.

The premiss of the argument - that 'the labour of his body and the work of his hands are properly his' - is ambiguous. On the one hand - if this is property in the second sense one cannot assume that it is his; the legal title to it may be held by a slave-owner, a feudal lord, or a capitalist employer; that Locke assumes such labour is alienable is evident from the striking interpolation of 'the turfs my servant has cut' amongst those things in regard to which 'the labour that was mine... hath fixed my property in them'. On the other hand - our readiness to accept the premiss is due to our reading it as if the labour mentioned in it is 'the unquestionable property of the labourer' in the first sense of the term, that is, inseparable from him. That Locke is trading on this sense is evident from the discussion of gathering apples: 'Nobody can deny but the nourishment is his.' If nobody can deny it, it must be because the nourishment is essentially his (the first sense of ownership); but then Locke goes on to ask, 'When did they begin to be his?' - and in asking this clearly conjoins the sense 'rightfully his' with 'essentially his' in order to end with the conclusion that 'gathering' made them 'his private property' - property in the second sense, obviously.

Locke's argument trades on this shifting between the two senses of ownership. His procedure is fallacious in that, if property is alienable, there is only ever a contingent relation between a man and the property he holds at any given time; so if the power to labour is such that a property it undercuts the argument based on the mixing of such labour with the natural material; alternatively, if labour provides a natural foundation for property right because it is 'unquestionably' the labourer's then it should not also be alienable; yet, besides the notorious turf-cutting servant, there is general evidence in Locke's text that he takes for granted that it is natural for labour-power to be alienable (4).

Locke presupposes a thoroughly bourgeois view of the individual as standing in a property relation to himself; he attributes to a man property in 'his life, liberty, and estate' (para.87). He also says: 'By property I ... mean that property which men have in their persons as well as their goods' (para.173). Yet, if an individual stands in a property relationship to his person and his labour in the same sense as he does to his goods, then he must treat them as external to him and alienable; if this is so there is nothing 'natural' about the characterization of labour as property of the labourer - still less of his 'private right' in the product of 'his' labour. In the end, for Locke, the only thing inseparable from a person is the abstract capacity to hold property.

This is also inherent in the views of such an apparently dissimilar thinker as Hegel, to whom we now turn.

2. Property and personality in Hegel's Ontology

The central organizing idea of Hegel's Philosophy of Right (5) is Freedom; the book is designed to show that it is actualized in the life of the modern state. The first part - entitled Abstract Right - introduces the notions of personality and property. According to Hegel, the person demonstrates his inherent freedom through embodying his will in an external thing, immediately different from him, thereby making it his. If we compare Hegel with Locke, we find that there is a deeper contrast than that between Hegel's talk of 'putting one's will into a thing' and Locke's talk of 'mixing labour with it'; for Hegel stresses that the rational ground of property lies in its relation to freedom:

'If emphasis is placed on my needs, then the possession of property appears as a means to their satisfaction, but the true position is that... property is the first embodiment of freedom and so is in itself a substantive end.' (para.45R)

Hegel postpones discussion of the relationship of property to need to later sections which presuppose the rational basis of private property.

Locke, to the contrary, starts from needs rather than freedom, and this is why he must immediately add limitations to rightful appropriation with respect to 'spoilage', and to 'enough, and as good, being left for
others' (Second Treatise, paras 31 & 33). He presupposes, rather than deduces, the property of individuals in their persons; but then faces a problem, granted the contingency of need, in that the earth is supposed to be given to mankind in common. For an individual to satisfy needs without 'express consent of all the commoners' (para.28), a transition to private property must be effected on the basis of pre-political claims. The founding of private property on the labour 'that is his own' gives a person such rights and enables him to satisfy his needs. Since it is assumed that others have the same sort of needs, and the movement from common property in the earth to private right in its useful produce is based on 'natural reason' (para.25), it is against such reason to appropriate so much that some would spoil; and from further contingencies making possible monopolisation is derived the natural limitation that enough be left for others.

Hegel, on the other hand, refuses to discuss the question of the extent of ownership at this point: 'The rational aspect is that I possess property.... What and how much I possess is a matter of indifference as far as rights are concerned' (para.49). It seems, nevertheless, that Hegel should have introduced analogous limitations to those of Locke instead, as his own justification of property might run into problems over monopolisation. However, it should be understood that Hegel in this first part of his book is talking of the person (para.49R); the moment of differentiation, and hence the positing of many individuals and their relationships, arrives only with Civil Society - discussed by Hegel in the third, and last, part (6).

According to Hegel, then, property is no mere social convenience giving people access to means of subsistence as of right; it is a 'substantive end' in virtue of its role in giving personality objectivity. He argues for its necessity by pointing out that 'a person in making decisions is related to a world of nature directly confronting him, and thus the personality of the will stands over against this world as something subjective'. In reacting to this situation 'personality ... struggles to lift itself above this restriction and to give itself reality, or in other words to claim that external world as its own' (para.39).

In this way personality can express its inherent freedom, Hegel believes, and he develops this idea as follows:

A person must translate his freedom into an external sphere - immediately different and separable from him.

What is immediately different from free mind is that which, both for mine and in itself, is the external pure and simple, a thing, something not free, not personal, without rights....

A person has as his substantive end the right of putting his will into any and every thing and thereby making it his, because it has no such end in itself and derives its destiny and soul from his will. This is the absolute right of appropriation which man has over all things." (paras.41,42,44)

It seems curious to speak of a 'right' of appropriation man has over 'things', without conceiving of it in terms of the relationships between persons with respect to the things appropriated. However, the point Hegel is driving at is that, from his philosophical standpoint, a thing can be appropriated rightfully, and constituted as the content of a right which prohibits any other attempting to appropriate it, if, and only if, it is not itself 'substantive', in that it 'has no ends of its own to realize' because it is external 'both for mind and in itself'. How can there be a realm of such things? What is its significance in Hegel's problematic?

