

MARX'S THEORY OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AS A CONTEMPORARY MODEL FOR NATION BUILDING: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Orji, Chidi Paul, Ph.D.
Department of Philosophy,
University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences,
Umuagwo, Imo State
paul.orji@uaes.edu.ng, hipaulco@gmail.com

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.31621.83688

Abstract

Karl Marx's bundle of ideas, postulates, and views is known as dialectical materialism. In it, he speculated about political and economic remedies to the issues facing France. It was a response to what he perceived as unfairness and social and economic wrongs that were quickly establishing themselves as the norm in his society. The relevance of actual circumstances in terms of class, labor, and socioeconomic interactions was underlined by the Marxist dialectic. Contrarily, the Hegelian dialectic emphasizes the notion that inconsistencies in natural occurrences can be resolved by deciphering them and synthesizing a resolution while preserving their essential characteristics. Marx thought addressing and rearranging the social organization systems at the core of the issues would be the most effective way to handle the issues brought on by stated contradictory phenomena. With this in mind, the goal of this research work is to critically analyze Marx's theory of dialectical materialism and then show how, if properly embraced in society, it may aid in the building of a nation. This study will eventually come to the conclusion that, despite communism's failure in practice, it still contains some key ideas and principles that are essential to the advancement of a nation.

Keywords: Karl Marx, Dialectical Materialism, Capitalism, Nation building

Introduction

A new era of outcome-oriented philosophy and practical dialectics is claimed to have started when Karl Marx entered the philosophical scene, replacing the age of speculative philosophy and that of spiritualizing dialectics. Philosophy's goal is to alter the world, more so than dialectics', instead of interpreting it. Marx believed that sociopolitical and economic issues have confronted humankind throughout history. Karl Marx, a well-known philosopher, however, developed his "Dialectical materialism" theory in an effort to address these problems.

He developed this as a critique of the overly-spiritualized dialectics and philosophical theories of George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, whose ideas predominated the intellectual life of his day in Germany and other areas of Europe. Dialectics is typically understood to refer to a methodical, progressive discovery of truth, reality, or a solution to a problem by the elimination of unnecessary components and the synthesis of components that are essential to opposing ideas. In philosophy, dialectics is a mental premise as well as a strategy for addressing societal issues.

There are various schools or types of dialectics, such as the historical dialectics that Rousseau accepted, the dialectics of the spirit that Hegel adopted, and the sociopolitical dialectics that

Adam Smith adopted. Marx's brand or school of dialectics, however, is known as dialectical materialism, which is a term that was also used by the early materialists, such as the atomists, Leucippus, and Democritus. The dialectics of the early atomists were significantly revived, reformatted, and modified by Marx. In contrast to Hegelian and Ficshterian spiritual dialectics, he termed it dialectical materialism. This was in keeping with his goal to transform philosophy from a problem-interpreting discipline, as Marx viewed it in Hegel and Ficshte, into a practical and result-oriented discipline. Marx believed that his theory would finally remove racial injustice, political repression, labor indignity, and poor leadership; as a result, it would become a vehicle for building nations. Marx was drawn to the tangible world and focused on outcomes and solutions, but he was unable to live without Hegel and other influential figures.

Due to his keen interest in transforming or re-building society through philosophical difficulties, Marx started out his adult life as a young Hegelian, one of several intellectual groupings that were inspired by the philosopher Hegel. How society should be run in terms of its socioeconomic system was Marx's main preoccupation. Marx and Engels came to the conclusion that, particularly in the early 1840s, Hegelian philosophy was being misused in an effort to explain the social unfairness in industrialized or developing nations like Germany, France, and the United Kingdom.

Marx developed a materialistic account in his own dialectics, emphasizing the materialist view that the concrete and material world shapes the socio-economic affairs of society, which in turn determine the socio-political realities of the state. This is in contrast to the conventional Hegelian dialectics, which emphasized the idealist view that human experience is dependent on the mind's perceptions. He saw the raw materials in the social superstructure. As a modern idea for nation-building, Marx's theory of dialectical materialism is being critically analyzed in this essay.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that Marx refers to these particles as the classes of people in the state although the theory adopts a materialist perspective on society as it was advanced by atomistic particles. These classes, which Marx refers to as "atomistic parts," are not only at odds and at odds with one another all the time. Marx thinks that conflict resolution through dialectics, or what he saw as conquering opposites, will improve societal strife. The proletariat should own and manage the means of production while the stronger atom, or the bourgeoisies, suffer. This is the only thing that can be held accountable for all of the state's issues, from politics to economics, from education to development.

