

## A CRITIQUE OF KARL MARX'S THEORY OF DIALECTICS MATERIALISM AS A SOLUTION TO CONTEMPORARY NATION DEVELOPMENT

**Orji, Chidi Paul, Ph.D.**

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

### **Abstract**

*Dialectical materialism is a collection of concepts, hypotheses, and beliefs advanced by Karl Marx. He made predictions about potential political and economic solutions to France's problems in it. It was a reaction to what he believed to be injustice, social injustice, and economic wrongs that were swiftly becoming the norm in his society. The Marxist dialectic emphasized the importance of actual circumstances in relation to class, labor, and socioeconomic connections. The Hegelian dialectic, on the other hand, promotes the idea that contradictions in natural phenomena can be resolved by analyzing them and synthesizing a solution while maintaining their fundamental qualities. Marx considered that the only approach to deal with the problems caused by the aforementioned conflicting phenomena was to address and reorganize the social organization systems at the root of the problems. In light of this, the purpose of this research project is to evaluate Marx's theory of dialectical materialism and then demonstrate how, if properly embraced in society; it may contribute to the development of a nation. In spite of communism's failure in practice, this study will ultimately come to the conclusion that it still contains important ideas and ideals necessary for contemporary nations to develop.*

**Keywords:** Karl Marx, Dialectical Materialism, Capitalism, Nation development.

### **Introduction**

Karl Marx is credited with bringing about the end of the age of speculative philosophy and the age of spiritualizing dialectics and the beginning of a new era of outcome-oriented philosophy and practical dialectics. Instead of interpreting the world, philosophy seeks to change it, more so than dialectics. According to Marx, humankind has always faced sociopolitical and economic problems. But well-known philosopher Karl Marx developed his "Dialectical materialism" theory to try to solve these issues. This was created as a critique of George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's overly spiritualized dialectics and philosophical theories, which dominated the intellectual life of the time in Germany and other parts of Europe.

Dialectics is generally regarded to mean a deliberate, progressive finding of truth, reality, or a solution to a problem by the synthesis of elements that are crucial to opposing views and the omission of those elements that are not important. Dialectics is a philosophical concept and a method for tackling societal problems. The historical dialectics that Rousseau accepted, the dialectics of the spirit that Hegel adopted, and the sociopolitical dialectics that Adam Smith took are only a few examples of the numerous schools or types of dialectics. However, the phrase "dialectical materialism," which was also employed by the early materialists like the atomists, Leucippus, and Democritus, refers to Marx's brand or school of dialectics.

Marx extensively resurrected, restructured, and changed the dialectics of the early atomists. He referred to it as dialectical materialism, in opposition to Hegelian and Ficshterian spiritual dialectics. This was consistent with his objective to change philosophy from a problem-interpreting study- as Marx saw it in Hegel and Ficshte- into a practical and goal-oriented discipline. Marx thought that his theory would eventually end racial injustice, political repression, labor humiliation, and weak leadership; as a result, it would become a tool for creating nations. Marx was drawn to the material world and concentrated on results and solutions, but he could not exist without Hegel and other key figures.

Marx began his adult life as a young Hegelian, one of several intellectual movements that were influenced by the philosopher Hegel, due to his intense interest in altering or re-building society through philosophical issues. Marx's main concern was with the socioeconomic structure and how society should be administered. Marx and Engels came to the opinion that Hegelian theory was being misapplied to try to explain social injustice in industrialized or developing countries like Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, especially in the early 1840s. In his own dialectics, Marx established a materialism theory, emphasizing the idea that the socio-economic affairs of society are shaped by the concrete and material world, which in turn determines the socio-political realities of the state.

Contrary to traditional Hegelian dialectics, which emphasized the idealist notion that human experience is based on mental perceptions, this viewpoint rejects this. He saw the social superstructure's primary ingredients. This essay critically evaluates Marx's theory of dialectical materialism as a contemporary concept for nation-building. Although the theory has a materialist perspective on society as it was developed by atomistic particles, it is interesting that Marx refers to these

particles as the classes of individuals in the state. Marx refers to these classes as "atomistic parts," and they are not just constantly at odds with one another.

