

From Hegelian Idealism to Marxist Materialism *(A critical assessment of connection and contradiction)*

Sangam Chaulagai

Lecturer, Department of English, Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Hetauda, Nepal
Corresponding Author: Sangam Chaulagai

Abstract: This article deals with the journey of western dialectical debate from Hegel to Marx and other Marxist critics. Hegelian idealist philosophy believes on the existence of idea which, according to Hegel, shapes other worldly matters. Marxian materialist philosophy, on the other hand, believes on the power of materiality in human life. For the study of connections and contradictions between them, an assessment on the views of Hegelian Idealists and Marxist Materialists has been done from critical perspective. The study explores that the two philosophers stand together on the views that conflict is the foundation for change in society, and historical development of human civilization has gone through dialectical process. They view differently on the nature and agents of conflict. Hegel believes upon the intellectual power of mind to bring change where as Marx believes on the power of proletarians to subvert the existing bourgeois ideology with socialist ideology.

Date of Submission: 04-10-2019

Date of Acceptance: 21-10-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and Karl Marx are the pioneers to open up the discourse of dialecticism in western metaphysics. When Hegel died in 1831, Marx was just 13 years old. Marx studied the philosophy of Hegel thoroughly and moved his journey from the weakness that he found in the theory of Hegel. This critical study of Marx upon Hegel gave rise to Marxist theory which dominated the whole world in 20th century.

The philosophy of Hegel is based on the proposition that reality can be attained through logical reasoning. He advocates for rationality and reconciliation of contradictions to run society in smooth and peaceful manner. Despite the attempt for reconciliation, Hegel acknowledges that ideas are naturally clashed by other new conflicting ideas. This dialectic principle makes human society active and creative. The philosophy of Marx, on contrary, is based on the proposition that social reality lies on materiality. The one who possesses material power rules over society, and those who are powerless, struggle against the power. This is what Marx calls class conflict. Class conflict, for Marx, is the main ground for social transformations.

There are some theoretical grounds that bind both Hegelian and Marxian philosophies together. Perhaps there would not have been Marx if Hegel had not been born on this earth. Marx himself has acknowledged the contribution of Hegel for propounding dialectical principle in historical development. Marx started his philosophical journey from the ground of Hegel. But it was Marx who popularized Hegel with heavy corrections in his philosophical standpoints. Other young Hegelians (Marxist scholars) have also credited Hegel for his contribution. Georg Lukacs was much influenced by Hegelian concept of totality and harmony that Lukacs has used in his theory of art and literature.

Hegelian philosophy provided ground for Marx and other Marxist thinkers to begin with the theory of dialectics. Propounding the concept of thesis-antithesis-synthesis, Hegel established the law of social transformation in which one established idea is countered by another new idea. This clash in human consciousness paves way to new consciousness, i.e., synthesis. For Hegel transformation in society is transformation in human consciousness. Karl Marx expresses his disbelief upon the claim of Hegel arguing that transformation of consciousness is not possible unless there is transformation in materiality. It is power that formulates consciousness, and that power comes from the possession of materiality. The two philosophers differ from each other in determining the agents for change. Hegel believes that change in society occurs only with the effort of educated and enlightened people. Marx, on the other hand, sympathizes the working class people, and considers them to be the real agents for change.

II. AN APPROACH TO HEGELIAN IDEALISM

The philosophy of Hegel aims to explain the truth and the inner connections of the world including nature, human society and human thought. While observing the world with mere appearance, it may be inexplicable, so it is required to comprehend them internally and observe them as the expression of the spirit. The essence of the real world, according to Hegel, can be achieved in two ways. First, by the process of logical reasoning, that the essence of real world is the mind. Our mind collects data through sense organs and formulates abstract thought. Second, the idea and thought in mind gives rise to the world. This two folded way of journey from concrete to abstract and from abstract to concrete is the essence of Hegelian philosophy.