Marx conceived that this battle was also to blame for other problems such as political oppression, underdevelopment, insecurity, and poverty. Marx holds that society is unable to resolve this conflict and reach its full potential because of religion, which Marx claims is an inherently evil force. Therefore, his proposed theory, known as Marx's dialectical materialism, or the practical resolution of class conflict, must result in a violent revolution, a communist revolution, which would change every state from this type of capitalist arrangement to a socialist setting and then to a communist society. Marx sees this as the most effective starting point for real nation-building. How much of Marx is correct, though, is the real question. Marx fails to demonstrate how the final dictatorship of the proletariat will give rise to progress and nation-building in any modern state, including Nigeria. This work has been criticized for failing to address one of Marx's issues, which is that revolution begets revolution. In light of this, a thorough analysis comparable to the one done in the current study is necessary.

One can support the Marxian theory of dialectical materialism, which proposes a kind of forceful

or violent takeover of power from the capitalists, or rather the bourgeoisies, by the proletariat, by taking into account the current state of society, especially in our nation, Nigeria, the level of injustice in society, bad governance, and the oppression of the oppressed, as well as gender inequality in developing countries.

Marx's attempt to address political injustice through dialectical materialism should be appreciated, but the theory itself generates additional issues that obstruct progress. Marx, for example, felt that everyone should be treated equally and have equal access to the resources needed for human existence and education, regardless of where they work or are from. Marx also respected equality and human rights. In a fully developed Marxist society, the emphasis on free health care, education, and gender equality would substantially contribute to the abolition of gender stereotypes, which are still a big issue in today's communities, particularly those in developing nations.

Marx's theories raise many intriguing questions that beg for solutions. These include: Is religion a natural part of human nature or not? Is a revolution the best method to resolve a dispute? Is communism really the ideal system for society to adopt? Finally, how can we compromise between the two classes? These are the problems that this study project focuses on.

Marx Theory of Dialectical Materialism

Marx's form of dialectics, known as dialectical materialism, became the Marxist-Leninist party's worldview. It is known as dialectical materialism because it takes a dialectical approach to examining and understanding natural phenomena, yet its perspective of these phenomena and theoretical underpinnings are materialistic (Audi 2006:538). Famous individuals from the modern era include Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx. Marx and Engels developed dialectics further to give them a modern scientific shape by retaining only the "rational kernel" of Hegelian dialectics and discarding its Hegelian idealistic exterior (Audi, 2006:538). In presenting his own theory, Karl Marx writes:

Not only is my dialectic approach distinct from Hegelian thought, it also stands in stark contrast to it. According to Hegel, the real world is merely the exterior, phenomenal form of "the Idea," which he even elevates to the status of an independent subject by giving it the name "the Idea." Hegel views thought itself as the creator of reality. The ideal, in contrast, is nothing more to me than the material world as it is mirrored by the human mind and expressed in thought forms (Marx 1938, xxx).

In addition, according to Engels, "all nature, from the smallest thing to the largest, from a grain of sand to the sun, from the Protista (the basic living cells) to man, is in a constant state of coming into existence and disappearing from existence, in a constant flux, in a ceaseless state of movement and change" (Engels 1938:8). Consequently, dialectics "takes things and their perceptual images essentially in their interconnection, in their concatenation, in their movement, in their rise and disappearance" (Engels 1938:8), according to Engels. Engel's stance on the dialectics of nature is that the natural occurrences can only be comprehended and interpreted within a dialectical framework.

Marx's historical dialectic is regarded as a movement inherent to objective reality; it has frequently been implied in society with competing interests (Marx 1873:316); this suggests a conflicting rather than a harmonious type of development because the dialectic is an exchange of

theses and antitheses that leads to a synthesis of the conflicting claims. In essence, the conflict movement (opposition and confrontation) is what Marxist dialectical materialism refers to when this movement is at odds. Therefore, with regard to Marx, there is an opposition between the two rights, both of which bear the stamp of the law of exchanges. Force makes a choice between equal rights. The definition of a working day thus emerges in the history of capitalist production as the outcome of a conflict, a conflict between collective capital, or class capitalists, and collective labor, or the working class (Marx 1873:164).