His problematic is that of personality overcoming the limitations of subjectivity by appropriating an external sphere as its property; but the way in which this problematic is articulated is significant, for personality (in the phase of its 'elementary immediacy' (para.43)) claims the world of nature ('what is immediately different and separable from him' (para.41)), not as its 'proper' realm, but in spite of its being 'immediately different'. Hegel feels it necessary to apologize:

'Even if my freedom is here realized first of all in an external thing, and so falsely realized, nevertheless abstract personality in its immediacy can have no other embodiment save one characterized by immediacy' (para.41A - my emphasis C.A.)

Why does he hold freedom is debased when realized in 'things'? It depends upon the concept of 'the external' being given a sense peculiar to Hegel's idealism in this problematic:

'From the point of view of free mind, which must, of course, be distinguished from mere consciousness, the external is external absolutely, and it is for this reason that the determinate character assigned to nature by the concept is inherent externality. (For), since a thing lacks subjectivity, it is external not merely to the subject but to itself.' (para.42 Remark and Addition)

Hegel on Nature

This doctrine (a truth of Speculative Reason which passeth Understanding (see 44R) 'of course') depends upon Hegel's general system (of which the Philosophy of Right is only a part), expounded in his Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences which moves from Logic, through Nature, to Spirit. The various moments of thought outlined in the Logic are internally connected through the self-determination of the concept in its development. The categories cannot be external to each other - they form a mediated whole. However, at the end of the Logic the absolute Idea freely posits itself in the form of otherness, 'as Nature' (7).

'Since therefore the Idea is (presented as) the negative of itself, or is external to itself, Nature is not merely
external in relation to this Idea (and to its subjective existence Spirit), but externality constitutes its specificity, as Nature" (8).

Nature is an external world of objects externally related to one another; it is unconscious of its concept, external to its own truth. It is absolute externality because the internality to which that own truth. It is absolute externality is related can only be reconstructed through the medium of thought. As Marx points out, the form of the dialectical deduction in the Encyclopaedia renders Nature, as such, senseless; it "only has the sense of an externality to be superseded (aufgehoben)" (9). When Hegel characterizes Nature as 'externality' this sounds innocent enough; but, as Marx explains, externality here should not be understood as a sensuously accessible world exposing itself to the light of day; rather, he says, 'it is to be taken in the sense of alienation (Entausserung), a flaw, a weakness... 'For the abstract thinker Nature must therefore supersede (aufgehen) itself, since it is already posited by him as a potentially superseded being.' (10). Because Nature is posited as the exoteric form of Logic with the consequence that 'the truth about things is that as such immediately single, i.e. sensuous things, they are only a show (Schein) (11) - they have no substantive independence, from the Speculative viewpoint. Nature is a realm of immediacy in which immediately single things positively cry out for mediation as it were.

For Hegel it is not a question of natural objectivity of which man is a part and in and through which his existence is naturally mediated; it is a question of mind positing the realm of nature (including the body incidentally - as we shall see below) as immediately other (i.e. opposite, antithetical, - not merely difference within a unity), and hence being moved to idealize this actuality, since, as inherent externality, Nature lacks ideality itself (in spite of its 'show of self-subistence for consciousness, intuition and representative thinking' (para.44R)) and must submit to its incorporation as a moment in Spirit's actualization.

One sees now why, for Hegel, the central instances of free action in the world are not bodily labours, but turn out to be 'judgements of the will on the thing' (para.53), because it is free-will which characterizes spirit; certainly, when he touches on a material content the importance of such moments is presented merely as a spur to an ideal upshot.

The Ideality of Property

Let us look at the material content touched on under the head 'Property', and how this reality is idealized.

Hegel admits that, since property is to be the 'embodiment of personality, my inward idea and will that something is to be mine is not enough to make it my property' (para. 51). Occupancy is necessary - not least in order to make my property recognizable by others. However, in the discussion of occupancy, Hegel overcomes 'the matter of the thing' only in ideality; for since 'matter offers resistance to me... occu­pancy, as an external activity whereby we actualize our universal right of appropriating natural objects... involves... restriction and contingency'; the 'mastery and external possession of things becomes... indeterminate and incomplete'; yet (Hegel consoles us) 'this actual occupancy is different from property as such because property is complete as the work of the free will alone' and 'in relation to the will and property... this independence of matter has no truth... even though there still remains in possession, as an external relation to the object, something external' (para.52 & Remark).

Hegel then turns to the 'further determinations' of property actualized in three moments of 'the will's relation to the thing' (para.53). The positive moment is signified by 'taking possession of the thing immediately' whereby one becomes objective to oneself in one's property. This sinking in to the particular realizes the universality of the will. Thus we move to the moment of negativity whereby the will distinguishes itself, through the 'use' of the thing for one's own ends, from the thing itself. Even in this relation the will is still debased (see above discussion (of para 41A)) by its involvement with the particularity of the objects and their use-value (see below on exchange-value). Hence the will must be asserted as the will absolutely and not in connection with the particularity of its objects. This is realized in 'alienation' (Verausserung) of the thing whereby is accomplished 'the reflection of the will back from the thing into itself' (albeit through the mediation of things still). Hegel says: 'These three are respectively the positive, negative, and infinite judgements of the will on the thing.' (para.53; see Enc para.172-3).