Bringing forward the concept of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, Hegel develops dialectical method to reach the conclusion of reasoning. There will be a category existing in society dominantly. The category, in the course of time, will be challenged by a new category. It creates contradiction between first category and the new category. This contradiction gives rise to third category that is almost the blending of two previous categories. It does not eliminate contradiction in society, rather “the third category can then generate another new category, and so on by the same process of unity – contradiction – unity. The three categories at work at a particular stage of deduction are sometimes called thesis – antithesis – synthesis” (Likitkijsoomboon, 1992, p. 407). This process can also be called immediacy – mediation – higher immediacy. The first category, thesis, is immediacy. In the case of immediacy, Stace (1995) states that “Immediacy is the same as simple identity, that within which no differences have yet disclosed themselves” (as cited in Likitkijsoomboon, 1992, p. 407). The second category that we call antithesis is the mediator which breaks down the existing unity. The third category is synthesis that creates higher immediacy. “This is higher order of unity and immediacy because it has included within itself all previous immediacies and mediations” (Likitkijsoomboon, 1992, p. 407). The higher immediacy creates more complexity in comparison to first immediacy.

Hegel’s concept of thesis, antithesis and synthesis puts forward the theory of dialectics that the dominant idea is countered by alternative idea in human society. The clash between two ideas give rise to new idea which often blends two conflicting ideas. This proposition of Hegel, which is later on defined as Hegelian Idealism, theorizes the process of social development. Since this contradiction is the contradiction of idea, Hegel defends the right of reason because it can reveal the identity of people on the self transforming path to freedom (Fraser & Burns, 2000). The logical reasoning makes a trip from concrete to abstract. When it becomes an idea, it logically gives rise to the world itself. In such situation, there is a trip from abstract to concrete.

The contribution of Hegel on the foundation of Marxist theory is considered much pivotal as his theory first developed the concept of dialectical reasoning. He proposed for the need of dialecticism for social transformation. Various Marxist scholars have highlighted the contribution of Hegel for setting the foundation of Marxism. Georg Lukacs (1980) argues that Hegel was essentially a rationalistic and radical philosopher who turned against the emotional irrationalism of Romanticism. Lukacs speaks for rationality and goes against modern fascism and capitalism. Not only that, he also positions Hegel as an alternative to some thinkers like Schelling, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche who, for Lukacs, are irrational thinkers as they paved the way for fascism.

The philosophy of Hegel has become much more influential from 19th century to present day throughout the globe. Dmitry Chizhevsky, a historian of Russian philosophy, stresses that Hegel’s dialectics was called upon by life in Russia not only as the dialectics of spirit and social life, but also as the dialectics of nature (Bartonek, 2018, p. 62). Theodor Adorno, a neo-Marxist, stands in the side of Hegel as Hegel’s dialectics speaks for the negation of ideas within it. Adorno tries to explain society’s ability to make its own negation into a part of its functioning as a principle that indeed comes from Hegel (Bartonek, 2018, p. 105). Adorno seems to be much inspired by Hegelian philosophy because Hegel can be regarded as the foundation for critical and dialectical theory of society. Slavoj Žižek, a neo-Marxist philosopher, realizes that Hegel’s philosophy is one of the most important theoretical points of departure. In an interview, Žižek tells “even when I sometimes try to be critical of Hegel, I remain a Hegelian” (as cited in Burman, 2018, p. 185). The weakness of understanding Hegel lies due to the lack of contextual understanding of his theory. It is necessary to “link Hegel’s philosophical project to the socio-economic and political situation in which he lived” (Burman, 2018, p. 187). If we set his philosophical ideas in today’s context, our understanding to Hegel becomes partial and biased.

With all these definitions and references, we can draw a conclusion on the philosophy of Hegel that he, for the first time, dealt with the concept of dialectics which provided Karl Marx and other Marxist critics a ground for propounding Marxist criticism.

III. APPROACHING MARXIST MATERIALISM

The theory of Karl Marx is based on the proposition that materiality is key determinant of human consciousness. From the origin of human civilization, there is clash among people for material prosperity. The one who owns material power rules over to those who lack property. Those who have material prosperity belong to bourgeois class, and those who lack property belong to proletariat class. Marx states that the history of human

society is the history of class conflict. Opposing the proposition of Hegel, Karl Marx argues that “Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life” (2004, p. 656). The condition of material ownership of a person determines his/her thoughts and ideas. Consciousness of a person is determined by the way he/she lives life.

