

**HOW THE DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE IS DIFFERENTIATED IN HEGEL'S
AND MARX'S PHILOSOPHIES**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

BY

SİBEL KİBAR

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

JUNE 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Akın Ergüden
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Akın Ergüden (METU, PHIL) _____

Prof. Dr. Sabri Büyükdüvenci (ANKARA, DTCF) _____

Dr. Barış Parkan (METU, PHIL) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Sibel Kibar

Signature :

ABSTRACT

HOW THE DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE IS DIFFERENTIATED IN HEGEL'S AND MARX'S PHILOSOPHIES

Kibar, Sibel

M.A., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Akın Ergüden

June 2005, 100 pages

The purpose of this study is to present the different approaches, which Hegel and Marx have developed regarding the relation between consciousness and life, consistent with their aims. Hegel's aim is to combine all the opposed ideas and beliefs proposed throughout the history of philosophy into a unified whole. Hegel's dialectics which is immanent to life can also explain the opposition between consciousness and life. Self-consciousness, which appears as subjectivity in Hegel's philosophy, at first, treats the life as an object of desire. Later, however, self-consciousness which cannot

thus realize itself desires another self-consciousness who will recognize itself, so it relates with an other self-consciousness. This relation is defined as a “life and death struggle”. At the end of the struggle, there arise new forms of self-consciousnesses, Master and Slave. While the Slave produces for its Master, it relates itself to Life and this relation between Slave and Life brings about Slave as self-consciousness. On the other hand, the aim of Marx is not only to combine the oppositions but also to create a worldly philosophy. To this end, Marx puts economic relations of human beings at the centre of his theory. According to Marx, relations of production condition classes. While one class produces, the other exploits the productions of the former class. In Hegel, the Slave obtains its certainty as self-consciousness while it produces, whereas in Marx, the worker, who produces, is alienated from him/herself in the capitalist mode of production. To sum up, both Hegel and Marx emphasize the mutual relation between consciousness and life, but their divergent aims lead to them constructing this relation with different concepts on different foundations.

Key Words: Hegel, Marx, consciousness, self-consciousness, life, dialectic, spirit, slave, master, alienation, proletariat, bourgeoisie, worker, capitalist, German Idealism, Young Hegelians, Feuerbach, worldly philosophy.

ÖZ

BİLİNÇ VE YAŞAM ARASINDAKİ DİYALEKTİK İLİŞKİ HEGEL'DE VE MARX'TA NASIL FARKLILAŞIYOR

Kibar, Sibel

Yüksek Lisans, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Akın Ergüden

Haziran 2005, 100 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı Hegel'in ve Marx'ın kendi amaçları doğrultusunda bilinç ve yaşam arasındaki ilişkiye dair geliştirdikleri farklı yaklaşımlarını sunmaktır. Hegel'in amacı felsefe tarihi boyunca öne sürülmüş birbiri ile çelişen düşünce ve inanışları bir bütün içinde bir araya getirmektir. Hegel'in yaşama içkin diyalektiği bilinç ve yaşam karşıtlığını da açıklayabilmektedir. Hegel'de özne olarak ortaya çıkacak olan öz-bilinç, oluşum sürecinde, önce, yaşama bir arzu nesnesi olarak bakmaktadır. Ardından, bu arzu ile kendini gerçekleştiremeyen öz-bilinç, diğer bir öz-bilincin kendisini tanımasını arzu eder ve başka bir öz-bilinç ile ilişkiye girer. Bu ilişki "yaşam ve