The idea of the proletariat's conflict with capitalists is connected to Marx's dialectical materialism. It highlighted the materialist theory that socio-economic relations are shaped by the concrete environment and that these interactions in turn define the socio-political reality (Sperber 2013, 8). Dialectical materialism examines the factors that influence growth; it finds that political systems and social norms are reflective of economic activity; and that shifts in human society provide the demands of life for different social classes.

A subset of materialism, in general, is dialectical materialism. It declares that the material world is paramount. In contrast to Hegel's theory, which holds that idea comes before matter, this means that matter comes first. The way Hegel described it is how Absolute sets itself apart by internal action. It is a procedure where a starting point (thesis) is refuted in order to establish a second that is in opposition to it (antithesis). To get to the third position, which represents the synthesis of the two proceedings in which both are transcended- that is, annihilated while yet being preserved on a higher plane of existence- this second position is in turn denied by the negation of the negation. Afterwards, this third phase functions as the starting stage of a new dialectical process leading to a new synthesis, and so forth (Al-Hikmat 2019:2). Marx's theory of dialectics differs from Hegel's in that it is a method for empirically studying processes in terms of interrelation, development, and transformation rather than a method for producing preconceived results (Sperber, 2013:10).

When the dialectical method is used to study economic problems, phenomena are not viewed separately from one another, by bits or pieces, but in the inner connection as an integrated total, structured around and by a dominant mode of production, according to Ernest Mandel in his introduction to the Penguin edition of Marx's Capital (Mandel 1976:18). When Marx started reading Hegel again in 1857, the concept of dialectical materialism was created. Marx adopted a realist epistemology as opposed to Hegel.

His economic and philosophical texts' pragmatic ambiguities were abandoned, and he changed his views to become a classic materialist. Karl Marx attempted a dialectical justification of the labor theory of value while also being influenced by Hegel. In *The Holy Family*, he abandoned his positivist critique and began utilizing dialectic to uncover a reality that was previously unavailable under the surface. However, his materialism and dialectic were at odds. At the level of economic argument, the philosophical level of reasoning that denied the association of reality with Praxis was maintained.

Marx's Labour Theory of Value

Karl Marx employed the idea of labor power extensively in his critique of the political economy of capitalism. Marx made a distinction between the ability to perform labor, or labor power, and the actual act of performing labor, or labor (Ben 2010:20). Every civilization possesses labor power, but the conditions under which it is exchanged or integrated with the instruments of production to produce commodities and services have changed significantly over time. Marx postulates that

under capitalism, the creative forces of capital appear to be equivalent to the productive powers of labor. "Labor power at work" does, in fact, become a part of capital; it serves as working capital. Work degenerates into mere labor, workers becoming an impersonal labor force, and management gains primary control over the work environment.

In chapter 6 of the first volume of *Capital*, Karl Marx presents the idea as follows: The collective of a person's physical and mental abilities that they use anytime they create something useful of any kind is referred to as labor power or capacity for labor (Marx 2021:26). He goes on to say that labor power, however, only materializes through its exertion and mobilizes through employment. However, a certain amount of human muscle, nerve, brain, and other tissues are lost as a result, and these need to be repaired (Marx 2021:27).

Although the idea of "human capital" has been used to compare Marx's concept of labor power to, Marx himself may have believed that the idea was a reification meant to suggest that workers were a form of capitalist. For instance, according to apologetic economists, [the worker's] labor force symbolizes his capital in commodities form and provides him with ongoing income, according to Marx's statement in *Capital* Vol. 2, Volume 2. In fact, rather than being his wealth, labor force is his property (self-renewing, reproducing). It is the only good he can and must constantly sell in order to survive, and it only functions as capital (a variable) in the hands of the capitalist buyer.

According to those economists, the fact that a man is forced to sell his labor power, i.e., himself, to another man, shows that he is a capitalist because he always has "commodities" (himself) up for sale. In this sense, a slave is also a capitalist, despite being sold once and for all by another as a commodity. This is because a slave's nature as a commodity requires that its buyer make it work continuously as well as provide it with the means to survive so that it can continue to do so. (Marx 2021:27). Commodity, by virtue of its economic and social nature, possesses two special qualities that are related to its value. These distinctive qualities include "first and foremost, a thing that satisfies a human need; second and foremost, it is a thing that can be exchanged for another thing" (Lenin 1978:19). In light of the fact that commodities are constantly exchanged with one another, despite their uniqueness and diversity, it is difficult to determine what these varied objects have in common within a system of social interactions. However, the shared connections that they have are the result of labor.