Karl Marx developed his materialist standpoint, according to which the economic factor, or political economy, appears as the most important and fundamental for the historical and societal life of human kind (Bartonek, 2018, p. 49). The economic factor is the base structure of a person on which his/her superstructure is constructed. Superstructure denotes philosophy, religion, education, culture, and other mental products. As Hegelian dialectical path is the dialectics of the Idea, Marx’s dialectical path is the dialectic of Capital. “Capital is the all-dominating economic power of bourgeois society. It must form the starting point as well as the finishing point” (Marx, Grundrisse, p. 107). In capitalist society, capital is the justification for every kind of superiority and power. The economic phenomenon is determined by the structure of the mode of production (Althusser, 1977, p.185). In capitalist mode of production, those who own capital are benefitted.

Marx assesses the history of human society from materialist perspective, and considers proletarians to be the agents for change. Marxism is a grand theory that tries to synthesize the whole human history in a single line of definition. Georg Lukacs opined “The system of socialism and its view of the world, Marxism, form a synthetic unity – perhaps the most unrelenting and rigorous synthesis since medieval Catholicism (as cited in Burman, 2018, p. 19). Lukacs advocates for harmony and totality in history and society which, in reality is the proposition of Marxism. Karl Korsch states that the scientific socialism of Marx consists of “a theory of social revolution comprehended and practiced as a living totality” (as cited in Bartonek, 2018, p. 41). Marxism is a social theory that aims at bringing change from status quo. It believes that today’s society is unjust and less humane which needs to be altered by the agents of change. The proletarians, according to Marxism, are the real agents for change.

Marxism is described as a theory of social reality. Marx also points out that philosophy and ideology are not only fabrications, but are realities in society. He writes “Philosophy doesn’t stand outside the world, just as the brain doesn’t stand outside man” (as cited in Bartonek, 2018, p. 43). Philosophy has direct contact with everyday problem. In contrast to bourgeois philosophy which is the philosophy of mere ideology, Marxist philosophy is, what Marxists claim to be, the philosophy of practicality. This realization led to take step from idealistic philosophy to dialectic materialism (Bartonek, 2018, p. 41). Marxism believes that forms of bourgeois consciousness cannot be abolished through thought only; for it the material relations of production needs to be practically overthrown. Talking about inseparability of theory and practice, Korsch in his book *Marxism and Philosophy* expresses:

Theoretical criticism and practical overthrow are here inseparable activities, not in any abstract sense but as a concrete and real alteration of the concrete and real world of bourgeois society. Such is the most precise expression of the new materialist principle of the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels (2009, p. 95).

Korsch has highlighted the immediate practicability of Marxist theory for the alteration of bourgeois society. Marxism believes that this theory is strong enough to overthrow bourgeois ideology from society.

Marxist theory is considered to be scientific theory. A scientific theory believes that an agent for change doesn’t come from external objects; rather it is created immanently, trying to produce negation from within. Marx tries to point out how capitalist society carries inner contradictions within itself (as cited in Bartonek, 2018, p. 47). Talking about the historical development of human society, Marx believes that capitalism will fall down because of its own internal problems and socialism will be established in its replacement. Marxist philosophy can be considered to be a science because it considers the world as a whole. It can be divided into the knowledge of the general laws of the development of nature and knowledge of the general laws of societal development (Mareeva & Mareev, 2018, p. 72). As the writers claim, Marxist philosophy incorporates the laws of both development of nature and societal development. Abram Deborin (1929) has written:

Marxism, or dialectical materialism, constitutes a holistic world outlook consisting of three main parts, namely, materialistic dialectics as a general scientific methodology (including cognitive theory), natural dialectics and the methodology of natural science (natural-historical-materialism) and the dialectics of history (historical materialism) (p. 8).

Deborin try to justify that Marxism is a scientific theory in which historical, materialist and natural dialectics are dealt with scientific methodology.