ölüm mücadelesi” olarak adlandırılır. Bu mücadelenin sonunda öz-bilinçlerden biri Efendi, diğeri Köle olarak karşımıza çıkar. Köle, Efendisi için üretirken, yaşamla ilişkiye girer ve bu ilişki onu bir öz-bilinç kılar. Marx’ın amacı ise karşıtlıkları birleştirmenin yanısıra, dünyevi bir felsefe üretmektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda Marx insanın iktisadi ilişkilerini felsefesinin merkezine koyar. Üretim ilişkileri insanın sınıfsal konumunu belirler. Sınıflardan biri üreten sınıf iken, diğeri bu üretimi sömüren sınıftır. Hegel Kölenin çalışarak kendi bilincini elde ettiğini öne sürerken, Marx, kapitalist üretim biçiminin olumsuz ve yabancılaştırıcı yanını vurgular ve işçinin üretiminin işçiyi kendine, doğaya ve türüne yabancılaştırdığını söyler. Aslında hem Hegel, hem de Marx, bilinç ve yaşamın karşılıklı ilişkisini vurgularlar. Ama onların farklı amaçları, bu ilişkiyi farklı temellere oturtmalarına neden olur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hegel, Marx, bilinç, öz-bilinç, yaşam, diyalektik, tin, köle, efendi, yabancı, proletarya, burjuvazi, işçi, kapitalist, Alman İdealismi, Genç Hegelciler, Feuerbach, dünyevi felsefe.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Akın Ergüden for his professional guidance throughout this research. I would also like to thank to Prof. Dr. Sabri Büyükdüvenci, who was a member of the jury, for his insightful comments. I am deeply indebted to the other jury member Barış Parkan for her invaluable academic and psychological support. Without her guidance in asking the right questions in my research, I would never have been able to accomplish this study. She was always with me during the hard times I had in writing the thesis. Besides, I am also very grateful to Dr. Elif Çırakman who taught me how to read Hegel and introduced me to the essence of his dialectical philosophy.

I owe special thanks to the friendship of Selma Aydın Bayram and Nilüfer Kaya who believed and encouraged me to finish this work. Here, I should not forget to remember my colleague Murat Arıcı who provided me with some technical supports. Finally, I cannot fully express my gratitude to my parents, who did everything for my education.

But philosophers do not grow like mushrooms out of the earth; they are the fruit of their time, of their people, whose most subtle, costly and invisible sap circulates in philosophical ideas. The same spirit that builds railroads with the hands of the workers builds philosophical systems in the brain of the philosophers. Philosophy does not stand outside the world any more than man's brain is outside him because it is not in his stomach; but philosophy, to be sure, is the world with its brain before it stands on the earth with its feet...

(Marx, Karl., from Dick Howard's The Development of Marxian dialectic)

To Journeys...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
DEDICATION.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN	
CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE IN HEGEL	15
2.1 Introduction to Hegel’s Philosophy and the	
Phenomenology	15
2.1.1 Hegelian Dialectic.....	16
2.1.2 The Dialectical Journey of Spirit	20
2.1.2.1 Spirit	21
2.1.2.2 Science.....	24
2.1.3 About the <i>Phenomenology</i>	27
2.1.3.1 Phenomenology of Spirit.....	27

2.1.3.2 Hegel's Aim with the <i>Phenomenology</i>	30
2.2 Consciousness and Self-Consciousness	34
2.2.1 Consciousness and Object	38
2.2.2 Self-consciousness.....	43
2.2.2.1 Desire	47
2.2.2.2 Desire for Recognition	51
2.3 The Relation between Self-consciousness and Life in Hegel	54
3. DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE IN MARX.....	57
3.1 Introduction to Marx's Philosophy	57
3.1.1 German Idealism and Marx	60
3.1.2 Young Hegelians and Marx	63
3.1.3 Feuerbach and Marx.....	66
3.1.3.1 Innovation of Feuerbach	66
3.1.3.2 Marx's Critique of Feuerbach.....	70
3.1.4 Marx's Political Theory.....	74
3.2 Marx on Hegel: A Settling of Account	78
3.2.1 Critique of Hegel's Philosophy in General	78
3.2.1.1 Marx's Positive Critiques	79
3.2.1.2 Marx's Negative Critiques.....	80
3.2.2 Alienation and Capitalism	84
3.2.3 Man versus Self-consciousness	87

3.3 The Relation between Consciousness and Life in Marx .	88
4. CONCLUSION	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	97