Marx holds to that dialectics, or what he regarded as overcoming opposites, will lessen societal conflict. The stronger atom, or the bourgeoisies, should suffer while the proletariat owns and controls the means of production. All of the state's problems, from politics to economy, from education to development, can only be attributed to this. Marx believed that other issues like political oppression, underdevelopment, insecurity, and poverty were also caused by this conflict.

Marx contends that religion, which he views as an intrinsically bad force, prevents society from resolving this struggle and realizing its full potential. As a result, his theory- also known as Marx's dialectical materialism, or the practical resolution of class conflict- must lead to a violent revolution, a communist revolution, that would transform every state from this particular form of capitalism to a socialist setting and ultimately into a communist society. According to Marx, this is the best place to start when actually constructing a nation. The essential question is how much of Marx is accurate. Marx fails to show how the proletariat's final dictatorship will lead to advancement and nation-building in any contemporary state, including Nigeria.

Marx's contention that revolution breeds revolution is one of the themes that this text has drawn criticism for neglecting to address. Given this, a full examination akin to the one carried out in the current study is required. By considering the current state of society, particularly in our country, Nigeria, the level of injustice in society, poor governance, the oppression of the oppressed, as well as gender inequality in developing nations, 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.

Additionally, he rejected religion in his Marxist theory; for instance, we learnt about the recent ENDSARS event in Nigeria, which many people referred to be a revolution, and which is scheduled to take place in October 2020. A person's position within a class hierarchy is said to be determined by their contribution to the production process, based on Marxian dialectical materialism, which isolates the dynamics of this power struggle. This theory also holds that class position determines political and ideological consciousness (Mandel, 1976:14). Thus, conflict in the nation's socio-economic domain has always been fanned by tension between those who have economic and political power (bourgeoisies) and those who do not (proletarians).

It is important to recognize Marx's attempt to use dialectical materialism to confront political injustice, yet the theory itself creates new problems that impede progress. Marx, for instance, believed that everyone, regardless of where they work or are from, should be treated similarly and has equal access to the resources required for human existence and education. Marx was a supporter of human rights and equality. The emphasis on free health care, education, and gender equality in a fully developed Marxist society would significantly aid in the eradication of gender stereotypes, which are still a major problem in today's communities, especially those in developing countries. Marx's views lead to a lot of intriguing problems that demand answers. Among these is the question of whether or not religion is innate to human nature. Is starting a revolution the best way to settle a conflict? Is communism truly the best form of government for society to adopt? How can we reconcile the two classes, in the end? These are the issues that this research effort primarily addresses.

### **Marx Theory of Dialectical Materialism**

The Marxist-Leninist party adopted the dialectical materialism school of dialectics, which was developed by Karl Marx. It is referred to as dialectical materialism because it employs a dialectical method for analyzing and comprehending natural events, despite the fact that its theoretical underpinnings and perspective on these phenomena are materialistic (Audi, 2006:538). Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels are notable figures from the modern age. By keeping only the "rational kernel" of Hegelian dialectics and removing its Hegelian idealistic veneer, Marx and Engels further developed dialectics to give them a modern scientific shape (Audi, 2006:539), putting out his own theory.

Hegelian thought is not only separate from mine, but it also contrasts it sharply, according to Karl Marx. Hegel claims that the real world is only the external, phenomenal manifestation of "the Idea," which he even elevates to the rank of an independent subject by naming "the Idea." In Hegel's opinion, reality is created by thought. As opposed to this, I see the ideal as nothing more than the material reality as it is reflected in the human mind and articulated through thought forms (Marx, 1938:xxx).

Aside from that, Engels claimed that "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). As a result, as stated by Engels, 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 Engel's view of the dialectics of nature, a dialectical framework is the only way to understand and interpret natural happenings.

Marx's historical dialectic is viewed as a movement inherent to objective reality that frequently arises in societies with conflicting interests (Marx, 1873:316). Since the dialectic is an exchange of theses and antitheses that results in a synthesis of the opposing claims, this suggests a conflicting rather than a harmonious type of development. Fundamentally, Marxist dialectical materialism relates to the process of conflict (opposition and confrontation). whenever this movement is in opposition. As a result, the two rights, which are both influenced by the rule of exchanges, are in antagonism to one another in Marx's view. Between equal rights, force decides.