Marxist critics consider this theory as a theory of liberation. It makes a critique of existing capitalist society as it believes that capitalism is a hindrance for transformation in society. Marxism leads for radical action for change. More than that, this theory advocates for the unity of theory and praxis. Marxism is not an abstract theory dissociated with real society. It is also clear about the agent of change that the working class people can lead the capitalist society into a socialist one. For Herbert Marcuse “Marxism had become a power

instrument, when in actual fact it once again needed to be a theory of liberation” (Bartonek, 2018, p. 83). Marcuse stresses for the need of Marxism again to us as a power instrument for the liberation of human beings. For liberation revolution is necessary. When Marxism is successful for liberating working class people from the bourgeois ideology and capitalist domination, it becomes successful in its mission. It believes that only the critique of capitalist ideology theoretically does not lead for change. So, a revolutionary action is necessary for the successful transformation of society. Marxism also believes that theory and praxis must not be understood as two separate entities that one should try to correct for the sake of liberating humankind (Bartonek, 2018, pp. 86/7). Marxism believes that it is only the theory that can liberate humankind from bourgeois status quo. This liberation needs forceful revolution.

There are some critical voices on Marxist philosophy within its family. Some Marxist critics of later phases have pinpointed the lacking in orthodox Marxism. Lukacs criticizes Engels for he ignores the dialectical interaction between subject and object in the historical process. According to Lukacs, Engels one-sidedly and rigidly talks about economic determinism. Critically commenting on Marxism, Korsch (2009) opines that Marxist theory gradually turns into a set of purely scientific observations, without any immediate connection to the political or other practices of class struggle (p. 60). Korsch is correct in the sense that in today’s intellectual discussion Marxism is much understood as an orthodox scientific theory, instead of understanding it from contemporary political nature and the condition of class struggle. Therefore, Marxism has become more a means for the acquisition of power rather than a philosophy of freedom.

IV. THE POINT ON WHICH HEGEL AND MARX STAND TOGETHER

Likitkijksomboon (1992) states “For Hegel as well as for Marx, dialectic is the objective and the universal property of things, each of which is finite, changeable, transitory and constantly moving towards its own opposite” (p. 418). The concept of dialectics is the common point that both Hegel and Marx have agreed upon for change. The theory of Marx can be effectively evaluated only with the comprehension of Hegelian dialectics. The words of Lenin shed much highlights on the need to study Hegel. He states “It is impossible completely to understand Marx’s *Capital*, and especially its first chapter, without having thoroughly studied and understood the whole of Hegel’s *Logic*” (Lenin, 1961, p. 180). It shows how strongly Marxist philosophy depended on Hegelian dialectics.

Karl Marx, the propounder of Marxism, has also acknowledged the contribution of Hegel for the law of dialectics. In his letter to Joseph Dietzgen, Marx has written that the “true laws of dialectics are already to be found in Hegel, albeit in a mystified form” (as cited in Burman, 2018, p. 21). Despite the vast ground of differences, Marx’s thinking was more inspired by Hegel’s dialectical philosophy of human history and society. Georg Lukacs has much acknowledged the contribution of Hegel on the foundation of Marxist philosophy. He states that it is necessary to return to Hegel in order to provide an accurate presentation of true Marxism. Besides the writings of Marx, “Hegel’s *Logic* and *Phenomenology of Spirit* are in fact the main background sources for Lukacs’ views of contemporary Marxism” (Burman, 2018, p. 21). Lukacs brought the concept of ‘totality’ directly from Hegel. Hegel talked about harmony in reason and the state while Lukacs talks of harmony in art and aesthetics.

Karl Marx and other Marxist critics are also called Young Hegels because they further extended and corrected the dialectical philosophy of Hegel. His dialectical method also provided a ground for the development of revolution in Europe. One major difference between Hegel and Young Hegels is; Hegel naturalized the dialectical method where as other young Hegels politicized it (Korsch, 1923). In other words, Hegel idealized dialectics while the Marxists materialized it. Despite these differences, the common ground of dialectics as the root for change remains the same. Korsch argues that Marxist revolutionary aim can be fulfilled with theoretical instrument of Hegelian philosophy. The purpose of Korsch is “to make Marxist theory anew with Hegel” (Bartonek, 2018, p. 38). Both Hegel and Young Hegel agree that dialectic is the key principle of history. According to Korsch, “Hegel wrote that in the philosophic system of this fundamentally revolutionary epoch, revolution was loaded and expressed as if in the very form of their thought” (2009, p. 41). The revolutionary thought of people ultimately leads the society for change. Herbert Marcuse also talks about the connection between Hegel and Marx. He claims that “Marx’s thinking was very much inspired by Hegel’s dialectical philosophy of the human, history and society” (Bartonek, 2018, p. 81). It is not only Marcuse who sees connections between Hegel and Marx; there are so many Marxist critics who have assessed on such connections.

