



IGWEBUIKE: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities

Vol. 11. No. 1, (2025)

ISSN: 2488- 9210 (Print) 2504-9038 (Online)

Dept of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Tansian University
Umunya

Indexed: Academic Journals Online, Google Scholar, Igwebuike Research Institute

**AN INTERROGATION ON THE CONCEPTION OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM
AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR HUMAN DIGNITY AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Orji, Chidi Paul, Ph.D

University of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Umuagwo, Imo State

paul.orji@uaes.edu.ng

&

Egberongbe Tijani Taiwo Ph.D

Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago Iwoye, Ogun State.

egberongbetaiwo@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng titaiwoegbe@gmail.com

&

Joachim Okoroafor PhD

Gregory University, Uturu, Abia State, Nigeria.

j.okoroafor@gregoryuniversityuturu.edu.ng

&

Nwagbara, Rufus Godswill

Babcock University, Ilisan Remo, Ogun State

godswillnwagbara@gmail.com, nwagbarag@babcock.edu.ng

&

Ucheoma C. Osuji Ph.D

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko- Ondo State

uc211179@yahoo.com, Ucheoma.osuji@aaua.edu.ng

&

Iyadunni Olamilekan

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago - Iwoye, Ogun State.

lokoinmillion2005@yahoo.com

&

Ese Henry Inoke (PG Student),

University of Port Harcourt (UniPort), Rivers State

henryinoke@gmail.com

Abstract

Dialectical materialism is the collection of concepts, theories, and viewpoints put out by Karl Marx. He made predictions regarding political and economic solutions to France's problems in it. It was a reaction against what he saw as injustices and economic and social injustices that were fast becoming the standard in his community. The Marxist dialectic emphasized the significance of actual conditions with regard to class, labor, and socioeconomic connections. On the other hand, the Hegelian dialectic places emphasis on the idea that contradictions in natural events can be reconciled by interpretation and the creation of a solution that retains the essential qualities of the original events. Marx considered the best approach to deal with the problems caused by declared contradictory phenomena would be to address and reorganize the social organization systems at the center of the problems. In light of this, the purpose of this article is to critically



evaluate Marx's theory of dialectical materialism and then demonstrate how, when appropriately assimilated into society; it may contribute to the formation and development of a nation.

Keywords: Karl Marx, Dialectical Materialism, Capitalism, National development

Introduction

Karl Marx is credited with bringing about the end of the speculative philosophy and spiritualizing dialectics era and ushering in a new one marked by outcome-oriented philosophy and practical dialectics. Philosophy, unlike dialectics, aims to change the world rather than to analyze it. Marx thought that economic and sociopolitical problems have faced humanity throughout history. However, the well-known philosopher Karl Marx created his "Dialectical materialism" theory in an attempt to solve these issues. He created this as a critique of George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's excessively spiritualized dialectics and philosophical theories, which dominated German and other European intellectual life at the time. The term "dialectics" usually refers to the systematic, progressive process of eliminating elements that are superfluous and synthesizing those that are crucial to conflicting concepts in order to arrive at truth, reality, or a solution to an issue. Dialectics is both a method of tackling societal difficulties and a mental assumption in philosophy. There are different schools or kinds of dialectics. For example, Rousseau embraced historical dialectics; Hegel adopted dialectics of the soul; and Adam Smith chose sociopolitical dialectics. Dialectical materialism, however, is the name given to Marx's brand or school of dialectics; early materialists like the atomists, Leucippus, and Democritus also used this term. Marx made a substantial contribution to the revival, reformulation, and modification of the dialectic of the early atomists. He called it dialectical materialism, to distinguish it from spiritual dialectics of Hegel and Ficshterian thought.

This was consistent with his objective of converting philosophy into a discipline focused on application and outcomes rather than on problem interpretation, as Marx saw it in Hegel and Ficshte. Marx thought that his theory would become a tool for national development by ultimately eliminating racial injustice, political repression, worker indignity, and bad leadership. Marx could not have survived without Hegel and other key figures, even if he was oriented to the material world and concentrated on results and solutions. At the beginning of his adult life, Marx identified as a young Hegelian, one of numerous intellectual movements inspired by the philosopher Hegel, because of his strong interest in using philosophical challenges to alter or rebuild society. Marx focused mostly on how society should be organized within its socioeconomic framework. Marx and Engels concluded that the interpretation of social injustice in industrialized or developing countries such as Germany, France, and the United Kingdom was based on a misapplication of Hegelian theory, especially in the early 1840s.