Let us examine the actual content of these 'judgements' more closely. The positive judgement is signified by 'taking possession' of the thing '(a) by directly grasping it physically (12), (b) by forming it, and (c) by merely marking it as ours' (para.54). The extraordinarily idealist manner in which Hegel 'shows his mastery over things' through taking them into possession is well exemplified in the following passage:

'The notion of the mark... is that the thing does not count as the thing which it is but as what it is supposed to signify... By being able to give a mark to things and thereby to acquire them, man just shows his mastery over things.' (para.58A)

No comment seems necessary - except to say that thus clothed with a costume not its own the individuality of the natural object is estranged. The negative judgement of the will on the thing is signified in its use to satisfy needs (and this is 'a still more universal relation to the thing' (para.59A) than marking); yet, lest we should be tempted to look here for a material content, Hegel reminds us that use is only a moment in the development of 'the will's relation
to the thing' (para.53). For example, 'squating' is rejected thus: '
The fact that property is realized and actualized only in use floats before the minds of those who look upon property as derelict and a res nullius if it is not being put to any use, and who excuse its unlawful occupancy on the ground that it has not been used by its owner. But the owner's will, in accordance with which a thing is his, is the primary substantive basis of property; use is a further modification of property, secondary to that universal basis, and is only its manifestation and particular mode.' (para.59R)

It is also very striking that Hegel considers that it is not the specific utility of a thing as related to a definite need but its universality as value ('abstracted from the thing's specific quality') 'wherein its genuine substantiality becomes determinate and an object of consciousness' (para.63). He comments further on the commensurability of values: 'The advance of thought here therefore is from the specific quality of a thing to indifference to this specificity, i.e. to Quantity' (para.63A). One cannot but agree with Knox (13) that it is because 'value is a concept existing for thought, not sensation, that it 'is the genuine substance of the thing' for Hegel, in spite of (or rather because of?) the fact that: 'If we consider the concept of value, we must look on the thing itself only as a symbol; it counts not as itself but as what it is worth' (para.63A) (14).

Commodity Fetishism confuses this peculiar social form - value - with the body of the commodity and hence naturalizes it. Hegel goes one better by declaring this social form form as such - as immediate the thing is formless, a mere 'show'. Hegel lifts himself above the fetishism of the commodity-body when he declares the value form to be a social mediation; but then instead of affirming the natural form of the object he declares this social form itself to be the substantive actuality of the thing, thus ending by fetishizing the commodity-form. It would hardly be an exaggeration to see in Hegel's Absolute, in which activity is ultimately self-related, the reflected form of capital's pure movement (M - M') which abstracts itself from use-values and the specificity of their production.

In the dialectic of 'the will's relation to the thing' as property, the moment of alienation, rather than posing any problem for Hegel, is seen by him as the most complete actualization of ownership. By a typical idealist twist, it is precisely in this 'negatively infinite judgement' on the thing ('in which the subject has no relation whatever to the predicate' (15)) whereby my will is reflected 'back from the thing into itself' (para.53) that, in thus distinguishing myself as an owner rigorously from any particular content to this proprietorship, I become a real proprietor!

Possession and use are limited, finite, relations of the will to property in which its movement runs aground; but through teating things merely as exchangeable objects, in the endless circle of acquisition and alienation, the will is reflected into its own self - without getting bogged down in the natural features of the alienated objects; in this way, the dialectic progresses to 'contract' where the will is dealing with its own other. 'This relation of will to will is the true and proper ground in which freedom is existent' (para. 71)(16).

In conclusion: the overriding moment in the 'mastery of things exhibited by free-will' is that which is most removed from their useful material character, namely the process of their alienation. This pushes forward the actualization of the will to the form of contract whereby it achieves recognition in another person. Only as a proprietor among proprietors am I free!

We will come back to Hegel after we have spent a little time developing the positive content of Marxian materialism.

3. Marx's Ontology

Marx uses a materialist criterion to distinguish the fundamental specificity of human being in Nature (and - let it be said - insofar as it is a practical and historic-
al criterion also, it is more dialectical than anything in Hegel:

'Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion, or something else you like. They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence' (17).

The fundamental human relationship to Nature lies therefore in labour. Nature is the objective sphere in which labour realizes itself through its objectification in a product worked up out of natural objects; as the object of his activity and the basis of his subsistence Nature is constituted for and by man as his 'inorganic body' (18).

Industry is the mediation in which is united both the identity and difference of human nature with so-called 'external' Nature: the celebrated "unity of man with nature" has always existed in industry and has existed in varying forms in every epoch according to the lesser or greater development of industry; even in the most primitive development of the productive forces, the 'cunning of reason' (20) remains mired in the 'realm of necessity' (21). The proprietor's 'absolute mastery over things' (from the point of view of legal ideology) is cruelly complemented by the subordination of labour to the natural recalcitrance of objects, which exhausts it. Furthermore, Marx, unlike Hegel, recognizes particularity as such (not purely as a moment to be sublated). He emphasizes that, when the objective world becomes the objectification of man and the realization of his powers, the manner in which the object becomes his depends on the specificity of the relation that constitutes its particular mode of affirmation (22).

The significance of human activity is by no means limited to the production of utilities in the narrow sense. Marx points to its fundamental ontological significance: 'By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their material life.... This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. Hence what individuals are depends on the material conditions of their production' (23).

This ontological framework stayed constantly at the basis of Marx's work. In his masterpiece, Capital, Marx sketches the fundamental nature of man's production of himself through labour. 'Labour is, first of all, a process between man and nature, a process by which man, through his own actions, mediates, regulates and controls the metabolism between himself and nature... Through this movement he acts upon external nature and, in this way he simultaneously changes his own nature' (24).