The worth of labor and the worth of commodities differ from one another. The former should be comprehended from its foundation because it comes before the latter. The phenomena of the worth of labor can be described in monetary terms or in terms of the caliber of the job produced. Speaking of the value of labor, Marx asserts that its monetary form is its required or natural price. On the other side, they discuss market labor rates, which are rates that fluctuate above and below the required rate. (Marx 1990:675). Since commodity prices fluctuate over time, it often has an impact on the market price of labor by raising or lowering the necessary price, which represents the overall cost of production. As a result, a commodity can only be traded on the open market if "labor exists at all times." However, if the worker could give it a life of its own, he would be selling a commodity rather than labor (Marx 1990:675). There are two options if an eight-hour workday and a four-dollar value are assumed.

Perhaps the worker earns four dollars for eight hours of work, which is the price of his labor wage, or there is no surplus value for the purchaser of his labor. For eight hours of work, he either receives nothing or less than \$4. For Marx, it is impossible to enunciate or codify the first.

Marx maintains that as a result, "the value of a commodity is determined not by the quantity of labor objectified in it but by the quantity of living labor necessary to produce it" (Marx 1990:676). This is due to the unevenness of the means of production of goods as a result of technological improvement.

Marx explores the topic of "How is the price of labor determined?" According to his theory, labor's natural price depends on the relationship between supply and demand and is set at the point when supply and demand is in equilibrium (Marx 1990:678). Instead than analyzing the price fluctuation caused by supply and demand, the analysis should center on this inherent price.

Marx contends that when political economists sought to determine the value of labor, they were actually asking, "What is the cost of production (which the cost of is producing or reproducing the worker)?" (Marx 1990:678). Since the state of being is inherent in the personality of the worker, it is vital to combine the value of labor with the value of labor power. However, the worth of labor power is determined throughout the course of the worker's life and corresponds to a specific working day length.

Therefore, according to Marx, "the value of labor must always be less than its value-product" (Marx 1990:679), which means that in a capitalist system, the value of labor must always be less than the good being produced in order for the capitalist to have surplus value and generate profit.

Dialectics and the Social Relations of Production

Marx opposed with Hegel's notion that dialectic forces, or forces between classes, are what cause history to occur. Remember that Hegel was an idealist philosopher who thought that genuine truth is an ideal in a world of appearances. Marx, however, accepted the idea of dialectic but disagreed with Hegel's idealism because he did not believe that the material world conceals the "real" world of ideals from us. On the contrary, he believed that historically and socially, particular ideologies prevented people from clearly understanding the material conditions of their lives.

Thus, his historical materialism is the methodological approach of Marxist historiography that focuses on human societies and their historical development, contending that they exhibit a variety of discernible trends. As the materialist interpretation of history, this was initially put forth by Karl Marx (1818–1883). It is, at its core, a historical theory that holds that the organization and progression of society are primarily determined by the interaction between a society's technological and productive capability and its social relations of production. The application of dialectical materialism's guiding principles to the study of social life, the phenomena of societal life, and the study of society and its history is known as historical materialism. A contribution to the critique of political economy; men engage in specific, will less relationships as part of the social manufacture of their own existence, relationships that serve as machinery for the development of their material powers. The economic framework of society is comprised of the whole of these production interactions. The way that people live their material lives impacts how they live their social, political, and intellectual lives; men's social existence shapes their consciousness, not the other way around. The material productive forces of society interact with the current production relations at a specific stage of development. The modification of the superstructure of the entire system eventually resulted from the changes to the economic underpinning.

It is crucial to distinguish between the legal, political, religious, artistic, or philosophic change and the material transformation of the economic situation of production, which can be obtained with

the accuracy of natural science. This period of transformation cannot be judged by its consciousness, just as one does not judge a person by how they perceive themselves. On the other hand, this consciousness must be explained by the contradictions of material life and the conflict that exists between the social forces and the relations of production. (Marx 1977:9).

In order for future generations of humans to survive, they must produce and reproduce the material necessities of daily life (Seligman 1901:163). This is the fundamental reality that historical materialism is based on. Marx then expanded on this idea by claiming that people must join into extremely precise social ties, or more specifically, "relations of production," in order to have enough output and exchange. Humans work cooperatively on the environment, but they do not all carry out the same tasks; instead, there is a division of labor, in which individuals not only carry out various tasks but also have the ability to profit from the labor of others by owning the means of production.