In his own dialectics, Marx created a materialistic explanation that emphasized the materialist theory that the socio-economic events of society are shaped by the concrete and material world, and that these affairs ultimately define the socio-political realities of the state. This stands in opposition to the traditional Hegelian dialectics, which highlighted the idealist theory according to which the perceptions of the mind determine human experience. He saw the social superstructure's



primary ingredients. This essay critically examines Marx's theory of dialectical materialism as a contemporary concept for national development. It is especially interesting to observe that, despite the theory adopting a materialist perspective on society as it was advanced by atomistic particles, Marx refers to these particles as the classes of individuals in the state. Marx calls these classes "atomistic parts," and they are constantly at odds- not just with one another.

Marx believes that dialectics, or what he perceived as overcoming opposites, can help resolve conflicts and lessen social unrest. The means of production should be owned and operated by the proletariat, with the bourgeoisies- the stronger atom- suffering in the process. Everything that affects the state, from politics to the economy, from development to education, can only be held accountable for this. Marx thought that other issues such political oppression; underdevelopment, insecurity, and poverty were also caused by this conflict. Marx proposes that religion, an essentially bad force, is the reason society is unable to overcome this conflict and realize its full potential. Thus, his thesis- known as Marx's dialectical materialism or the practical solution to class conflict- must lead to a bloody revolution, a communist revolution, which would transform every state from this form of capitalist organization to a socialist environment and ultimately a communist society. For Marx, this is the best place to start when actually constructing a nation. The actual question is how much of Marx is correct. Marx does not show how nation-building and advancement will result from the proletariat's ultimate control in any contemporary state, including Nigeria. The failure of this work to address one of Marx's concerns- that revolution breeds revolution- has drawn criticism. Given this, a comprehensive analysis akin to the one carried out in the current work is required.

Considerations such as the current state of society, particularly in Nigeria, the degree of injustice in society, poor governance, the oppression of the oppressed, and gender inequality in developing nations can be made in favor of the Marxian theory of dialectical materialism, which advocates a kind of forceful or violent takeover of power from the capitalists, or rather the bourgeoisies, by the proletariat.

For example, we heard about the October 2020 ENDSARS march in Nigeria, which many referred to as a revolution. A person's position in a class hierarchy is decided by their contribution to the production process, according to Marxian dialectical materialism, which isolates the dynamics of this power struggle and maintains that class position determines political and ideological consciousness (Parkin, 1979:56). Thus, conflicts within the nation's socioeconomic domain have always been stoked by tension between those who hold political and economic power (bourgeoisies) and those who do not (proletarians). Although Marx's attempt to use dialectical materialism to confront political injustice is commendable, the theory itself creates more problems that hinder advancement. Marx, for example, considered that regardless of one's place of employment or origin, everyone should be treated fairly and has equal access to the resources required for human existence and education. Marx upheld human rights and equality as well. Gender stereotypes are still a major problem in today's communities, especially those in



developing countries. A fully developed Marxist society would place a strong focus on free health care, education, and gender equality. Marx's views pose a lot of fascinating problems that demand answers. Among these are the following: Does religion naturally occur in human nature? Is a revolution the most effective way to settle a conflict? Is communism truly the best political structure for the world to adopt? Furthermore, what is a compromise that both classes can agree on? This research initiative aims to address these issues.

Marx Conception of Dialectical Materialism

The dialectical materialism of Marx served as the foundation for the worldview of the Marxist-Leninist party. Though its perspective on these occurrences and its theoretical foundations are materialistic, dialectical materialism derives its name from the dialectical approach it takes to analyzing and comprehending natural phenomena (Audi, 2006:538). Two well-known modern-day figures are Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. By keeping merely the "rational kernel" of Hegelian dialectics and removing its Hegelian idealistic veneer, Marx and Engels advanced dialectics to give them a modern scientific shape (Audi, 2006:538). Karl Marx states: "My dialectic approach is not only distinct from Hegelian thought, it stands in stark contrast to it" when introducing his own theory. Hegel claims that the real world is nothing more than the external, phenomenal form of "the Idea," which he even names in order to give it the status of a separate subject. Hegel believes that reality is created by thought itself. On the other hand, I see the ideal as nothing more than the material reality as it is reflected in the human mind and articulated in thought forms (Marx, 1938:xxx).