Thus, in the history of capitalist production, the concept of a working day is born out of a confrontation between collective capital, also known as class capitalists, and collective labor, also known as the working class (Marx, 1873:164). Marx's dialectical materialism is linked to the idea of the proletariat at odds with capitalists. It emphasized the materialist thesis that the concrete world shapes socio-economic connections, and that these interactions in turn affect the socio-political reality (Sperber, 2013).

Dialectical materialism examines the variables that affect growth and discovers that political structures and social mores are reflections of economic activity as well as that changes in human society meet the needs of various social classes. Dialectical materialism is a subcategory of general materialism. It proclaims that the material world comes first. This implies that matter comes first, contrary to Hegel's thesis, which maintains that concept precedes matter. Absolute distinguishes itself by internal action in the manner that Hegel articulated. A starting point (thesis) is disproved in this process in order to establish a second that is in opposition to it (antithesis).

This second position is in turn denied by the negative of the denial in order to reach the third position, which represents the synthesis of the two proceedings in which both are transcended- that is, annihilated while still being preserved on a higher plane of existence. Following that, this third phase serves as the beginning of a new dialectical process that produces a new synthesis, and so on (Al-Hikmat, 2019:2). Marx's theory of dialectics varies from Hegel's in that it is a strategy for

experimentally examining processes in terms of interaction, growth, and transformation rather than a strategy for arriving at predetermined conclusions (Sperber, 2013).

As stated by Ernest Mandel in his introduction to the Penguin edition of Marx's *Capital*, 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 (Mandel, 1976:18). The idea of dialectical materialism was developed when Marx re-read Hegel in 1857. In contrast to Hegel, Marx adopted a realist epistemology. Practical ambiguities in his economic and philosophical writings were dropped, and he adopted a typical materialist viewpoint.

Karl Marx, who was also influenced by Hegel, attempted a dialectical defense of the labor theory of value. He gave up his positivist critique in *The Holy Family* and started using dialectic to reveal a reality that was previously hidden beneath the surface. His materialism and dialectic, however, were at clash. The philosophical level of reasoning that rejected the connection between reality and Praxis was upheld at the level of economic argument.

### **Critical Examination of Karl Marx's Theory of Dialectics Materialism and Its Application**

Critique of the Marx Theory of Dialectics Materialism comes from various political ideologies and academic disciplines. This includes a general examination of a lack of internal consistency, a study of historical materialism, a subset of historical determinism, problems with the application of communism, and unworkable economic problems like the distorted or missing nature of price signals and diminished incentives (Popper, 2002:49).

### **Examination of Marx's Dialectical Materialism**

The notion that societies can only attain socialism through class warfare and a proletarian revolution is rejected by some democratic socialists and social democrats. The idea of a transitional state phase is opposed by many anarchists. Some intellectuals have disproved the tenets of Marxist theory, such as historical materialism and the labor theory of value, and have instead used different justifications to decry capitalism and promote socialism. Many current proponents of Marxism believe that the theory is still relevant in many areas, but they assert that there are other areas of economic, political, or social theory where the corpus is lacking or a little out of date. Thus, they may incorporate some Marxist

principles with those of other thinkers, such as Max Weber. One example of this strategy is the Frankfurt School.

According to conservative historian Paul Johnson, "the truth is, even the most superficial inquiry into Marx's use of evidence forces one to treat with skepticism everything he wrote that relies on factual data." For instance, Johnson argued in Key Chapter Eight of *Capital* that "the entire Key Chapter is a deliberate and systematic falsification to prove a thesis that an objective examination of the facts showed was untenable" (Johnson, 1988).

### **Examination of Historical Dialecticism in Marxist's Dialectical Materialism**

One of the philosophical pillars of Marxism is still historical materialism (Bakker, 2001). It asserts that changes in the social relations of production will necessarily result from technological advancements in production methods (Marx, 1996). The ideological "superstructure," which includes culture, religion, politics, and all other facets of humanity's social awareness, is supported, reflected by, and influenced by this economic "base" of society (Marx, 2001:7-8). As a result, it searches for the reasons for historical developments and shifts in regard to economic, technological, and more generally, material issues as well as conflicts between the material interests of various tribes, social groups, and countries.

Marx viewed society's superstructure- which includes law, politics, the arts, literature, morals, and religion- as a reflection of its economic foundation. Many opponents have asserted that this oversimplifies the nature of society and that, if anything, the influence of ideas, culture, and other elements of what Marx called the superstructure is even more crucial to the development of society than the economic foundation. However, as shown by the following letter written by Friedrich Engels, a longtime collaborator to Marx, society's economic foundation is not the only factor that determines society.