The difference between Marx's materialist problematic, and Hegel's idealist one, turns crucially on the relationship of the object of activity to that activity. A materialist point of view, of course, cannot accept Hegel's characterization of Nature as external to itself: Nature is not in itself external to anything - least of all to itself. It is a mediated whole in which, if single isolated things only have a 'show' of self-subistence, it is not because they require spirit to incorporate them in its logical totality, but rather because on investigation they will be found to depend on larger natural complexes.

The problem now is: to conceptualize the status of such things as natural objects taken up by human activity. The struggle to wrest the means of subsistence from Nature grounds that activity in an internal differentiation in which, from the side of man, Nature is a means of life only as transformed (in accordance with its objective possibilities in relation to the current historically developed powers of man) by productive labour; and for this labour Nature is now posited as the moment of immediate material - labour's object. In this sense, Nature as a realm of essential objects for labour is man's 'inorganic body'. However, there is no reason why these essential objects for man should have man as their essential object! (25) Labour's object may be posited as immediate by labour but it is not so inherently. It is of course true that (whereas the animal's activity is bounded by particular pre-given relationships to its environment) man's activity, and his relationship to Nature, is universal. From this point of view an object can be put to new uses which - if you like - are 'unnatural' to it. So, therefore, abstractly considered (and especially from the point of view of certain social relations which posit activity as abstract, whether it is Hegel's 'free-will', or more concretely, the production of value by 'abstract labour') Nature is reduced to immediately existing material divorced from any specific internal connection (its own mediatedness in natural ecology) or from particular labour processes. The abstract identity in labour's material disappears, however, when any concrete useful labour is actually embarked upon. As Peter Ruben (26) points out, it cannot then be considered merely 'naked matter'; for in showing its specific resistance it requires specific adaptations of labour based on knowledge of its objective specificity. As a corollary we can understand that labour's object is posited as immediate material only as it is taken up as a moment in the production of values (27).

A further important consequence is that in the outcome of labour's mediating activity we find that natural objectivity and particularity are by no means negated - as
they are for Hegel when the mediation of mind idealizes the 'external sphere'.

Productive consumption re-possits the object as an object in that: in consuming the material it makes use of this consumption itself in order to transform, while preserving, the material, and the materialized labour, into the form of a product; and, while treating the given form of the object merely as the immediate material moment in production, it reduces this sublation (of the objective character of the thing) itself to a moment, and is hence the positing of the object, but in a new objective form. (The dialectical negation of the negation is not of course the restoration of the origin of the movement.) On the basis of this new determinate objective form, the product, as a particular object, becomes a definite use-value, more specifically adapted to human requirements (28).

**Marx and Hegel**

If we compare this with the Hegelian philosophy of property, we recall that when the object acquires the 'mark' of private property it is posited as other than itself, and that the most significant use then made of it is the suspension of its use for the purposes of exchange, in which its abstract universality as a value negates the particularity of its natural form (para.77) (29) and it becomes the mere bearer of the identical wills of the proprietors. Freewill posits the object as other than itself in that: in marking, using and alienating it, freewill makes the matter of the thing its property; and in treating the object as inherent externality it overtakes the 'unmediated' (para.44R) objective character of the thing in this movement and hence posits itself, but as objective rather than subjective will.

Because Hegel remains uncritically within the camp of private property he cannot conceive the (first-order) mediations of man and nature in industry except through the prism of (second-order) property relations. Thus he presents private property as a fundamental ontological dimension of the concrete totality manifested in Spirit's actualization. For Marx, it is a derived second-order mediation within the fundamental ontological framework of objectification - it is a determinate mode of externality of man to himself and to the conditions of his labour. Marx does not consider the natural conditions of labour as immediately external to man and his powers (except in the sense that all of nature, including man and his work, participates in a sensuously manifest whole). However, if Nature is man's 'inorganic body' because it has been constituted as the essential object of his activity through the mediation of labour, then to separate labour-power from its conditions of realization by constituting the latter as private property (whether or not the means of production are in fact monopolised in consequence) is really to constitute the object as external both to itself ('land has nothing to do with rent...' (30) - Marx) and to labour-power - which latter is now thrown back (because of the contingency of this external relationship to the means of production) into 'subjectivity' estranged from its objective realm of expression. (Here is an inversion, if you like: for Hegel, private property is the mediation through which subjectivity claims the external, thus constituting personality; for Marx, private property is the mediation whereby personal powers separate themselves from their objective conditions of expression - one might almost say they are demediated - thus introducing an external relation between them requiring sublation in further mediations - exchange, wages, etc. - of the estranged moments). If the potentially monopolisable means of production are in fact monopolised, the subjective moment too has to become external to itself since labour-power can now realize itself in objective activity only insofar as it is alienable. The consequence is that (in Marx's striking phrase) the worker is no longer at home in his work.

We now turn to Hegel and Marx on alienated labour.

**4. Hegel on Personal Powers**

Like Locke, Hegel considers the relation between persons and their labour-power to be one of property, and also recognizes that as such labour is alienable. Unlike Locke, he recognizes that there is a problem in accounting for the justification and even the very possibility of such alienation - because he sees that labour-power is not immediately 'external' in the same sense that other alienable things are. Before taking up the question of labour's alienation then, we must review Hegel's account of bodily power. Hegel considers that men, while free 'in their concept', are not free in their immediate natural existence. Hegel emphasizes that it is necessary for this concept of human freedom to be actualized through a process whereby the natural basis of human existence is sublated through the mediation of free mind. This mediation turns out to be the evolution of a property once again! He speaks of 'the possession of our body and mind which we can achieve through education (Bildung), study, habit, etc., and which
exists as an inward property of mind' (para. 43R). Immediately my 'bodily organism' is merely 'my external existence' (para. 47) so that it has to 'be taken into possession by mind' (para. 48) through the mediation of the will.