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

While I was examining a book, *Hegel After Derrida*¹, an article, whose title is “Hegel/Marx: Consciousness and Life”², drew my attention. I came across with this article when I was trying to understand why Derrida approves of Marx, but in contrast to this approval of Marx, why he despises Hegel. In addition to Derrida, some other philosophers, such as Foucault and Deleuze, also declare their detestation for Hegel, but sympathy for Marx. It is difficult for me to understand why these philosophers, i.e., Foucault, Deleuze and Derrida have such different attitudes towards Hegel and Marx, because although Marx has considered himself opposed to Hegel, some kind of continuity between Hegel and Marx is always mentioned in the literature.

In this article, “Hegel/Marx: Consciousness and Life”, the author Warminski states “To begin reading the Hegel/Marx relationship, we may as well start with their differing versions of the relation between

¹ Barnet, Stuart. Ed., *Hegel After Derrida*, Routledge, New York and London, 1998.

² Warminski, Andrzej. “Hegel/Marx: Consciousness and Life”, *Hegel After Derrida*, Routledge, New York and London, 1998, p. 171.

consciousness and life”.³ In fact, Marx grounds his disagreement with Hegel on the basis of the relation between consciousness and life with his famous statement, “Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life”⁴. Before carrying on this discussion, I want to present the historical origin of the problem between consciousness and life.

Actually, the relation between consciousness and life may be considered one of the oldest problems of philosophy. We may call the problem “the relation between mind and its externality”. The relation between mind and what is outside the mind, which some philosophers have called “body”, “object”, or “in-itself”, has been questioned since the ancient ages. Especially in Cartesian philosophy, body and mind are considered to be different kinds of substances. In contrast to Cartesian understanding, Spinoza condemns the body-mind dualism in Cartesian philosophy. Instead, he defends that both body and mind are the attributes of the one substance. For Hegel, body and mind cannot be considered as separate substances, either. As Taylor claims, “...it [Hegel’s work] is strongly anti-dualist; it strives to overcome the body-soul dichotomy,

³ Warminski, Andrzej. “Hegel/Marx: Consciousness and Life”, *Hegel After Derrida*, Routledge, New York and London, 1998, p. 171.

⁴ Marx, Karl. “German Ideology”, *The Marx Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1978, p. 155.

or the spirit-nature dichotomy, which is the legacy of Descartes”.⁵ However, unlike Spinoza, Hegel does not reduce one substance to the other. That is, Hegel defends not only their unity but also their disparity at the same time, which can be understood in their relationships with each other.

Decidedly, Hegel uses the terms, “consciousness” and “object” or “self-consciousness” and “life”, instead of “body” and “mind”, since the concepts, consciousness or self-consciousness and object or life, have broader meanings than those of mind and body. Neither consciousness nor object, for Hegel, can be understood without their relations. Furthermore, in contrast to traditional understanding of object or body, life is something vivid and active, consisting of consciousness. In addition, life produces Hegelian subjectivity, namely, self-consciousness⁶, so that consciousness and life can be grasped through their relationship with each other. More precisely, life provides a certainty for self-consciousness, which saves Hegel’s philosophy from solipsism. Therefore, the two main concepts of this study consciousness and life cannot be investigated as separate substances, which means that they are mediated by each other.

⁵ Taylor, Charles., *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 1977, p. 24.

⁶ Self-consciousness which refers to subjectivity is a significant concept in Hegel’s philosophy. It is going to be explained in next chapter, in detail.

The relation between consciousness and life is also a significant theme in both early and late writings of Marx – whether there is a significant difference between early and late Marx is not the issue in the scope of this study. Indeed, it may be claimed that the dialectical relation between consciousness and life in Marx's philosophy is very similar to Hegel's one. For Marx also, consciousness and life cannot be considered as separate substances. However, as mentioned above, Marx claimed in his *German Ideology*⁷, that consciousness does not determine life, but life determines consciousness. If only one side determines the other side, then how is it possible to construct a dialectical relation between them?