The production and replication of real life, in the materialist interpretation of history, is what ultimately determines history. Marx and I never claimed anything more than this. Therefore, if someone distorts this to imply that the economic factor is the only one that matters; he turns that claim into an absurd, meaningless phrase (Marx & Engel, 1955:498). Critics claim that this adds yet another issue for Marxism. Marx's repeated claim that social history is the chronicle of economic class strife is unnecessary if the superstructure also affects the foundation.

The question of whether the base or the superstructure came first thus turns into the age-old chicken-or-egg dilemma. Understanding that Marx believed the economic foundation to be ultimately real is the solution to this issue, according to Peter Singer. Marx held that the means of production were what made humanity unique, and that man could only be freed from oppression by seizing control of the means of production. Marx argues that this is history's purpose and that the components of the superstructure serve as its instruments (Singer, 1980:50). Marx believed that the connection between the intellectual superstructure and the material foundation was a determination rather than a causal one (Marx, 1977).

Nevertheless, some of Marx's detractors have contended that he said the superstructure was a result of the basis. For instance, Murray Rothbard, an anarcho-capitalist, challenged historical materialism by pointing out that Marx stated society's "consciousness" in the superstructure was determined by its "base" (its technology and social connections). Rothbard asserts that human consciousness is what triggers and propels the evolution of technology and social relations, building on the theories of Ludwig von Mises. Bypassing Marx's assertion that the base is brought about by historical material forces, Rothbard contends that Marx ignores how the base arises, concealing the fact that the real causal chain runs from the superstructure to the base because people decide how technology advances and the types of social relationships they want to pursue.

Von Mises is cited by Rothbard in his statement that "We may summarize the Marxian philosophy in the following manner: In the beginning, there exist the "material productive forces," i.e., the technological machinery that supports human production endeavors, such as tools and machines. We must presume that they are fallen from heaven since there can be no doubt about their origin; they are, and that is all (Rothbard, 1995; 372).

### **Examination of Rigid Determinism in Marxist's Dialectical Materialism**

Marx's reliance on dialectical materialism as an endogenous mechanism for social change has led some to label his view of history as a form of historical determinism (Johannes, 2001). The material productive powers of society come into confrontation with the production relations that are currently in place, or to put it another way, with the property relations that have been their previous operating environment, according to Marx. These relationships change from the forms of growth of the productive forces into their chains. Then the social revolution era



starts. Changes in the economic basis eventually cause the entire massive superstructure to alter. (Marx, 1977).

The idea of dialectic first appears in the conversations between ancient Greek philosophers, but George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel popularized it as a theoretical framework for the frequently conflicting forces driving historical change in the early nineteenth century. Arnold Toynbee and Oswald Spengler have also been linked to the concept of historical determinism, but it has recently been less popular (Habermas, 1996). Marx's ideas "should not be taken to mean that everything that has ever happened is a matter of class struggle," according to Terry Eagleton. Instead, it means that the most fundamental aspect of human history is class struggle (Marx, 1946:34).

The academic Peter Stillman thinks it is a "myth" that Marx was a determinist (Marx, 1946:34). By stating that "the production and reproduction of real life is the ultimately determining element in history," Friedrich Engels himself cautioned against viewing Marx's views as deterministic. In addition, neither Marx nor I have ever claimed Therefore, if someone distorts this to imply that the economic factor is the only one that matters, he turns that claim into an absurd, meaningless word. (Engel. 1972). Engels stated that "younger people sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it" (Aboulafia, 2001) in another context.

Although historical materialism has been referred to as a materialist theory of history, Marx does not assert that he has created a master-key to history and that the materialist conception of history is not "an historico-philosophic theory of the marche generale, imposed by fate upon every people, whatever the historic circumstances in which it finds itself." He explains that his theories are founded on an in-depth examination of the current state of affairs in Europe in a letter to the editor of the Russian journal *Otetchestvennye Zapiskym* written in 1877 (Marx & Engels, 1877). Prabhat Ranjan Sarkar has questioned Marx's ideas on historical evolution for what he views as their limited intellectual underpinning in an effort to reassert this approach to understanding the forces of history.