The principle of immediacy-mediation-higher immediacy as talked in Hegelian philosophy can be connected in Marx’s materialist theory. In Hegelian idealism, the first category (thesis) plays the role of immediacy, and the new category (antithesis) functions as mediation. The contradiction between these two categories gives rise to third category (synthesis) which plays the role of higher immediacy. These three categories can be applied to the overall structure of capitalism as production- circulation- production as a whole. The first category is capitalist production as an immediacy which involves production of commodity and surplus

value. It causes for the accumulation of capital (Likitkijsonboon, 1992, p. 412). The second category is capitalist circulation which plays the role of mediation. In this stage “the straightforward and immediate production process is transformed by the complications of the circulation sphere”(Likitkijsonboon, 1992, p. 412). The third category, capitalist production as a whole plays the role of synthesis of production and circulation process. In this stage, “capital in general develops into many capitals, as a concrete category of many different individual capitals confronting one another” (Likitkijsonboon, 1992, p. 413). The structural principle of Hegelian Idealism and Marxian Materialism is common as both of them advocate for the principle of challenging the established ideological structure.

V. THE POINT OF DEPARTURE

Karl Marx rejects Hegel’s philosophy because it postulates an abstract Idea as the subject of dialectic. Marx further opines:

My dialectical method is not only different from the Hegelian, but it is direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of ‘the Idea’, he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurges of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of ‘the Idea’. With me, on the contrary, the idea is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought (1971, p. 29).

The main point of departure that Marx stresses is replacing the concept of Hegelian Idea with his concept of matter. Hegel believed that the idea of human brain is real and these all external phenomena are reflections of idea. Marx undercuts this belief and claims that idea is the reflection of material world into human mind. For Marx whatever a person experiences in the external world, idea is constituted in accordance with that experience. Critiquing upon Hegel, Marx declares “With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again” (1971, p. 29). The claim of Marx is that the dialectic of Hegel was directed toward opposite side which Marx corrected and led toward right direction.

Lenin also clarifies the point of Hegel-Marx departure clearly. The logic for Marx is the logic related to materiality. He states:

Marx didn’t leave behind him a ‘Logic’. . . , he did leave the logic of Capital, and this ought to be utilized to the full in this question. In Capital, Marx applied to a single science logic, dialectic and the theory of knowledge of materialism . . . which has taken everything valuable in Hegel and developed it further (1961, p. 319).

The logic for Hegel is for achieving reality of the idea while the logic for Marx is related to capitalism and the knowledge of materialism. It is the point in which Marx steps further in Hegelian philosophy. Hegel’s idealist philosophy is also considered to be shrouded in mysticism. Marx’s contribution is to demystify Hegel’s thought through more materialist and dialectical approach (Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 1). Hegel developed his theory of dialectic as an elite theory which can only be comprehended by extra ordinary minds. Marx brought this theory down to the earth for common minds.

Karl Marx disregards Hegel because “Hegel regards entities such as wealth and the state, for example, as estranged from man, but only in abstract philosophical thought” (as cited in Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 3). Hegel, for Marx, “fails to locate alienation in man’s material existence because he offers only ‘dialectic of pure thought’” (as cited in Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 3). According to Marx, Hegel ‘fails into the illusion of conceiving the real as the product of thought concentrating itself, probing its own depths, and unfolding itself, out of itself, by itself’ (Grundrisse, p. 101). The accusation of Marx on Hegel is based on the contradiction of the root of dialectic. Hegel considers the real as the product of thought, and considers thought as an end. For Marx, there are other entities like state, alienation, materiality which are crucial for determining human life.