The question stated above will be one of the main problems of this study. This question harbours in itself other important questions and possible replies, such as; how is the relation between consciousness and life to be elucidated, how are the other dichotomies dissolved with the dialectical approach, how does Marx differ from Hegel and how does the difference lead us to a praxis philosophy?

In light of these questions, throughout this study, I try to uncover the reasons why Hegel and Marx have different dialectical constructions and attitudes to the problem between consciousness and life. Since

⁷ Marx, Karl., "German Ideology", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

they have diverse objectives, which are handled in following chapters, I attempt to examine both Hegel's and Marx's different tendencies and aims while they are generating their philosophical thoughts. In other words, this study endeavors to remark both the importance of the problematic relation between consciousness and life and the meaning of the stress made - by Hegel and Marx - on whether consciousness determines the life or life determines the consciousness.

To this end, I first examine Hegel's approach to the dialectical relation between consciousness and life in Chapter 2. As an introduction, I go over some general points of Hegel's philosophy to understand Hegel better. I mention Hegel as a philosopher grasping the phenomena in a dialectical construction. At this point, I summarize dialectics of Hegel, which is a bit different from the previous understandings of dialectics. Hegel does not locate his dialectical construction as a methodology to grasp the process but he grasps dialectics as the process' itself.

Then I pass into "dialectical journey of Spirit" in order to make Hegel's dialectic more concrete in Chapter 2.1.2, since Hegel identifies dialectical process with "the journey of Spirit". In Hegel's

philosophy, all the process, changes, contradiction, and recurrences are the result of the transformation of the Spirit.

I begin to explain what the “Spirit” is in 2.1.2.1. In Hegelian philosophy, Spirit, one of core concepts of Hegel, has various and even contradictory meanings. For example, Spirit refers to both subjectivity and objectivity at the same time. These divergent characteristics of Spirit represent excellently the nature of Hegelian dialectics. In fact, what Hegel means about the dialectical process is nothing but the movement of Spirit from one moment to the other.

In addition to Spirit, some other special concepts, which are needed to understand Hegelian philosophy, such as, “Science”, “Absolute knowledge” and “truth criteria” are defined in 2.1.2.2. Science comes on the scene as the Absolute form of knowledge of consciousness. Hegel states that consciousness seeks the criterion of Absolute truth, i.e. Science, which is possible only in this age since the Spirit has matured.

I introduce Hegel’s famous work *Phenomenology of Spirit*⁸ in 2.1.3 and 2.1.3.1 in order to indicate the aspiration of Hegel, which is merely to demonstrate the journey of Spirit as the reason underlying

⁸ Hegel, G.W.F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller. Oxford University Press, New York, 1977.

all misconceptions and contradictions of previous philosophies. More precisely, while Spirit moves from one moment to another, it naturally changes and these changes lead to different manifestations of Spirit, which mislead the phenomenologist.

Besides, I try to give a brief summary of Hegel's aim with his *Phenomenology*, in 2.1.3.2. In fact, it is difficult to catch and express Hegel's aim, since Hegel claims that an aim or a subject matter cannot be limited and fixed within a proposition.⁹ Hegel talks about the vividness and fluidity of life and thought. Showing the transformational structure of life and thought, Hegel provides a journey to the reader with his *Phenomenology*.

After introducing some key points of Hegel's philosophy, I define the two important concepts, namely, "consciousness" and "self-consciousness" in 2.2. Although, both of them refer to subjectivity, Hegel shows a discrepancy between consciousness and self-consciousness. Actually, self-consciousness is the further moment of consciousness. Both consciousness and self-consciousness imply an awareness of self in a counter relation with another. However, self-consciousness is a position, awareness of itself as a subject. Nevertheless, not only self-consciousness but also consciousness is

⁹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 2.

a product of a distinctive dialectical process. I therefore describe both processes in detail.

In 2.2.1, I explain the split relation between consciousness and object. At the beginning, this relation is a contact between the knower and what is to be known. In other words, consciousness starts to make a contact with the object in order to know it. However, consciousness realizes that knowledge cannot be acquired from a contemplative relation with the object because the object and its knowledge are not immediate matters. When consciousness relates with an object, the contact between them naturally lead to a change in both itself and the object. Therefore, this relation cannot be considered as a contemplative relation but it is a dynamic and active process.