Ravi Batra drew attention to significant distinctions between Sarkar and Marx's historical determinist perspectives in *The Downfall of Capitalism and Communism*, published in 1978. What gives Sarkar's theory universality is his primary interest on the human element. Marx therefore believed that economic factors had a major role in social progress. The major argument in favor of the Sarkarian hypothesis is that, unlike the dogmas that are currently in disgrace, it is

founded on the entirety of human experience and human nature rather than emphasizing one single issue to the exclusion of all others.

Every time one factor- no matter how significant and fundamental—is asked to shed light on the entirety of the past and, implicitly, the future, it only stirs up skepticism and, upon closer examination, rejection. That mistake was made by both Marx and Toynbee, at least in part. As a result, historical determinism is now viewed by the majority of scholars as an ideology that is so bankrupt that it will never recover (Batra, 2011:267). They both submitted essays that were easy prey for the reviewers.

### **Examination of Economic Analysis as Unworkable**

Numerous arguments have been made against Marxian economics. Some critics reference Marx's critique of capitalism, while others contend that the Marxist economic system is untenable (Acemoglu, 2014). Additionally, there are questions about whether capitalism's profit rate will actually tend to decline as Marx predicted. Nobuo Okishio, a Marxist economist, developed Okishio's theorem in 1961 to demonstrate that if capitalists employ cost-cutting strategies and the real wage remains flat, the rate of profit must increase (Howard & King, 1992).

### **Labor theory of value**

One of the central ideas of Marxism that is most frequently challenged is the labor theory of value (Staff, 2010). The Austrian School rejects this central tenet of classical economics as untrue and instead supports Carl Menger's more recent and up-to-date subjective theory of value as the correct one. The labor theory of value was criticized by a number of schools, including the classical and Austrian schools. "It is not true that the spinning of yarn in a factory [...] is the product of the labor of the operatives," asserted British economist Alfred Marshall in an attack on Marx. It is the result of their labor, as well as the labor of the employer, inferior managers, and the invested capital.

Marshall argues that the capitalist forgoes the funds he could be utilizing right now to invest in businesses, which ultimately create jobs. According to this reasoning, the capitalist helps the industry work and produce more goods since he delays his satisfaction through investment. The Marxian theory of value was criticized by Marshall using the law of supply and demand. Marshall claimed that demand from the consumer as well as supply determines price or value (Buchholz, 1989:166–67). Costs are influenced by both labor and consumer preferences and needs. Marx's economic conclusions and some of his social theories are

undermined by the change from labor being the source of all value to subjective person assessments providing all value (Von Mises, 1951:111).

By comparing the total labor value to the total price of various economic sectors, most studies that claim to provide empirical support for the labor theory of value frequently make methodological mistakes, according to Shimshon Bichler and Jonathan Nitzan. This comparison produces a strong overall correlation, but this is a statistical exaggeration. The authors contend that there are frequently negligible, if any, relationships between labor value and price in each industry. Researchers are compelled to make assumptions, according to Bichler and Nitzan, because it is difficult to quantify a technique to assess abstract work (Nitzan, 2009:53). But Bichler and Nitzan contend that these presumptions are circular in nature:

The three most crucial ones are that the value of labor power is proportionate to the actual wage rate, that the price ratio of wages to profits determines the ratio of variable capital to surplus value, and that occasionally the value of depreciated constant capital is equal to a portion of the capital's money price. To put it another way, the researcher makes the exact assumptions that the labor theory of value is meant to support (Nitzan, 2009:54). Unreliable or nonexistent price signals In the economic calculation problem, socialism economics- or, to be more exact, centrally planned socialist economies- are examined. Ludwig von Mises, an economist from the Austrian School, first put up the idea in 1920, and Friedrich Hayek later developed it.

The issue being discussed is how to equitably allocate resources in an economy. The price mechanism is the free market's answer, allowing individuals to choose how a good should be distributed depending on their desire to pay money for it. The pricing includes information about the availability and value of resources, which enables adjustments to be made to avoid shortages and surpluses based on individual, voluntary decisions. This is the sole option, according to Mises and Hayek, who also said that socialism lacks a mechanism for rational resource allocation due to the lack of information offered by market prices.