Additionally, Engels stated 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). Therefore, Engels states that 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). In terms of the dialectics of nature, Engel holds that natural events can only be understood and interpreted in the context of dialectics. As an exchange of theses and antitheses that results in a synthesis of the conflicting claims, 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. When this movement is at odds, Marxist dialectical materialism basically refers to the conflict movement (opposition and confrontation). As a result, according to Marx, the two rights- which are both endorsed by the law of exchanges- are incompatible. Force chooses between having equal rights. Thus, the history of capitalist production defines a working day as the result of a struggle between collective labor, or the working class, and collective capital, or class capitalists (Marx, 1873:164).

Marx's theory of dialectical materialism is related to the notion of the proletariat's struggle against capitalists. It emphasized the materialist theory according to which the tangible environment shapes socio-economic relations, and these interactions define the socio-political reality (Sperber,



2013:8). Examining the variables that impact growth, dialectical materialism discovers that social norms and political structures mirror economic activity and that changes in human society offer the necessities of existence for various social strata. Dialectical materialism is a subset of materialism as a whole. It asserts the primacy of the material world. This implies that matter comes first, as opposed to Hegel's thesis, which maintains that concept comes before matter. Absolute distinguishes itself by internal action, as Hegel put it. This process entails disproving a first hypothesis (the thesis) in order to prove a second, opposing one (the antithesis). This second position is in turn denied by the negative of the denial in order to get at the third position, which is the synthesis of the two proceedings in which both are transcended—that is, annihilated while yet being preserved on a higher plane of existence.

Subsequently, this third stage initiates a new dialectical process that results in a new synthesis, and so on (Al-Hikmat, 2019:2). Marx's dialectics theory is different from Hegel's in that it is an approach to experimentally studying processes in terms of development, transformation, and interaction rather than an approach to arriving at predetermined conclusions (Sperber, 2013:10).

In the Penguin edition of Marx's *Capital*, Ernest Mandel wrote in his introduction that when the dialectical method is applied to economic problems, phenomena are not seen apart, by bits or pieces, but rather in the inner connection as an integrated total, structured around and by a dominant mode of production (Mandel, 1976:18). The notion of dialectical materialism emerged when Marx resumed his reading of Hegel in 1857. By contrast with Hegel, Marx embraced a realist epistemology. His views evolved into that of a classic materialist, abandoning the pragmatic ambiguities of his economic and philosophical books. Although he was also influenced by Hegel, Karl Marx endeavored to justify the labor theory of value dialectically. His positivist criticism was dropped in *The Holy Family*, where he started using dialectic to reveal a reality hidden under the surface. His dialectic conflicted with his materialism, though. The philosophical level of argumentation, which rejected the connection between Praxis and reality, was upheld at the level of economic argument.

Marx's Notion on Labour Theory of Value

Karl Marx's critique of the political economy of capitalism made extensive use of the concept of labor power. According to Ben (2010:20); Marx distinguished between the act of performing labor and the capacity to perform labor, or labor power. Although labor power is a resource shared by all civilizations, the ways in which it is combined or exchanged for goods and services have evolved dramatically over time. The creative energies of capital seem to be equal to the productive capabilities of labor, according to Marx's theory, under capitalism. Working capital is what "labor power at work" actually becomes when it is put to use. Work becomes mere labor, employees become an impersonal labor force, and management takes over as the main authority over the workplace. Karl Marx introduces the concept in chapter 6 of the first book of *Capital* as follows: work power, also known as capacity for work, is the sum of an individual's physical and mental abilities that they employ whenever they produce something valuable (Marx, 2021:26). However, labor power only materializes through exertion and mobilizes through employment, he continues.



But these results in the loss of some human muscle, nerve, brain, and other tissues, which need to be restored (Marx 2021, 27).

While the concept of "human capital" has been used to contrast with Marx's theory of labor power, it's possible that Marx thought the term was a reification intended to imply that laborers were a type of capitalist. For example, Marx states in Capital Vol. 2, Volume 2 that "[the worker's] labor force symbolizes his capital in commodities form and provides him with ongoing income," a claim that is contested by apologetic economists. Actually, his labor force is his property (self-renewing, reproducing) rather than his riches. In the hands of the capitalist customer, it just serves as capital (a variable), and it is the only good he can and must continuously sell in order to survive. Some economists assert that a man is a capitalist if and only if he is compelled to sell his labor power—that is, himself- to another man because he constantly has "commodities"- that is, himself- up for grabs. Slaves are capitalists in this sense, even though they are bought and sold as commodities by other people. This is because, by definition, a slave is a commodity, and its buyer must both provide it with the means to live and the means to labor continuously for the slave to continue being a slave. Marx (2021:27). Since commodities are social and economic constructs, they have two unique characteristics that determine their value.