'Man, pursuant to his immediate existence within himself, is something natural, external to his concept. It is only through the development of his own body and mind, essentially through his self-consciousness's apprehension of itself as free, that he takes possession of himself and becomes his own property and no one else's.' (para. 57)

'At this stage Hegel, just as the world of nature, as an 'inherent externality', is to be ideally subsumed under the concept of property, so too our own natural existence is 'external to its concept' and likewise to be sublated through this same mediation. We are to own ourselves! One of the results of developing our powers is that we have the power to treat our powers as mere legal 'things'! The phrase 'he becomes his own property' is explicitly given the significance that one can take self-consciousness and its powers 'as one's object', and logically therefore, one's self-consciousness becomes thereby 'capable of taking the form of a "thing"' (para. 57), like any other, held as property, and, if suitable mediations may be found (see below), alienated as such. However, here Hegel runs into insoluble problems: how can essentially inward property be held as a 'thing' of this kind? On the one hand it seems that such substantive characteristics of the person should be inalienable (31): on the other hand, Hegel (in an earlier section) recognizes that alienation penetrates this sphere insofar as mental aptitudes, erudition, skills, attainments, inventions, and so forth, are 'brought on a parity through being bought and sold, with things recognized as things;' and yet it seems difficult to speak of legal possession of such 'things' for 'there is something inward and mental about it' (para. 43R). Hegel attempts to rationalize this situation as follows: 'Attainments, erudition, talents, and so forth, are, of course, owned by free mind and are something internal and not external to it, but even so, by expressing them it may embody them in something external and alienate (veraussern) them and in this way they are put into the category of 'things'. Therefore they are not immediate at the start but only acquire this character through the mediation of mind which reduces its inner possessions to immediacy and externality' (para. 43R).

'This does not seem very satisfactory, but instead of amplifying the point Hegel backs away from it: 'In this sphere we are concerned with mental aptitudes, erudition, &c., only in so far as they are possessions in a legal sense; ... it is not until we come to deal with alienation (Verausserung) that we need begin to speak of the transition of such mental property into the external world where it falls under the category of property in the legal sense' (para. 43R).

Nevertheless, Hegel was forced eventually to recognize that he falls to cope with a new problem here - that of externalization - for he notes in the margin (that is, after publication of the book) with respect to the use of the word 'alienation' here: 'It would be better to speak here of a mode of externality. Alienation is giving up something which is my property and which is already external, it is not to externalize' (32). In other words, we cannot cheerfully subsume the problem away under the process of 'alienation' for, if alienation is of something 'external by nature', then it has to be shown how my 'inner possessions' acquire the 'mode of externality', and whether or not this is contrary to their concept. It would seem that we require a particularly subtle 'mediation of mind' whereby these inner possessions, acquired so that I become 'my own property', achieve a 'mode of externality' on the basis of which they are alienable on a par with 'things' yet without estranging personality from itself.

The Sale of Labour-Power

At all events, Hegel certainly regards spiritual possessions, such as conscience, as inalienable, while cheerfully accepting the alienation of external things embodying a person's powers (paras. 43 and 67). The former are supposed to involve the substance of personality whereas the latter are merely particular single objectifications of my powers. He manages to sidestep the problems that might arise with a person's products, what of the alienation of personal material powers themselves? The alienation of material powers ought to pose difficulties for Hegel, for, in spite of his identification of the person with 'self-consciousness', he admits the peculiar status of the body once the will has taken possession of it, and says clearly that I, and my freedom, exist for others only as embodied (para. 48R). Hence it would seem to follow that the worker lacks freedom while labouring for another, albeit that he might 'abstract himself' from the routine of production and absorb himself in dreaming up dirty jokes, for example. If I possess my labour-power only because I have made my body my own in such a way that its powers only exist as powers developed by my will, Hegel should find it paradoxical that my abilities could yet be posited in the mode of exteriority required for their alienation.

Hegel certainly regards slavery as incompatible with the Idea of Freedom, but he makes an ingenious distinction between wage-labour and slavery, whereby the former may be endorsed by 'the concept' ...