Economic historians have come to refer to that particular phase of the discussion as the socialist calculation dispute since it raged throughout the 1920s and 1930s. With varying degrees of success, socialist countries like the Soviet Union used mathematical methods to establish and decide prices in the real world (Nove & Nuti, 1972).

### **Reduced Incentives**

Some socialist critics contend that income sharing lessens people's motivation to work and that salaries should thus be as individualized as possible (Zoltan, 1999:47). There cannot be a monetary motivation to work in a society where everyone is equally wealthy, according to socialist critics, because there are no rewards for hard labor. Furthermore, they contend that incentives boost everyone's productivity and that losing those benefits would cause stagnation. John Stuart Mill stated in *Principles of Political Economy*:

mankind; their propensity for passivity, for becoming creatures of habit, and for continuing unabatedly on a chosen path. The concern is that once people reach a level of existence they find bearable, they won't make the effort to advance farther and will instead become stagnant. Socialists frequently make the mistake of ignoring people's innate laziness, which causes them to lose even the energy needed to keep their faculties from deteriorating. Nobody can predict a day when competition won't be essential to advancement, even though it may not be the best stimulus imaginable at the moment. (Mill, 1948).

He gradually changed his mind, however, and developed a greater affinity for socialism, particularly Fourierism. He added chapters to *Principles of Political Economy* to support a socialist worldview and some socialist goals. He also made the extreme suggestion in this revised text that the entire wage system be eliminated in favor of a co-operative wage structure. Nevertheless, even in a significantly toned-down form, some of his opinions on the concept of flat taxes persisted. According to the economist John Kenneth Galbraith, communal variants of socialism that support pay or compensation equality are unrealistic in their presumptions about human motivation.

History and practical experience have disproved the far-reaching hope [that an egalitarian reward would result in a better level of drive] made by Marx. People do not reach such heights, for better or evil. To their disappointment and, more frequently, to their anguish, socialists and other socially conscious leaders have learnt this across the generations. It is obvious that a good community must embrace both men and women for who they are (Galbraith, 1996: 59–60). As an answer, Zoltan says:

The understanding that labor is necessary to maintain society and that they are contributing to it alongside their

fellow males and females is sufficient motivation for them to want to work. He goes on to criticize anti-socialists for having what he sees as contradictory standards: "Notice how they object to the unemployed receiving a miserly dole without having to work, but never object to the millionaires (most of them in that position through inheritance) being able to live in luxurious idleness" (Zoltan, 1999).

Hunter-gatherers implemented primitive communism without encountering issues like these, according to writers like Arnold (Arnold, 2005). As a result, they claim, these arguments are false. Inconsistency. The value theory of Karl Marx and the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, according to later opponents, are fundamentally incoherent. In other words, the opponents claim that Marx drew conclusions from his theoretical premises that do not truly follow. Once those inaccuracies are fixed, Marx's assertion that total value and surplus value determine and equal total price and profit is no longer valid. This finding challenges his claim that the only source of wealth is the exploitation of labor (Michael, Howard, & King, 1992). Since the 1970s, the claims of inconsistency have been a central part of the discussion of Marxian economics.

For Andrew Kliman, the critique of political economy made by Marx and the subsequent research based on it, as well as the purported flaws that Kliman claims Marx had, are all undermined by the fact that internally inconsistent theories can never be valid. Former and present Marxian or Sraffian economists, including Paul Sweezy, Nobuo Okishio, Ian Steedman, John Roemer, Gary Mongiovi, and David Laibman, have argued that Marx has been shown to be internally inconsistent. They suggest that the field be grounded in their correct versions of Marxian economics rather than in Marx's critique of political economy in the original form that he presented and developed it in *Capital*.

Like Kliman, proponents of the temporal single system interpretation (TSSI) of Marx's value theory contend that the alleged contradictions are actually the result of misinterpretation and that when Marx's theory is understood as "temporal" and "single-system," the alleged contradictions vanish. Kliman draws the following conclusion from a modern analysis of the controversy: "The proofs of inconsistency are no longer defended; the entire case against Marx has been reduced to the interpretive issue" (Kliman, 1968:208).

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

Marx's dialectical materialism, a highly developed theory of change and development, examined the issue of development from a very fundamental perspective. It has a strong undertone of materialism, which suggests that material circumstances are where ideas that eventually propel society growth are formed. Marx's dialectical materialism fundamentally emphasizes his condemnation of capitalism due to its exploitative nature. He is obviously against capitalism morally. It aims to fulfill an impartial moral goal. This criticism also draws attention to the basic flaw in ideology, which is that the interests of the ruling class dominate it.