The nature and extent of these productive forces-which include the means of production including tools, instruments, technology, land, raw materials, and human knowledge and abilities-that are present at any particular moment in history influence the relationships. Marx believed that because the capitalist class was always transforming the means of production, it was the most revolutionary class in history. People engage in the sale of their labor power in capitalism when they accept payment for the work they have completed over a specific period of time, which enables them to subsist. The term "proletarian" refers to individuals who sell their labor power in order to survive, whereas "capitalist" or "bourgeois" refers to those who purchase labor power, which is typically someone who possesses land and technology for productive purposes.

Marx also thought that capitalism was prone to produce crises and a decreasing amount of work. Marx came to the conclusion that the rate of profit would decline even as the economy developed because he thought that surplus value from work was the source of profits.

Communism as the Final Stage in Marx's Dialectics

Marxist politics calls for the destruction of the state and the establishment of global communism as a new world order; these are anticipated progressive processes. A "true democracy" according to Marx and Engels is communism, as stated by Allen W. Wood in his book *Karl Marx*, who claims:

Marx, on the other hand, agrees with the first point of view that there is no need for the social environment to be as negative as it is. We should support communism if capitalist social connections are a contributing factor to the world's ugliness and cruelty and if it allows for greater freedom for individuals to develop more kind and compassionate interpersonal relationships (Allen 1981:260).

In this society, the state has completely disappeared, there are no classes, and private property is nonexistent. The constitution was drafted by the people and represents the authentic expression of their will now that they have their own sovereignty. So, the constitution is created by the people according to their own needs and interests. In considering the best way to attain "true democracy," Marx and Engels stressed on the proletarian revolution, as he claims in his *Communist Manifesto* that:

The Communists despise hiding their beliefs and objectives. They openly admit that the only way to achieve their goals is by the violent overthrow of all current societal norms. Let a Communist revolution make the aristocracy quake. The only thing the proletariat stands to lose is their chains. They need to win the planet. United are the working people of the world (Marx 1848:30)

Since every social formation is the result of the growth of the material powers of production in society, the capitalist state contains the germ of this revolution within itself. The proletariat's dictatorship results inevitably from the class struggle. The dictatorship itself, however, simply serves as a bridge leading to the elimination of all classes and the creation of a society without classes. The new global order thus represents a step forward from earlier nations, states, tribes, and other racial or class divides. The former Soviet Union's Mikhail Gorbachev's top aide Georgi Shakhnazarov claims that "our epoch is the epoch of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into communism" (Shakhnazarov 1981:18).

The ultimate objective of Marxism is the development of international communism, which gives the people control over the means of production, eliminates classes and the state, and creates a global society based on consensus and cooperation. Conflict between socialist and capitalist societies, however, will continue to exist until international communism becomes a reality. Warfare will be a part of this battle as a continuation of class hostility. Nations under socialist rule will clash, just as the bourgeoisie and the proletariats do. Marxists therefore seek to construct a world communism and abolish all forms of governmental authority. As a result, they are ready to subdue, terrorize, and attack the opposition.

Political and Economic Implication of Marx Class Theory

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' economic and political ideology places a strong emphasis on the idea of class struggle as they predicted that society would inevitably progress from bourgeois oppression under capitalism to a socialist and ultimately classless society. One of the traditional economists, Karl Marx, supported the "Labour Theory Value" to account for relative variations in market prices. According to this idea, "the value of a produced economic good can be measured objectively by the average number of labor hours required to produce it". The fundamental tenet of the materialistic conception was the foundational significance that economic factors played in society.

The superstructure, which is made up of the state, the law, the government, as well as art, culture, and philosophy, is responsible for everything else. Marx went on to claim that human institutions and behavior are influenced by the economy; as a result, the superstructure is conditioned by and dictated by the economic base. Karl Marx asserted that "it is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their existence" (Marx 1997:11–12). The consciousness also changes when the economic foundation of society is altered. Typically, when the economic base changes, the superstructure also changes as a result. Marx stated:

The material forces of production in society clash with the existing relationship of production—or what is only a legal manifestation of the same thing- with the property relation in which they had previously been at work at a specific moment in their development. These relationships, which stem from the ways in which the forces of production are developing, affect the economic basis and more or less swiftly transform the entire superstructure (Marx 199:12). Marx outlined the five historical stages of economic growth. Slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and primitive communism were among them.