'Single products of my particular physical and mental skill and of my power to act I can alienate (Verausserung) to someone else and I can give him the use of my abilities for a restricted period, because, on the strength of this restriction, my abilities acquire an external relation to the totality and universality of my being. By alienating the whole of my time, as crystallized in my work, and
everything I produced, I would be making into another's property the substance of my being, my universal activity and actuality, my personality.'
(par.67) (33)
And he explains in the Remark: 'It is only when use is restricted that a distinction arises between use and substance. So here, the use of my powers differs from my powers and therefore from myself, only insofar as it is quantitatively restricted.
It seems, then, that Hegel admits that my labour-power is part of the substance of my personality - an essentially inward property insofar as I am in possession of myself. However, as he noted earlier (para.43R), it might be possible that in expressing my powers I reduce them - 'through a mediation of mind' - to 'immediacy and externality'. Although not immediately external at the start, labour-power may be externalized through some mediation. Here, in this discussion of the alienation of the use of my powers, the mediation required is identified with the time-limit which creates a distinction between use and substance (even though the substance of my power is nothing but 'the totality of its manifestations' (para. 67R)). On the strength of this restriction, my abilities require an external relation to the totality and universality of my being.'
The trouble with Hegel's distinction between entire alienation and alienation piece by piece - a distinction which is supposed to guarantee the independence of the worker's personality - is that it breaks down when one considers the possibility - which is effectively realized in the case of modern wage-labour - that, through successive piecemeal alienations of my time, my entire labour-time is appropriated by others.
Either Hegel must take his equation of the totality of the manifestations of my labour-power with that power itself in a material sense and criticize wage-slavery; or else he will have to posit that from an idealist standpoint the substance of my power is its status as property rather than the totality of its potential manifestations. For the powerful person there is substituted the legal person who remains himself alone even when effectively relinquishing his entire power to others. Legal ideology in its pure form would accept the substance itself as external property like other 'things'. It is only Hegel's instinct for the non-legal essence of possession based on Bildung that prevents him assuming that; but he capitulates to piecemeal reification. What is a 'thing' in pieces is all of a piece a 'thing'. Only the position that the substance of labour-power is itself alienable property will justify wage-slavery and if that is reificatory because it treats inward property as an external 'thing', then the pieces are inwardly 'substantive' as well, and their alienation is not mere against personality. The substance of the coal-miner thrown on the scrap-heap with 'black lung' has certainly wasted away in the service of the employer, notwithstanding that 'a distinction between use and substance arises' in virtue of the miner's selling himself piece by piece instead of into explicit slavery. If the worker's entire labouring time is alienated, then his distinction from a slave is surely reduced to his legal status, while materially he is in slavery to capital.
However, these quantitative considerations may be left at this point; for there is a deeper, qualitative, incoherence in Hegel's endorsement of wage-slavery. To say that the time restriction effects an 'external relation' between the use of my powers and my substantive possession of them is inadequate, because Hegel fails here (para.67) to deal with the same point that was missed in the earlier (para.43R) discussion. Even if the time-limit may satisfy the criterion for the continuation of an independent legal personality throughout piecemeal alienations of labour-power, it does not deal with the problems arising when the transition of such personal power into the 'mode of exteriority' is attempted such that 'it falls under the category of property in the legal sense', that is (having been 'reduced to immediacy and externality') alienable to another to be made use of by him for however limited a period. Hegel says, at one point, that if I am given the use of something that remains the property of someone else 'there would remain in the thing something impenetrable by me, namely the will, the empty will, of another' (para. 62). Does the alienation of labour-power reduce the status of its original possessor to that of an 'empty will'? The situation is clearly more complicated; with wage-labour the worker is present in his work as much more than an empty will; for, since his power only exists insofar as he is 'in possession of himself' and he has developed it as essentially 'inward property', it is
not a 'thing external by nature' but is itself will-with-thing, so to speak. In developing the powers of my 'brains, nerves, and muscles' I remove their immediately external character and they become my inward possessions (to use Hegel's terminology). The mediation which my labour-power is yielded 'to the will of another ... as a res nullius' (para.65) cannot consist, therefore, in my withdrawing out of myself, leaving behind only my 'empty will' to mark my right to recover my powers. The powers of my brains, nerves, and muscles exist only insofar as I am present in exercising them. If they are to be alienated, these powers must be externalized; but they can only be externalized if they are objectified in production, and this latter requires, not the exclusion of my will, but my own use of my powers, however grudgingly. The worker's will is not in his powers like a squatter in a house - to be ejected or ignored. Getting him to exercise them in the service of another therefore requires the subordination of his will to the other's.

There are two problems with labour's externalization that arise from this fact. One is a problem for the purchaser of the use-value, labour-power: how is he to effect its externalization if this must involve subordination of the worker's will? (We advert to this central question below; we postpone it for now - until we have raised it on the basis of Marx's work.) The other problem arises for Hegel's apologetic. At this point there comes home the contradiction implicit in Hegel's view of personal powers as, on the one hand, inward property actualizing freedom, and, on the other, potentially externalized property held mediatedly as an alienable 'thing'. If this second relation is realized in the alienation of labour the will exists in contradiction with itself: for, in Hegel's general theory, the moment of alienation establishes the will as will through its reflection from the thing; in the contractual relation with the other's will, symmetrically mediated in the 'thing', it becomes 'identical' with its other and both equally achieve objective recognition: but, since the thing' here itself embodies the will, as we have seen, the externalizing mediations presuppose an asymmetrical relationship, in which one will bends to the other, being thus 'refracted' rather than 'reflected' (so to speak) in this alienation. This is nothing less than self-estrangement.

5. Marx's Theory of Alienated Labour

The contradiction between the symmetry of the wage-labour contract effected by autonomous, juridically equal, persons, and the asymmetry of the employer's relationship during the working day to his 'hands' (to employ the striking vernacular of capital), finds its way into the texts of the bourgeois ideologists from reality. This reality disguises the relations of personal dominance inherent in wage-slavery by reifying the personal powers of the labourer so that they become a 'factor of production' like any other. The factors of production themselves are posited as inherently external to one another and mediatable only through the valorisation process brought about within the movement of capital. What lies at the basis of all this is the estrangement of labour from its conditions of actualization and itself. This was first brought to light in that extraordinary text of Marx's: the chapter on Estranged Labour in his 1844 Manuscripts. Let us review that, very briefly. The poor situation of the modern wage-worker is reflected first of all in the fact that the objectification of his labour in the product is no confirmation of his powers, but their estrangement, in that the product is not his but the property of his employer.