Based on Marx's materialist theory of history, all social institutions are fashioned by the production of the resources required to maintain human life and the exchange of those resources. In other words, maintaining one's basic needs for food, shelter, and clothing is what sustains human society. So it makes sense to discuss humans in terms of praxis, or their practice of satisfying needs. Marx would therefore describe man as a working, productive, or creative being, in addition to being a part of nature, a rational being, a social being, etc. A man can only reach his full potential when he applies intelligence to satisfy his needs. So a man's work becomes what defines him as a person.

His analysis of the capitalism system undoubtedly brings out basic realities. For instance, it makes note of how the material order profoundly affects societal ideas and moulds the human mind. Furthermore, it cannot be disputed that society in capitalism is highly stratified and based on a number of distinct ideologies. However, it would be exaggerated and possibly extreme to rule out the existence of universal concepts, as Marx claimed. Some basic ideas, like justice and equity, can nonetheless act as the cornerstone for ideologies notwithstanding the fluidity of the substructure or material order.

As a result, conceptions of justice may be considered as universal when they are more inspired by the spirit of reciprocal fairness. Because of their capacity for reason, humans have the potential to adapt to the altering substructure and change along with the shifting material order. As a result, rather than being absolute, the denial of the concept of everlasting and universal rules. Although subjective, it lacks objectivity. Another instance of Marx's materialist philosophy in action is the concept of labor as a social activity. Men have always been compelled to work together in an endeavor to control the forces of nature as they search for a means of subsistence.

Humans arrange themselves to perform jobs such as gather raw materials, build and staff factories, operate, maintain, and develop machines. The convergence of these productive elements leads to improvements in human potential, capacities, and relationships in the production process as well as the development of production instruments. Thus, there is a link between what people desire and what is accessible to satisfy their wants. One characteristic of Marx's materialist ideology is how it portrays the interests of the working class. Liberation from exploitation is a key component of Marx's political thought, which is notably apparent in the alienation of labor.

Marx and Engels' historical materialism actually has a tendency toward revolution, serves as the working class's weapon in the struggle against capitalism, and is a reliable strategy for transforming human society. Thus, the importance of philosophy for the evolution of society is highlighted by Marx's materialist worldview and its implications. In essence, Marxism offers a scientific interpretation of the cosmos and really follows scientific principles, as is especially evident in the notions of dialectical materialism. By doing this, it highlights the pre-existing relationships between philosophy and science. Marx's philosophy largely exemplifies the scientific form it assumes by methodically fusing "materialism" with "dialectics."

Before him, philosophers had many perspectives on these concepts. For instance, Hegel was a dialectician but not a materialist, whereas Feuerbach was a materialist but not a dialectician. Marx included these concepts into his dialectical-materialist philosophy. Marx's dialectical materialism is a philosophical school that places more emphasis on acting than simply thinking. The world needs to be altered, according to Karl Marx, because only by action can the oppressed and exploited man be emancipated and have his human dignity restored to him (Marx, 1887:27). Philosophers have all made various attempts to make meaning of the universe. Social changes and their causes are thoroughly justified by Marx's theory of dialectical materialism. It also provides practical strategies for developing a nation's social, economic, and political growth.

## **Conclusion**

The social, political, and economic issues that a country faces have a significant impact on the population and development of the nation. To achieve a meaningful transformation of a society's social and political systems, it is primarily important to improve intellectual capacity and engage in practical actions that are progress-oriented. Marx worries that the majority of philosophers and social scientists do

little to no actual work to effect positive change, instead interpreting and theoretically analyzing social reality. This need is undoubtedly met by his philosophy, which skillfully integrates theory and practice while providing a solid framework for social change.

However, Karl Marx gave equality and respect for human rights a high priority. He is adamant that everyone should have access to the resources required for human existence and education, regardless of race, sex, or religion. If completely implemented, his theory would place a strong emphasis on gender fairness, free health care, and free education, all of which would considerably contribute to the eradication of gender stereotypes. Karl Marx can be considered as a potential remedy for some of capitalism's issues once more. Although capitalism encourages quality and competition, it also has a serious monopolization issue.