There are contradiction-producing factors present in every step (apart from the ultimate one), which makes revolutions inevitable. The current state of affairs would serve as the thesis, with its

conflicts creating an antithesis. The solution would then form the synthesis, which would then serve as the thesis. This cycle would continue until a perfect society was achieved. Politically, the class struggle is the primary driver of historical change under capitalism, which brought about inescapable pain and should be replaced by socialism first, followed by communism. His works sparked political upheaval, uprisings, and the creation of new governmental structures. The foundation of his social class theory is how we understand social stratification and inequality.

Therefore, based on Marxian viewpoints, the systems of stratification in stratified societies were derived from the links of the social groupings to the forces of production. The two main social classes are the governing class and the subject class. The ownership and control of the production forces by the ruling class is the source of its power. The subject class is dominated, exploited, and subjected by the ruling class. There is a fundamental conflict of interest between the two classes as a result. Marx analyzed historical social systems and discovered a common pattern of development among them. Marx was able to develop a precise framework for the development of humanity as a result of this and his outlook on the future.

The Relevance of Marx's Theory of Dialectical Materialism to Nation-Building

As a profound theory of change and development, Marx's dialectical materialism approached the problem of development from a very fundamental angle. The undercurrent of materialism in it implies that the ideas that eventually fuel societal advancement are birthed from the material circumstances. Marx's rejection of capitalism for its exploitative nature is essentially emphasized by his dialectical materialism. He clearly has moral objections to capitalism. It strives to achieve an objective moral ideal. This critique also highlights a fundamental problem of ideology: that it's being dominated by the interests of the ruling class.

Marx's materialist interpretation of history argues that all social institutions are shaped by the creation of the resources necessary to sustain human life and the trade of those resources. In other words, fulfilling one's basic requirements for food, shelter, and clothing is what keeps human society alive. So it makes sense to talk about humans in terms of praxis, or their practice of meeting needs. Marx would consequently characterize man as a laboring, producing, or creative being, aside from as a part of nature, a logical being, a social being, etc. Only when a man uses his intelligence to meet his wants does he attain his full potential. Thus, a man's work becomes what makes him who he is. His examination of the capitalist system surely draws attention to simple truths. For instance, it notes that the material order significantly shapes the human mind and has a significant impact on a society's ideals. Additionally, there is no denying the fact that capitalism society is extremely stratified and built on a variety of different ideologies. Nevertheless, to rule out the existence of universal ideas, as Marx did, would be an overstatement and perhaps an extreme presumption. Despite the fluidity of the substructure or material order, some fundamental concepts, such as justice and equity, can nonetheless serve as the foundation for ideologies.

As a result, when concepts of justice are more motivated by the spirit of reciprocal fairness, they may be regarded as universal. Humans also have the capability to change along with the changing material order, adjusting to the shifting substructure, thanks to their capacity for reason. Because of this, the denial of the existence of the idea of eternal and universal norms is relative rather than absolute. It is subjective, but not objective. The idea of labor as a social activity shows another application of Marx's materialist philosophy. As they look for a means of subsistence, men have always been motivated to band together in an effort to subdue the forces of nature.

Humans organize themselves to collect raw materials, create, use, and maintain machinery, construct and staff factories, and other tasks. The convergence of these productive factors results in the improvement of human abilities, potentials, and production relationships as well as the advancement of production tools. Therefore, there is a connection between human wants and the resources available to meet them. The way that Marx's materialist ideology projects the interests of the working class is one of its distinctive features. The goal of Marx's political philosophy is to free the masses from exploitation, which is particularly evident in the alienation of labor.

In actuality, Marx and Engels' historical materialism has a revolutionary bent, acts as the working class's weapon in the fight against capitalism, and is a dependable method of reshaping human society. Marx's materialist ideology and its ramifications thereby highlight the significance of philosophy for the advancement of society. In essence, Marxism gives a scientific view of the universe and in fact acts according to scientific principles, particularly as shown in the ideas of dialectical materialism. By doing thus, it draws attention to the connections between philosophy and science that already exist. Marx's philosophy primarily demonstrates the scientific shape it adopts by systematically combining "materialism" and "dialectics."