I express in 2.2.2 that at the end of a practical interaction with object, consciousness realizes its unity with the object. At that moment, it becomes a unity superseding the opposition between consciousness and object. This unity is no longer consciousness but it becomes consciousness of consciousness, that is, self-consciousness. However, this unity, that is, self-consciousness is also condemned to be split. At this point, it is necessary to introduce the concept of “desire”.

During these processes, “desire” is an important issue for self-consciousness encountering an other. I explain the role of desire in the formation of self-consciousness in 2.2.2.1. In this moment, self-consciousness’ desire towards life provides its satisfaction and certainty. Nevertheless, self-consciousness cannot reach ultimate satisfaction and certainty, since destroyed or consumed object conditions the satisfaction of self-consciousness, which means that the self-consciousness cannot return into itself from the object, not surviving other. Hence, self-consciousness needs another self-consciousness.

In 2.2.2.2, I speak of what happens when self-consciousness confronts with another self-consciousness. In the moment of self-consciousness, desire has a new form, which is called “desire for recognition”. I bring up desire for recognition as an origin leading to the struggle between two self-consciousnesses before passing into the opposition between “Master” and “Slave”.

At the end of the Hegel chapter, I recount the relation between self-consciousness and life. The opposition between Master and Slave transforms into another opposition between Slave and Life. To serve

the Master, the Slave must produce Life. While he/she begins to interact with Life, the Slave recognizes him/herself in relation to Life.

I reserve Chapter 3 for Marx. In this chapter, I attempt to show how Marx constructs the dialectical relationship between consciousness and life. Through this aim, at first I make an introduction to Marx's philosophy in 3.1. I stress on the importance of taking Marx as both theoretical and practical figure. Without speaking of his political theory and economic analysis, Marx would be missing. I mention about the origins of Marx's development, which are namely the Industrial Revolution in England, the French revolution and German Idealism.

In 3.1.1, I articulate the influence of German Idealism on Marx's thought. I define German Idealism briefly as a movement aiming to complete Kantian project and dealing with the Enlightenment dualism. In other words, German Idealists attempt to defeat the disparity between human nature and deterministic scientific Newtonian laws. Actually, they try to find a rational ground for morality since there is a gap between "what is" and "what should be". German Idealists find the solution in an idealistic point of view, which is mainly based on a view of reality as developing towards self-

realization. Marx copes with this problem between “factual” and “valuable”, too. However, he does not espouse their idealist solution.

In 3.1.2, I introduce Young Hegelians as another group influencing Marx. Young Hegelians, also called Left Hegelians, is a group against the orthodox interpretation of Hegel’s philosophy. Their aim is to defeat religious aspects of Hegel’s idealist philosophy and to bring a secular explanation of the material world. Marx was one the Young Hegelians but in time, he realizes the efforts of Young Hegelians are insufficient.

In 3.1.3, Feuerbach is taken into consideration since Marx imputes special importance to him. In 3.1.3.1, I give a place to Marx’s positive critiques on Feuerbach. Marx thinks that Feuerbach makes a materialist critique of Hegel’s philosophy. Feuerbach considers on the real, concrete man by eliminating religion and belief in God. Moreover, Feuerbach speaks of man as a social being in a society. Therefore, he gives up the abstract understanding of man as that of in German Idealism. All of the innovations of Feuerbach influenced Marx’s thought.

Nevertheless, Feuerbach’s innovations are not sufficient to be a rival to Hegelian philosophy. I discuss Marx’s critiques on Feuerbach, in

3.1.3.2. Marx claims that Feuerbach's materialist understanding is inadequate and defective. In this part, I go through Marx's theses on Feuerbach. Most of these theses are based on the criticism that Feuerbach's materialism does not sufficiently account for human practice.