According to Lenin (1978:19), "first and foremost, a thing that satisfies a human need; second and foremost, it is a thing that can be exchanged for another thing" is one of these distinguishing features. It is challenging to identify the commonalities among these diverse things within a system of social relationships, given that commodities are continuously exchanged with one another despite their individuality and diversity. But labor is what brought them together to form these shared relationships. There is a difference between the value of labor and commodities. As it precedes the latter, the former must be understood from the ground up. One way to explain the phenomenon of labor value is either in terms of money or the quality of the work that is produced. Marx claims that the monetary form of labor's value represents its necessary or inherent cost. Conversely, market labor rates—that is, rates that vary from the required rate to below it- are the subject of discussion (Marx, 1990:675). The market price of labor is frequently impacted by changes in commodity prices because these fluctuations affect the required price, which is a measure of the whole cost of production. A commodity can only be exchanged on the open market as a result if "labor exists at all times".

Instead of selling labor, the worker would be selling a commodity if he could give it a life of its own (Marx 1990:675). Assuming a four-dollar value and an eight-hour workday, there are two possibilities. Or there may be no surplus value for the buyer of the labor, meaning the worker only receives four dollars for eight hours of work. He is paid either nothing or less than \$4 for eight hours of labor. In Marx's view, the first cannot be expressed or defined. According to Marx (1990:676), this means that "the quantity of living labor necessary to produce a commodity determines its value, not the quantity of labor objectified in it." This is a result of how unevenly advances in technology have affected the means of producing products. Marx examines "How is the price of labor determined?" His theory holds that the natural price of labor is determined by



the relationship between supply and demand and is fixed at the equilibrium between supply and demand (Marx, 1990:678). This intrinsic pricing should be the focus of analysis rather than the fluctuations in price brought about by supply and demand. Marx argues that the real question that political economists asked when attempting to calculate the worth of labor was, "What is the cost of production (which the cost of is producing or reproducing the worker)?" (Marx, 1990: 678. It is essential to balance the value of labor and labor power since a worker's state of being is ingrained in their personality. On the other hand, labor force productivity is defined over the course of an employee's life and is correlated with a given duration of workday. Thus, in a capitalist system, the value of work must constantly be less than the good being produced in order for the capitalist to have surplus value and make a profit, according to Marx, "the value of labor must always be less than its value-product" (Marx, 1990:679).

Dialectics and the Production's Social Relations

Marx disagreed with Hegel's theory that history is the result of dialectic forces, or tensions between classes. Recall that Hegel was an idealistic philosopher who believed that in a world of appearances, true truth is an ideal. But Marx disagreed with Hegel's idealism, accepting dialectic but not the premise that the "real" world of ideals is hidden from us by the material world. Conversely, he thought that certain ideas had historically and socially hindered people from having a comprehensive knowledge of the material circumstances of their life. As a result, his historical materialism is the methodological approach of Marxist historiography, which maintains that human civilizations display a range of detectable trends and concentrates on their historical development. Karl Marx (1818–1883) first proposed this as the materialist view of history. Fundamentally, it is a historical theory that maintains that the relationship between a society's social relations of production and its technological and productive capacity determines how that society organizes and develops. Historical materialism is the application of the tenets of dialectical materialism to the study of social life, social life phenomena, and society and its history. Men participate in particular; will-less relationships as part of the social manufacture of their own life, relationships that operate as machinery for the growth of their material powers, which is a contribution to the critique of political economics. All of these production relationships make up the social structure of economy. People's social, political, and intellectual lives are influenced by their material life; men's social existence molds their consciousness, not the other way around. At a certain developmental stage, the material productive forces of society interact with the existing production relations. The adjustments to the economic foundation ultimately led to modifications to the system's superstructure as a whole. It is important to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic situation of production, which can be ascertained with the accuracy of scientific science, and the changes that are philosophical, artistic, religious, political, or legal. Just as one does not judge a person by how they see themselves, neither can this transformational time be assessed by its consciousness. Conversely, the contradictions of material existence and the tension between social forces and production relations must account for this consciousness (Marx, 1977:9).