Philosophers viewed these ideas differently before him. For example, Feuerbach was a materialist but not a dialectician, whereas Hegel was a dialectician but not a materialist. These ideas were incorporated by Marx into his dialectical-materialist worldview. Marx's dialectical materialism is an approach to philosophy that emphasizes doing rather than just thinking. Karl Marx asserts that while philosophers have all attempted to make sense of the world in their own unique ways, what is really needed is for the world to be changed since only through action can the oppressed and exploited man be freed and have his human dignity returned to him (Marx 1887:27). Marx's theory of dialectical materialism provides a thorough justification for social transformations and their causes. Additionally, it offers workable plans for advancing a country's social, economic, and political development.

Conclusion

Any nation's social, political, and economic problems heavily influence the composition and course of the country. Improved intellectual capacity and progress-oriented practical activities are mostly necessary for the endeavour to secure a significant transformation of a society's social and political systems. Marx is concerned that the majority of philosophers and social scientists only interpret and theoretically analyze social reality, making little to no concrete efforts to bring about beneficial change. His philosophy, which successfully combines theory and practice and offers a strong foundation for social change, clearly fills this need.

Karl Marx, however, placed a high importance on human rights and equality. He firmly believes that everyone, regardless of color, sex, or religion, should have access to the resources needed for human existence and education. If fully implemented, his theory would emphasize free health care, free education, and gender bias or inequity, which would significantly aid in the abolition of gender stereotypes. Once more, Karl Marx can be seen as a possible solution to some of capitalism's problems. Even though it promotes quality and competition, capitalism also has a significant monopolization problem.

When a company or industry has accumulated enough wealth and notoriety to completely control its market segment, it becomes a monopoly. As a result, there may be less pricing competition, less possibilities for entrepreneurs, and smaller businesses that fail. According to Marx's theory,

businesses should be governed by the state. This could help prevent monopolies because, if one company starts to dominate the market, other smaller businesses can be given more funding to catch up or the dominant company can lose funding to give the other businesses a chance.

Marx's theory on the various social classes might offer insightful recommendations on how these classes can interact to form a whole and so show how society functions as a single entity. Additionally, his theory may be used as a mode of study to look at the connection between ownership, power, and social change and can be used to shed light on a wider range of social transformations than just those that are now in fashion.

Marx's theory has additional relevance in that it can aid in considering the present from a long-term perspective through his historical sense, as well as in understanding the underlying dynamics of a society as a whole and not just their functionality as separate units. This refers to all of its various classes and members, as Marx views the development from a historical perspective and can, therefore, identify the movements and preferences of that society.

Conclusively, even though Marx's projection of communism over capitalism has failed in practical application, it still offers important principles and thoughts essential for every political and social system. If these essential principles and thoughts can be abstracted from his theory and adopted in our current political and social system, especially our Nigerian system, it will greatly aid in development and the building of our great nation.

References

- Allen, W. (1981). Wood, Karl Marx. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group Press.
- Al-Hikmat, T. (2019). A journal of philosophy, vol. 39.
- Audi, R. (2006). Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Batra, R. (2011). "Sarkar, Toynbee and Marx". PROUT Globe.
- Engels, Friedrich. (1938). Anti- Durhring cited in Joseph Stalin. Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- _____ (1938). Dialectics of Nature cited in Joseph Stalin. Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- Ben, F. (2010). Marx's Capital (5th ed.). Pluto Press.
- Mandel, Ernest. (1976). Introduction to Karl Marx, Capital, .Penguin, Vol. I.
- Marx, Karl. (1887). Capital, Frederick Engels (ed.), Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling (trans.). Progress Publishers.
- _____ (1938). Capital. George Allen & Unwin Press Ltd., Vol. I
- _____ (1977). A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Progress publishers): Notes by R. Rojas.
- _____ (1990). Capital Vol 1, Pengium Classics.
- _____ (2001). Preface to a critique of Political Economy. The Electric Book Company.
- _____ (2021). "Economic Manuscripts: Capital Vol. 1 - Chapter Six". Marxists.org.
- Marx, Karl., & Engels, Friedrich. (1968), (1877). "Letter from Marx to Editor of the Otetchestvennyye Zapisky".
- Plato. (1974). The Republic. Second Edition, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Popper, Karl. (2002). Conjecture and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge. Routledge.
- Seligman, Edwin. (1901). The Economic interpretation of History, Political Science Quartely.
- Sperber, Jonathan. (2013). Karl Marx: A Nineteenth-Century Life. Live right Press.