Furthermore:

'The externalization (Entäußerung) of the worker in his product means not only that his labour becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently of him and alien (fremd) to him, and begins to confront him as an autonomous power; that the life which he has bestowed on the object confronts him hostile and alien.' (34)

Moreover, if we are concerned about the estrangement between the worker and his product, it is necessary also to look at the character of the activity that effects it. 'How could the product of the worker's activity confront him as something alien (fremd) if it were not for the fact that in the act of production he was estranging himself from himself. After all, the product is simply the résumé of the activity, of the production. So ... production itself must be active alienation, the alienation (Entäußerung) of activity, the activity of alienation. The estrangement of the object of labour merely summarises the estrangement (Entfremdung), the alienation in the activity of labour itself.' (35)

Marx describes the situation in the following striking terms:

'Labour is external to the worker, i.e. it does not belong to his essential being; ... he therefore does not confirm himself in his work but denies himself.... 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 labour is therefore not voluntary but forced, it is forced labour. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need but a mere means to satisfy needs outside itself. In it he belongs not to himself but to another.' (36)

In sum: the worker views his product - and his very labour - as external to him; his objectification of his powers is 'directed against himself' insofar as it produces and reproduces his 'self-estrangement' - his estrangement from himself, his work, and his world (37).

**Terminological Excursus**

I am going to argue that Marx's theory is insufficiently clarified conceptually - but to introduce this point it will be useful to examine some of the terminology employed - difficulties which I will argue flow from a certain condensation in the employment of the expressions themselves. There are three key terms:

1. **'Objectification', as should be clear from our earlier discussion, is employed when Marx is dealing with the natural and essential expression of labour in its product. In the context of the first-order mediations (logically prior to the second-order mediations: alienation of property and transfer of ownership) it is confirmation of man's activity: 'through it nature appears as his work and his reality ... he can therefore contemplate himself in a world he himself has created' (38).

2. 'Entfremdung': estrangement; alienation.

3. **Entusserung:** alienation of property; parting with; renunciation; relinquishment; externalization.

Let us examine these in turn:

1. 'Objectification', as should be clear from our earlier discussion, is employed when Marx is dealing with the natural and essential expression of labour in its product. In the context of the first-order mediations (logically prior to the second-order mediations: alienation of property and transfer of ownership) it is confirmation of man's activity: 'through it nature appears as his work and his reality ... he can therefore contemplate himself in a world he himself has created' (38).

2. 'Entfremdung' has the sense of 'making strange'. It is used in cases of interpersonal estrangement for which English also uses 'alienation' (following Latin: alienare)

3. Entusserung: alienation of property; parting with; renunciation; relinquishment; externalization.

Let us examine these in turn:

1. 'Objectification', as should be clear from our earlier discussion, is employed when Marx is dealing with the natural and essential expression of labour in its product. In the context of the first-order mediations (logically prior to the second-order mediations: alienation of property and transfer of ownership) it is confirmation of man's activity: 'through it nature appears as his work and his reality ... he can therefore contemplate himself in a world he himself has created' (38).

2. 'Entfremdung' has the sense of 'making strange'. It is used in cases of interpersonal estrangement for which English also uses 'alienation' (following Latin: alienare)

   (a) to make another's, transfer ownership;
   (b) to cause a separation (interpersonal estrangement). However, it should be noticed that whereas English, following Latin, uses the term 'alienation' in the sense of transfer of ownership in legal-commercial contexts, 'Entfremdung' would not be used in such contexts and therefore its meaning maps more naturally on to 'estrangement'. I agree with Istvan Meszaros (39) that Marx uses 'Entfremdung' to express the fact that man is being opposed by a hostile power of his own making.

3. Entusserung: one should note here that the root 'usserung' means 'manifestation' and that 'ent' indicates presence of or entry into a new state or relinquishment of an old state. Thus, in combination we see that the sense is that something is manifested in such a way as to change its state. The sense of relinquishment comes out strongly when Marx makes the following contrast between the root and its modification in connection with life:

   'Private property is only the sensuous expression of the fact that man becomes objective for himself and at the same time becomes an alien and inhuman object for himself, and his expression of life (Lebensusserung) in his alienation of life (Lebensentusserung).' (40)

   'Entusserung' would naturally be translated as 'alienation' in legal-commercial contexts involving transfer of ownership. The problem is that unlike 'alienation' it also has the sense of 'externalization' and appears therefore in other contexts besides (41).

   It will be noted that, with regard to the two crucial terms ('Entfremdung and Entusserung') which may be translated as 'alienation' (42), we have three concepts:

   (a) estrangement;
   (b) alienation of property to another;
   (c) externalization. The translators have adopted different solutions to this complexity, and we append their versions below.

   In my view, the problem is not simply one of translation, but that there are certain fuzzinesses in Marx's own expressions. The problem for translators appears as 'three into two won't go', but it really boils down to the rendition of 'Entausserung'. There is no good reason not to select 'estrangement' for 'Entfremdung' except that the adjectival usage is not very idiomatic: 'The product becomes strange to the worker' sounds 'strange' to be sure~

   Nevertheless, the conceptual content of 'Entfremdung' is univocal and maps on to 'estrangement' as we have argued above.

   The problem remains that we have to choose between 'alienation' and 'externalization' for 'Entfremdung'. Milligan and Benton, who both prefer the former, nevertheless occasionally feel forced to resort to the latter thus indicating a genuine ambiguity. If all alienation were of 'things external by nature' then all occurrences would be equivalent in that the change of state implicit in the term could only refer (in the conditions dealt with by political economy) to the transfer of ownership. This is indeed how the matter appears to the ideological consciousness caught up in the toils of reification. It knows of no problematic of 'externalization' as a presupposition of alienation. However, if we penetrate this reification then we understand that, whatever might be the case with the means of production (see above), labour-power is surely internally related to its owner as its peculiar possession. We must therefore distinguish the moment of externalization from the moment of alienation, for to alienate is to treat something as already external property, it is not to externalize. The use of 'Entusserung' in Marx condenses these two moments and they need to be separated.