Humans work cooperatively on the environment, but they do not all carry out the same tasks; rather, 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. This is the fundamental reality upon which historical materialism is based (Seligman, 1901:163). 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. The relationships are influenced by the type and quantity of these productive forces, which include the means of production at any given time in history, such as tools, instruments, technology, land, raw materials, and human knowledge and abilities. Marx thought that the capitalist class was the most revolutionary class in history because it was always changing the means of production. When people accept remuneration for the labor they have performed over a certain amount of time, which allows them to survive, they are participating in the sale of their labor power in the context of capitalism. While "bourgeois" or "capitalist" refers to those who buy labor power, usually those who possess land and technology for productive reasons, "proletarian" refers to people who sell their work in order to subsist. Marx also believed that capitalism was prone to creating fewer jobs and crises. Since Marx believed that profits stemmed from surplus value created by labor, he concluded that even as the economy expanded, the rate of profit would decrease.

Marx's Dialectics: Communism as the Final Stage

Marxist politics envisions progressive processes such as the dissolution of the state and the development of worldwide communism as a new world order. Marx and Engels' definition of a "true democracy" is communism, as stated by Allen W. Wood in his book *Karl Marx*. Wood claims:

Marx, however, agrees with the first viewpoint, according to which the social environment need not be as harmful as it is. If capitalism social connections are a part of the ugly and cruel world and if communism gives people more flexibility to form compassionate and kind interpersonal relationships, then we should be in favor of it (Allen, 1981:260).

There is no such thing as classes in this society, the state has vanished entirely, and private property does not exist. Now that the people have their own sovereignty, the constitution was drafted by them and is the true expression of their will. The people, then, drafted the constitution in accordance with their own demands and interests. The proletarian revolution was emphasized by Marx and Engels as the best means of achieving "true democracy," as he states in his *Communist Manifesto* that:

Hiding their goals and views is something that the Communists despise. They freely acknowledge that eliminating all existing social conventions by violence is the only way they can accomplish their objectives. Give the nobility a shake-up via a Communist revolution. What the proletariat is losing are their chains; that is all. It is their planet to conquer. All workers across the globe are united (Marx, 1848:30).

Every social structure that exists today is a product of society's expanding material powers of production, and the capitalist state is home to the seeds of this revolution. Class conflict eventually



leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Still, the dictatorship itself is only a means to an end—the abolition of all classes and the establishment of a classless society. Compared to past nations, states, tribes, and other racial or class divisions, the new global order thus marks a step forward. According to Georgi Shakhnazarov, the top adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev in the former Soviet Union, "our epoch is the epoch of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into communism" (Shakhnazarov, 1981:18). The establishment of worldwide communism, which places the people in charge of the means of production, does away with the state and classes, and establishes a consensus-based, cooperative global society, is Marxism's ultimate goal. Nonetheless, conflict between capitalist and communist societies won't end until global communism is achieved. This fight will include warfare as a continuation of class conflict. Socialism will lead to conflict between nations, just as capitalism and the proletariat do. Therefore, the goal of Marxists is to eliminate all forms of state authority and establish a global communism. They are prepared to frighten, subdue, and attack the opponent as a result.

The Implications of Marx Class Theory for Politics and Economics

The concept of class struggle is central to the economic and political theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who held that society would eventually move from bourgeois tyranny under capitalism to a socialist and ultimately classless society. Karl Marx, a conventional economist, favored the "Labour Theory Value" as a means of explaining relative differences in market prices. According to this concept, "the value of a produced economic good can be measured objectively by the average number of labor hours required to produce it". The crucial role that economic factors played in society was the cornerstone of the materialistic conception. Everything else falls within the purview of the superstructure, which includes the government, the state, the legal system, and the arts, cultures, and ideas. Marx proceeded to assert that the economy shapes human institutions and conduct; hence, the superstructure is shaped and determined by the economic foundation. "The determination of men's existence is not their consciousness, but rather their social existence," Karl Marx argued (Marx, 1997:11–12). When a society's economic basis is changed, so is its awareness. It is common for the superstructure to alter in tandem with changes in the economic base. According to Marx:

In society, the material forces of production come into conflict with the current production relationship, or rather, only a legal expression of it, with the property relation in which they had previously operated at a particular point in their evolution. These connections, which result from the ways in which the forces of production are evolving, have an impact on the economic foundation and quickly alter the entire superstructure (Marx, 199:12).