In 3.1.4, Marx is taken into account as a political figure. I speak of briefly Marx's terms: substructure, the economical base and superstructure, forms of state and social consciousness. According to Marx, economical base of a society determines the superstructure of the society. Therefore, Marx concerns on the economical base. Marx classifies societies according to their substructure, and he defines his age as capitalism, in which there are two classes: bourgeoisie and proletariat. Bourgeoisie, the owner of capital exploits the working class, proletariat. Marx believes that proletariat will make the revolution and establish a socialist and then communist system.

After generally presenting Marx, I come to the essential point, which is Marx's settling account with Hegel, in 3.2. In this part, I present Marx's critiques on Hegel; some of which posits the worthwhile points of Hegelian philosophy, and some other is very harsh. While Marx emphasizes the importance of Hegel's dialectic, he underlies the mystical aspects of it.

In 3.2.2, I claim that Marx's one of the major critiques on Hegel is about the negative character of labour. Marx brings up that labour in capitalism leads to man alienated from himself. Marx claims that there are four types of alienation; alienation from the product of labour, alienation from the process of production, alienation from the human species and alienation from each other. I pay attention to Marx's theory of alienation since it is the most important divergent aspect of Marx in a relation with Hegel.

In 3.2.3, I speak of Marx's inversion of self-consciousness with man. For Marx, as I said before, self-consciousness is an abstract thought, not representing the real man. Therefore, instead of self-consciousness, Marx always uses man in his economic relations.

In 3.3, I deal with the relation between consciousness and life in Marx's thought. Marx regards this relation as a matter of human practice. Otherwise, it would be a scholastic problem. Therefore, Marx takes human practice as his subject matter and deals with the economic needs and activities of human beings. Instead of Hegel's Master-Slave parable, Marx considers the struggle between the "capitalist" and the "worker", which are not abstract self-consciousnesses, but they refer to definite classes. Besides, unlike

Hegel's Slave, the worker cannot realize him/herself through his/her work. On the contrary, while the worker produces for the capitalist, he/she consumes him/herself. Moreover, as I stated in the section on Alienation, labour in capitalism leads to the worker's estrangement. Therefore, in Marx's thought, the worker's productive activity does not emancipate him/herself.

In conclusion, I sum up the similarities and differences between Hegel and Marx. I repeat my thesis that consciousness and life are in a mutual dialectic relation, but the diverse objectives of Hegel and Marx lead them to develop different accounts of the dialectical relation between consciousness and life. While Hegel aims to give a comprehensive ontological and epistemological explanation of the consciousness-life relation, Marx takes this relation as a matter of practice.

CHAPTER II

DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE IN HEGEL

2.1 Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy and the Phenomenology

Before examining a philosopher's specific approach to a problem, it is necessary to be acquainted with his/her manner of philosophizing, namely, his/her general approach to basic philosophical problems, the main concepts used by him/her and so on. This would make it easier to grasp that philosopher's solution or approach to that problem. Therefore, I prefer to begin with introduction to a general feedback for the Hegelian philosophy, before directly addressing our subject matter, that is, the dialectical relation between consciousness and life.

Hegel is an interesting philosopher in the history of philosophy since he aims to comprise every single philosopher and every idea. In the history of philosophy, since Plato and Aristotle, philosophers have

refuted previous philosopher's ideas and opposed themselves to the previous' one. On the contrary, Hegel aims to combine all the opposed ideas and beliefs proposed throughout the history of philosophy into a unified whole. He does not deny any of the ideas and beliefs, not even the contradictory ones. "Hegel throws nothing away".¹⁰ In this direction, Hegel proposes a dialectical way of understanding those contradictions in a united structure. Now then, it is necessary to introduce Hegelian dialectic that demarcates Hegel from other philosophers.