Marx pinpoints the shortcomings of Hegel claiming that his dialectic is only limited on the dialectic of pure thought, but he ignores the part on how a person is objectified in capitalist mode of production. Georg Lichtheim highlights that German Idealism, and Hegel in particular, had contributed for the bourgeois world, in contrast to Materialism, Marxism in particular which would contribute for the world of socialism (as cited in Burman, 2018, p. 29). The charge of Marxists to Hegel is that he served for capitalist through his ideology because he ignored the power of proletarians to change the society.

The major confrontation that Marxism makes with Hegel is Hegel took the social elite to be the agents of change. Observing the social change in Britain and in France which were quite bloody, Hegel might have expected for a less traumatic and less bloody revolution in Germany which he thought can be led by the social elites, rather than the blind destruction produced by mobs and factories. He saw states as guarantors of freedom, not instrument of oppression. Marx, in contrary, believes in the power of working class people to bring the real change in society. The state, according to Marxism, is repressive towards those who do not own capital and do not belong to bourgeois class. The repressive rule of the state cannot be subverted without forceful invasion. Hegel always searches for the possibility of resolution through thought and absolute idea. In contrast, Marx

argues that contradictions have to be overcome through real historical struggle. (as cited in Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 3). Hegel regarded the poor and working class as incapable of being agents of social progress while Marx considers working class people as real agents for social change. Hegel intended to have reconciliation through the theory of dialectics whereas Marx intended to have change.

Lukacs (1972) points out that Hegel missed to unite thought with being. For Lukacs “Hegel remained imprisoned in the duality of thought and being and did not attempt to unite them concretely” (History and Class Consciousness, p. 17). Lukacs also criticizes Hegel for highlighting thought only instead of uniting them with being. His dialectical thought directly promoted bourgeois philosophy because his idealist thought can only be exercised by elitists. The conclusion of Marx upon the philosophy of Hegel was “Hegel was a child of his age and remained trapped within the highest form of idealist ethics and so of bourgeois philosophy” (as cited in Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 11). The concern of Marx is that the idealist philosophy of Hegel could not address the potential of the large mass of working class people. Instead, it only served few bourgeois people. Marcuse (1941) also criticizes Hegel for ignoring the significance of social and economic categories. These categories, in reality, are the determining factors for ideas according to Marcuse. “He criticizes Hegel for comprehending social and economic categories as being nothing more than disguised philosophical concepts” (p. 258). Hegel did not realize that the reality is quite reversing than he opined which Marx later realized. Henri Lefebvre also argues with the line of Marcuse telling that Hegel fails to capture the entire content of human experience because he reduces material reality to consciousness (as cited in Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 14). Material reality, according to Marxists, is not determined by consciousness; rather consciousness is determined by material reality. Lucio Colletti finds Hegel’s philosophy contradictory because “it is half idealist and half materialist” (as cited in Fraser & Burns, 2000, p. 16). Idealism, according to Colletti, is clearly visible in Hegel and materialism seems latent. It means Hegel himself seems to be in confusion in his theoretical standpoint.

The relation between Hegel and Marx is also related to the question whether history is idealistic or materialistic. Hegel explores the history of human civilization through the light of idealist philosophy. Historical changes, according to Hegel, took place due to the clash between two ideas. Marx opposes his proposition with the claim that the history of human civilization is the history of class conflict. The conflict between the people of ruling class and working class for material possession caused transformation in society. Korsch claims that reality does not get changed in Hegel’s principle, but it is legitimized in its historically established form (Bartonek, 2018, p. 50). In contrast to Hegel, Korsch opines that history must lead to a total transformation of reality with the help of negating intervention of theory (Bartonek, 2018, p. 50). Hegel’s idealistic dialectic does not lead for revolution; rather it remains within philosophy. In Hegel, bourgeois society and the bourgeois state become the political end point (Bartonek, 2018, p. 50). Hegel’s philosophy does not advocate for radical transformation, but Marxism demands for transforming human society radically to release it from the clutch of capitalistic ideology.

Dialecticism is the law of nature as change occurs through the conflict between two internal factors. Both Hegel and Marx are successful to uncover this law of natural and social progression. Hegel prefers more on synthesis which demands reconciliation between two conflicting ideas. He regards consciousness to be superior and guiding principle for other life activities. Karl Marx views the world differently as he believes that human consciousness is not autonomous as it is conditioned by material possessions. The philosophical standpoint proposed by Marx and his followers seems more politically applicable today for transforming society from bourgeois ideology to socialist ideology.