The five historical stages of economic growth were delineated by Marx. Among these were capitalism, feudalism, slavery, and early forms of communism. Revolutions are inevitable since every stage (except from the last one) has elements that lead to contradictions. The current situation would be the thesis, and the conflicts inside it would be the antithesis. The synthesis, which would thereafter function as the thesis, would be formed by the solution. This would keep happening until an ideal society was attained. 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 ruling class derives its power from owning and controlling the production forces. The ruling class dominates, takes advantage of, and subjugates the subject class. As such, there is a basic conflict of interest between the two classes. Marx examined past social systems and found that they all followed a similar course of development. This and his vision of the future allowed Marx to create an accurate framework for the advancement of humanity.

Marx's Dialectical Materialism Theory and Its Applicability to National Development

Marx's dialectical materialism explored the issue of development from a very basic perspective, making it a profound theory of development and change. Its subtle materialism suggests that the material conditions give rise to the ideas that eventually drive society progress. Dialectical materialism is essentially the emphasis of Marx's condemnation of capitalism due to its exploitative nature. His objections to capitalism are obviously moral. An objective moral ideal is what it aims to accomplish. A basic issue with ideology that is brought up by this criticism is that the interests of the ruling class are driving it forward. Marx contends that the production of the resources required to support human life and the exchange of those resources have shaped all social structures in his materialist view of history. Put differently, the fulfillment of fundamental needs such as clothing, food, and shelter is what sustains human society. That's why discussing humans in terms of praxis, or the act of satisfying needs, makes sense. Marx would therefore define man not only as a component of nature, a logical being, a social being, etc., but also as a man who works, produces, or is creative.

A man never reaches his full potential until he uses his intelligence to get what he wants. A man's work therefore becomes an integral part of his identity. There is little doubt that his analysis of the capitalist system highlights several basic facts. For example, it observes that the material order greatly influences a society's ideas and affects the human mind. Furthermore, the reality that capitalism society is highly stratified and founded on a multitude of diverse ideologies cannot be denied. However, Marx's rejection of the possibility of universal concepts would be an exaggeration and possibly an excessive assumption. Certain basic ideas, like justice and equity, can nevertheless act as the cornerstone of ideologies in spite of the substructure's or material order's flexibility. Therefore, notions of justice may be viewed as universal when they are driven more by the spirit of reciprocal fairness. As they are able to think, humans can also adapt to the shifting substructure and change with the changing material order.

As a result, the idea of eternal and universal norms is relativistic rather than absolutely denied. Though not objective, it is subjective. Another way that Marx's materialist philosophy is used is in the concept of labor as a social activity. Men have always been driven to form groups in an attempt to control the forces of nature as they search for a way to survive. The tasks that humans



organize themselves to perform consist of collecting raw materials, building and staffing factories, and creating, using, and maintaining machines. Enhancements in human capacities, potentials, and production relationships accompany the advancement of production instruments as a result of these productive variables coming together. Human desires and the resources available to fulfill them are therefore related. Marx's materialist worldview is characterized, among other things; by the way it portrays the interests of the working class. This alienation of labor is a clear manifestation of Marx's political ideology, which strives to liberate the masses from exploitation. The historical materialism of Marx and Engels is, in fact, a methodical approach to reconstructing human society with a revolutionary bent, and it serves as the working class's weapon in the struggle against capitalism. Therefore, Marx's materialist ideology and its consequences emphasize the importance of philosophy for the development of society. Marxism essentially provides a scientific explanation of the cosmos and operates based on scientific principles, as demonstrated by the concepts of dialectical materialism. It highlights the already-existing links between philosophy and science by doing this. Marx's philosophy first shows the form that science gives it by methodically fusing "materialism" and "dialectics."

Earlier philosophers had a different take on these concepts. Hegel, on the other hand, was a dialectician and not a materialist, but Feuerbach was both. Marx integrated these concepts into his dialectical-materialist philosophical framework. One school of thought that stresses acting over just thinking is dialectical materialism, as advocated by Marx. While philosophers have all tried to understand the world in their own special ways, in accordance with Karl Marx, what is actually needed is for the world to change since the oppressed and exploited man can only be emancipated and given back his human dignity by action (Marx 1887, 27). A comprehensive defense of social changes and their origins can be found in Marx's theory of dialectical materialism. It also provides feasible ideas for promoting the political, social, and economic development of a nation.