2.1.1 Hegelian Dialectic

As a term, "dialectic" is firstly used in Ancient Greek. Zeno of Elea is regarded as the founder of dialectic. Paradoxes of Zeno and his contradictory reasoning are called "dialectic". For example, for Zeno, the same thing can be limited and unlimited, large and small, at the same time. After Zeno, Plato used "dialectic", for the Socratic dialogues used to obtain knowledge with a logical reasoning. Considering Kant's usage of dialectic, it is called "logic of illusion that transcends our experience" implying incompatible antinomies. For Fichte dialectic is something, having three steps, namely, *thesis* (the I posits itself), *anti-thesis* (the I posits a non-I), and *synthesis* (the I

¹⁰ Taylor, Charles., *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 1977, p.49.

posits in the I a divisible non-I in opposition to the divisible I).¹¹ More precisely, dialectic is called “identity in difference” in Fichte’s philosophy, but this “identity” refers to “I” or “consciousness” and difference refers to “different positions of I”.

All the previous conceptions of dialectic influenced Hegel. However, dialectic for Hegel although characterized by negation and contradiction, is neither a paradox nor an illusion. In fact, Hegel proposes an ontological and epistemological contradiction - not an illusion - but this contradiction does not remain paradoxical, it is resolved through progression. Besides, unlike Fichte, for Hegel dialectic is not a schema composed of three steps, thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Similar to Fichte’s understanding of dialectic, Hegelian dialectic has a threefold nature, but it is not a method to understand reality; it is something immanent to reality.

Actually, Hegel rarely uses the term “dialectic”, because he is against taking dialectic as a philosophical method or principle on a subject matter. Since neither a method nor a principle could explain the vividness of life and complex process of nature.¹² Dialectic simply is

¹¹ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p. 81.

¹² Solomon, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel: A Study of G. W. F. Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1983, p.24.

development of the subject matter.¹³ This development has distinct moments. These moments are usually called “affirmation”, “negation” and “sublation”. The first moment is an immediate moment of the subject matter, extracted from its determinations. Since it is immediate, it is considered as truth, so it is called affirmation. However, when it starts to move, it will naturally change and it will pass onto the opposite side of it, which is merely a negation of itself, so we may say that the being is split. After that the being will return to itself, which is however, not the same point as it was when the process was started, but something more which contains and has integrated the previously negated moments into itself. This last process is called sublation.

Upon first glance, this account of dialectic seems similar to Fichte’s. However, unlike Fichte, dialectical process in the Hegelian sense does not take place only in I, - although this is what Marx accuses Hegel of - but it also occurs in between I and its externality. Moreover, as mentioned above, dialectic is neither a schema nor a method, and therefore it cannot be formulated as “thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis”. The empty formulation of dialectic is not sufficient to understand the rhythm of life.

¹³ Solomon, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel: A Study of G. W. F. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1983, p.25.

On the contrary, dialectic indicates how both reality and thought have not only divided but also united nature throughout the progression. “Dialectic, on Hegel’s view, accounts for all movement and change, both in the world and in our thought about it.”¹⁴ That is, dialectic is a way for Hegel to explain all the transition in nature and in the history of thought, which lead to contradictions, in a cohesive system. “It also explains why things, as well as our thoughts, systematically cohere with each other.”¹⁵ In other words, for Hegel, dialectic is an explanation of the change in thought and in reality. Owing to this change or movement, we perceive reality and thought, as if they have divided and contradictory nature. However, this division and contradiction are nothing else than the transformation of the unity. Therefore, Hegelian dialectic illuminates how it is possible for reality and thought to be both unity and diversity.

To understand dialectic, it is necessary to examine the concrete instances, provided by Hegel. Hegel narrates the dialectical process as the story of a “journey”, more accurately the “journey of Spirit”.

¹⁴ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p.83.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.83.

2.1.2 The Dialectical Journey of Spirit

As mentioned in the previous part, Hegel explains all contradictions as different perceptions of reality. I mean, the differences are the effects of different manifestations of reality or in the Hegelian terminology “transition of Spirit”¹⁶. In other words, Hegel tries to display that all the opposed ideas and concepts can actually be explained as different manifestations of Spirit (Self-consciousness) through its dialectical transformation.