A corporation or industry becomes a monopoly when it has amassed sufficient riches and fame to totally monopolize its market segment. There can be less price competition as a result, less opportunities for entrepreneurs, and smaller companies that fail. In accordance with Marx's idea, the government ought to run businesses. Because other smaller businesses can be given additional funds to catch up or the dominant company can lose funding to give the other businesses a chance, this could aid in the prevention of monopolies.

Marx's concept of various social classes may provide valuable advice on how these classes can combine to form a whole and so demonstrate how society functions as a single entity. His theory can also be applied as a method of research to examine the relationship between power, ownership, and social change and can be utilized to shed light on a wider spectrum of social transformations than just those that are now in vogue. Marx's theory has extra value in that it can help in comprehending the underlying dynamics of a society as a whole and not simply their functionality as distinct units, as well as in looking at the present from a long-term perspective through his historical sense. As Marx sees the development from a historical viewpoint and can, therefore, identify the motions and preferences of that society, this pertains to all of its varied classes and members.

Conclusively, even though Marx's projection of communism prevailing over capitalism has been unsuccessful in practice, it nevertheless gives crucial principles and ideas that are crucial for any political and social system. The development and construction of our great nation would be considerably aided if



these key ideas and principles from his theory could be abstracted and applied to our contemporary political and social structure, particularly the Nigerian system.

## References

- Al-Hikmat, T. (2019) *A Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 39.
- Acemoglu, D. (2014). *“The Rise and Decline of General Laws of Capitalism”*. Oxford University Press.
- Audi, R. (2006). *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Batra, R. (2011). *“Sarkar, Toynbee and Marx”*. PROUT Globe.
- Ben, F. (2010). *Marx’s Capital* (5th ed.). Pluto Press.
- Buchholz, Todd. (1989). *New Ideas from Dead Economists*. A Plume Book.
- Engels, Friedrich (1938). *Anti- Durhring cited in Joseph Stalin*. Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- Engels, Friedrich. (1938). *Dialectics of Nature cited in Joseph Stalin*. Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- Galbraith, K. (1996). *The Good Society: The Human Agenda*. Houghton Mifflin Co.,
- Habermas, G. (1996). *The historical Jesus: ancient evidence for the life of Christ*. Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Howard, C., & King, E. (1992). *A history of Marxian Economics (1992): Vol. II*. Princeton Univ. Press.
- Johnson, Paul. (2007). *Intellectuals from Marx and Tolstoy to Sartre and Chomsky* (revised ed.). Perennial.
- Kilman, A. (1968). *Reclaiming Marx’s “Capital”*, Lexington Books.
- Mandel, Ernest. (1976). *Introduction to Karl Marx, Capital*, .Penguin, Vol. I.
- Marx, Karl. (1873). *Capital, after word to the second German Edition, Volume I*. \_\_\_\_\_(1887). *Capital*, Frederick Engels (ed.), Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling (trans.). Progress Publishers
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1938). *Capital*. George Allen & Unwin Press Ltd., Vol. I.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1946). *Marx: Myths and Legends*. Penguin.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1977). *A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.Progress publishers):  
Notes by R. Rojas.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1990). *Capital* Vol 1, Penguin Classics.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996). *The poverty of philosophy. Marxists*. Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (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. (1955). Friedrich Selected correspondence.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968) [1877]. “Letter from Marx to Editor of the Otetchestvennye Zapisky”.
- Nitzan, Jonathan. (2009). *Capital as Power: A Study of Order and Creorder*. Routledge.
- Nove, Alexander., & Nuti, D. (1972). *Socialist Economics*. Selected Readings.
- Plato. (1974). *The Republic*. Second edition, penguin books ltd.
- Popper, Karl. (2002). *Conjecture and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. Routledge.
- Rothbard, M. (1955). *Classical Economics: An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic thought*, Vol. 2, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Seligman, Edwin. (1901), *The Economic interpretation of History*, Political Science Quartely.
- Singer, Peter. *Marx*. (1980). *A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press
- Sperber, Jonathan. (2013). *Karl Marx: A Nineteenth-Century Life*. Live right press.
- Staff, Investopedia . (2010). “*Labor Theory of Value*”. Cambridge University Press.
- Von Mises, L. (1951). “*Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis*” 2nd Ed. Yale University Press.