Conclusion

The social, political, and economic issues facing each nation have a significant impact on its makeup and future. A society's social and political systems must be significantly transformed, which primarily requires increased intellectual capacity and progress-oriented practical activity. Marx is worried that most social scientists and philosophers only interpret and theoretically analyze social reality, with little to no effort put into really enacting positive change. This need is undoubtedly met by his philosophy, which skillfully blends theory and practice and provides a solid basis for social reform. On the other hand, Karl Marx thought that equality and human rights were very important. He is adamant that everyone should have access to the materials required for human existence and education, regardless of gender, race, or religion. His idea would greatly contribute to the eradication of gender preconceptions if it were fully put into practice. It would place an emphasis on free health care, free education, and gender bias or inequality. Once more, some of the issues facing capitalism may be resolved by turning to Karl Marx. Capitalism has a serious monopolization problem despite encouraging competition and excellence.



An industry or company becomes a monopoly when it has amassed sufficient wealth and reputation to control every aspect of its market niche. Little enterprises that fail and fewer opportunities for entrepreneurs may follow from reduced pricing competition. In Marx's view, the state ought to regulate enterprises. By giving other smaller businesses additional financing to catch up or by allowing the dominant company to lose funds to give the other businesses a chance, this could help prevent monopolies by allowing smaller businesses to gain market share. Marx's theory of social classes may provide useful guidance on how different social classes might collaborate to form a whole and demonstrate how society operates as a unit. Not only can his theory be applied to shed light on the current state of fashion, but it can also be employed as a research method to examine the relationship between ownership, power, and social change.

In addition, Marx's theory is useful for comprehending the underlying dynamics of a society as a whole rather than just its functioning as discrete units and for taking a long-term view of the present through his historical sense. As Marx analyzes the evolution from a historical standpoint and is thus able to pinpoint the motions and inclinations of that society, this pertains to all of its different classes and individuals. Ultimately, Marx's theory of communism as an alternative to capitalism has shown to be ineffective in real-world scenarios, but it still contains valuable ideas and concepts that are fundamental to all political and social structures. Our great nation's development and construction will be considerably aided if these fundamental ideas and concepts from his philosophy can be taken out and applied to the political and social structure that exists now, particularly in Nigeria.

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-Dühring cited in Joseph Stalin*. Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- Engels, Friedrich. (1938). *Dialectics of Nature cited in Joseph Stalin*. Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- Ben, F. (2010). *Marx's Capital* (5th ed.). Pluto Press.
- Kanu I. A. (2010). "A Discourse on the Romance between Philosophy and Christian Theology". *International Journal of Theology and Reformed Tradition*. 2. 185-198.
- Kanu I. A. (2011). "Corruption in Africa and its Challenges for the Enterprise of Christian Theology". *International Journal of Research in Arts and Social Sciences*. 4. 492-500.
- Kanu I. A. (2012). "On the Possibility of Miracles". *International Journal of Theology and Reformed Tradition*. 4. 81-89.



- Kanu I. A. (2020). "Igwebuike theology of Ikwa Ogwe and the Inculturation of the Gospel message". *OGIRISI: A Journal of African Studies*. 16(1),15-28.
- Kanu I. A. (2020). "Igwebuike theology of Omenani and the missionary bifurcation of horizons". *OGIRISI: A New Journal of African Studies*. 16(1), 127-144.
- Kanu I. A. (2024). "The Inculturation of Consecrated Life in Africa: Towards a Logic for Promoting Indigenous Gifts of Fidelity". *The Catholic Voyage: African Journal of Consecrated Life*. 21(1), 245-265.
- Kanu I. A. (2012). "Inculturation and Christianity in Africa". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 2(17), 236-244.
- Kanu I. A. (2016). "Igwebuike as an Igbo-African hermeneutics of globalisation". *IGWEBUIKE: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*. 2(1), 61-66.
- 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.
- Marx, Karl. (1938). *Capital*. George Allen & Unwin Press Ltd., Vol. I
- Marx, Karl. (1977). *A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Progress publishers): Notes by R. Rojas.
- Marx, Karl. (1990). *Capital Vol 1*, Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl. (2001). *Preface to a critique of Political Economy*. The Electric Book Company.
- Marx, Karl. (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.