VI. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the debate on Hegel and Marx makes a final remark that both Idealism and Materialism were creative philosophical initiatives on the same land of Germany. These philosophers have commonly advocated for social transformation though their concept on methods and agents contradict from each other. Both of these philosophers seem progressive in nature.

The debate on either life is determined by consciousness or consciousness is determined by life may exist even today that was once the great philosophical debate in the field of western metaphysics. Hegel-Marx debate lies within the question of whether life or consciousness comes first for human. Many of the Marxist critics have argued that Hegelian philosophy was faulty although the credit for generating dialectic methodology goes to him. The claim of Marx that Hegel was standing with his head and he turned him right side up tries to justify the limitation of Hegelian ideology. For true assessment of the dialectical nature of human society, Hegel sowed the seed and other Young Hegelians tended and fertilized massively. The influence of Hegelian Idealism upon Marxist philosophy and their point of departure are yet to be studied objectively.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Althusser, L. (1977). *The spectre of Hegel: Early writings*. London & New York. Verso.

- [2]. Bartonek, A. (2018 A). Herbert Marcuse: No dialectics, no critique. *Hegelian Marxism*. Eds. Bartonek & Burman. Stockholm. Södertörn Philosophical Studies, 81-106.
- [3]. Bartonek, A. (2018 B). Karl Korsch: To make the right Marx visible through Hegel. *Hegelian Marxism*. Eds. Bartonek & Burman. Stockholm. Södertörn Philosophical Studies, 35-59.
- [4]. Burman, A. (2018 A). A Lacanian Hegelianism: Slavoj Žižek's (mis-)reading of Hegel. *Hegelian Marxism*. Eds. Bartonek & Burman. Stockholm. Södertörn Philosophical Studies, 185-198.
- [5]. Burman, A. (2018 B). Back to Hegel! Georg Lukács, dialectics, and Hegelian Marxism. *Hegelian Marxism*. Eds. Bartonek & Burman. Stockholm. Södertörn Philosophical Studies, 17-34.
- [6]. Deborin, A. (1929). *Dialektika I estestvoznanie*. Moskava- Leningard.
- [7]. Fraser, I. & Burns, T. (January 2000). *Introduction: An historical survey of the Hegel- Marx connection*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1-33, DOI: 10.1057/9780230595934_1.
- [8]. Korsch, K. (March 10, 1923). Die Marxsche Dialektik. *Imprekorr*, 330-331. (Trans. By Heinz Otto as "The Marxist Dialectics.")
- [9]. Korsch, K. (December 2009). *Marxism and philosophy*. Ed. & Trans. Fred Halliday. New York: Monthly Review press.
- [10]. Lenin, V. I. (1961). *Collected works, Vol. 38: philosophical notebooks*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.
- [11]. Likitkijsoomboon, P. (December 1992). The Hegelian dialectic and Marx's Capital. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 16(4), 405-419.
- [12]. Lukacs, G. (1972). *History and class consciousness*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- [13]. Lukács, G. (1980). *The destruction of reason*. Trans. Peter Palmer. London: Merlin.
- [14]. Marcuse, H. (1941). *Reason and revolution*. (2nd ed). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- [15]. Mareeva, E & Mareev, S. (2018). Hegelian dialectics and Soviet Marxism (from Vladimir Lenin to Evald Ilyenkov). *Hegelian Marxism*. Eds. Bartonek & Burman. Stockholm. Södertörn Philosophical Studies, 61-79.
- [16]. Marx, K. (1971). *Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production*. Vol. I, trans. S. Moore and E. Aveling. Ed. F. Engels. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- [17]. Marx, K. (1973). *Grundrisse, foundations of the critique of political economy (Rough Draft) 1857-58*. Trans, and Foreword by M. Nicolaus. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- [18]. Marx, K. (2004). The German Ideology. *Literary theory: An anthology* (2nd ed.). Eds. Julie Rivkin & Michael Ryan. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing, 653-658.

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Sangam Chaulagai. From Hegelian Idealism to Marxist Materialism." IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 10, 2019, pp. 01-07.