   I suggest that the problem of 'alienation' comprises three distinct moments. We need the following three terms:

   (1) 'Externalization' - for the process whereby a person's labour-power is
expressed in such a way as to be treated as immediately external property.

(2) 'Alienation' - for the transfer of such property to some other agency.

(3) 'Estrangement' - for the consequences of the subordination of the person to his own externalized powers. Objectification of my powers in working up nature becomes at the same time estrangement in the conditions dealt with by political economy, i.e. wage-labour.

Alienated Labour and Private Property

This clarification of the conceptual framework of Marx's theory of alienation helps us to understand that passage in the 1844 Manuscripts which has mystified many commentators (43) - that in which private property is posited not as the cause but as the consequence of labour's estrangement. It seems that it is the movement of private property which separates the worker from his means of production and constitutes his labour-power as a commodity like any other, thus estranging him from his labour. Marx says that this view inverts the real relation (44). I suggest that this is because the estrangement inherent in the capitalist labour-process is not an epiphenomenon of the property relations of the wage-contract but a pre-condition of its making sense to posit labour-power as alienable property; because before anything can be alienated an external relation must exist, or be potentially realizable, between it and its present owner. The estrangement of labour-power from its conditions of expression, and its own self, is presupposed by such private property. In order to uncover the real relationship 'alienated labour' must be given conceptual priority over 'private property'.

As far as the material practice is concerned, the interest of the capitalist in appropriating the use-value of labour means that labour-power is alienable only if the capitalist is confident he has ways and means of externalizing this labour-power in an appropiable form. No capitalist would buy my immortal soul - for such alienation would remain notional without the possibility of introducing the relation of externality required for the realization of another's property in it. The devil alone knows how such a purchaser would occupy, use, or even mark, it as his.

With most commodities the contract of sale, and acquisition of the use-value, are concluded more or less at the same time. In the case of wage-labour there is a problem for the capitalist in that after hiring the worker he must find ways of enforcing performance of work with desired quality and in maximum quantity. For labour-power to exist as alienated property an external relation between the worker and his work must be set up; but this is not given in the wage-contract itself; it must be realized in the labour-process. The history of the capitalist labour-process is not merely one of increasing efficiency through technical improvements but also one of the increasing subordination of labour to the will of the capitalist. From this point of view capitalist exploitation is not a merely quantitative matter of getting something for nothing - analogous to merchant profit - it is a qualitative matter of subordinating the worker to the aims and methods of the capitalist so that surplus labour can - in Marx's graphic phrase - 'be pumped out of him'. The problem of management is the problem of this 'pumping out' through the institution of all sorts of controls and pressures which tend towards the supplantation of the worker's autonomous exercise of his powers. The factory organisation constitutes a collective worker which is under the sway of capital and in the face of which the personality of the individual worker is effaced.

The worker reproduces his estrangement every day insofar as his externalized labour accumulates as 'dead labour' at the pole of capital, reconstituting its domination over his living labour, and the necessity for him to alienate his labour-power piece by piece.

Conclusion

Private property is the mediation in and through which labour is estranged from itself; it is the expression of the estrangement of labour from its objective conditions and itself (45).

In the works of the bourgeois ideologists such as Locke and Hegel the estranged consciousness expresses in an uncritical way the external relation thus established between the person, his powers, and his world. In their eyes, a person appropriates this world as private property, and is even presented as the owner of his individuality; but since the actualization of the property relation presupposes alienability no coherent account of personality can be given; a person both is, and is not, constituted through the development of his powers and their objectification through activity in the material world.
For Marx the critique of private property leads to the unveiling of its secret: that it is the historically developed form through which the development of human powers, and the humanisation of Nature, has been realised, now in estranged form. The abolition of private property is significant for him insofar as it amounts to the re-appropriation by humanity of its essential powers and essential objects (46).

Appendix – Translations

Milligan
(Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, Moscow, n.d. and all subsequent revised proofs in Marx-Engels Collected Works Vol.3, London 1975)

Entfremdung = Estrangement
Entusserung = Alienation (or estrangement or externalization)

Bottomore
(Earl Marx Early Writings, London 1963)

Entfremdung & Entusserung = Alienation (or estrangement or externalization)

Easton & Guddat
(Writings of the Young Marx, New York 1967)

Entfremdung = Alienation
Entusserung = Externalization

McElhinney
(Karl Marx Early Writings, London 1963)

Entfremdung = Alienation
Entusserung = Externalization

Benton
(Karl Marx Early Writings, Harmondsworth, Middx. 1974)

Entfremdung = Estrangement
Entusserung = Alienation (or estrangement or externalization)
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IF IT HAD NOT BEEN FOR THESE THINGS I MIGHT HAVE LIVED OUT MY LIFE TALKING AT STREET CORNERS TO SCORING MEN. I MIGHT HAVE DIED, UNMARKED, UNKNOWN, A FAILURE. NOW, WE ARE NOT DOUCED FOR TODAY. FOR JUSTICE OF MAN AS NOW, WE DO BY ACCIDENT, OUR WORDS OUR LIVES – OUR PAINS NOTHING. THE MAKING OF OUR LIVES LIVES OF A GOOD SADNESS AND A POOR WISH PREDL LALL THAT LAST MOMENT BELONGS TO US. THAT AGONY IS OUR TRUTH. 15