On the other hand, Marx describes Hegel’s construction about the journey of Spirit as a movement of an abstract subject, which is not a concrete human being but a spiritual thought. Marx claims that, in this construction, Hegel also mystifies real nature. Therefore, the relation between subject and object is a mystic alienation of Spirit. He speaks of the process of Spirit:

...this process must have a bearer, a subject. But the subject first emerges as a result. This result—the subject knowing itself as absolute self-consciousness—is therefore *God—absolute Spirit—the self-knowing and self-manifesting Idea*. Real man and real nature become mere predicates—symbols of this esoteric, unreal man and of this unreal nature. Subject and predicate are therefore related to each other in absolute inversion—a *mystical subject-object* or a *subjectivity reaching beyond the object—the absolute subject as a*

¹⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 11.

process, as subject alienating itself and returning from alienation into itself, but at the same time retracting this alienation into itself, and the subject as this process, a pure, restless revolving within itself.¹⁷

As seen from the quotation, Marx claims that Spirit does refer to neither real man nor real nature. Therefore, the “restless turn of Spirit” is for Marx a mystical narration of the process of thought. However, Hegel uses the word Spirit for both its mystical or abstract and concrete senses. Hence, Spirit has a dialectical movement going on between the opposite poles. At this point, I examine the nature of Spirit in Hegel’s philosophy to understand whether Marx’s criticisms about it are well-taken.

2.1.2.1 Spirit

Spirit - not mind - the English translation of *Geist*, is a central concept in the Hegelian philosophy. Several cautionary remarks about the term “Spirit” are in order.

(1) Hegel uses the concept of Spirit in various senses, as I said before, such as nature, subjective spirit, intuition, objective spirit, absolute spirit, world-spirit, history and God. Those meanings of Spirit do not refer to several Spirits, in Hegelian philosophy; they

¹⁷ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p.122.

refer to only one Spirit. That is, Hegel's use of "Spirit" usually contains all of the meanings above. However, sometimes Hegel refers to one single meaning and then what it means is that Hegel refers to a certain stage of the Spirit.¹⁸ For example, when Hegel talks about an individual Spirit, he adds later that kind of Spirit is an incomplete Spirit. Furthermore, he claims "the single individual must also pass through the formative stages of universal Spirit".¹⁹

(2) Subsequently, Spirit is something dynamic, which goes on from one stage or one mode to another. It changes in time; therefore, we cannot consider Spirit to be something fixed and static but it is something active and full of life in the same way that the reality is. In fact, considering Hegelian philosophy, it is difficult to treat reality and Spirit as distinct entities, since from the beginning of the *Phenomenology*, Hegel speaks of understanding of Spirit and reality, as if they are well matched. In his Preface to the *Phenomenology*, he defines the maturation of Spirit as the initial appearance of the new world.²⁰ As Inwood States;

... since it is activity, not a thing, and, as truly infinite, is not sharply distinct from the finite, *Geist* cannot simply transcend worldly

¹⁸ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, pp. 275-6.

¹⁹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 28.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, § 13.

phenomena, and is hard to distinguish from the logical structure of these phenomena.²¹

(3) Accordingly, Spirit is not merely a mental entity, but at the same time something physical and practical. Although it seems contradictory, Hegel associates both cognitive and practical properties in the body of Spirit. Hegel considers Spirit as both subject and object.²²

Hegel's claim that *Geist* is the absolute does not mean that everything is mental or the product of one's own mind, but that: (a) the unified system of thoughts and rational structures that form the core of the (subjective) *Geist* are immanent in nature and in the development of *Geist* itself; and (b) spirit/mind 'overreaches' (*übergreift*) and idealizes what is other than spirit, by its cognitive and practical activities.²³

In this sense, Spirit is one unique entity that embodies both totality or universality and particularity, or both objectivity and subjectivity. However, the uniqueness or the sameness of the Spirit is dividable into "various shapes and forms which have become its moments"²⁴. Spirit has different appearances in time, so, Spirit is both unity and contradiction. More precisely, Hegel sometimes talks about Spirit referring to unique God, but sometimes to individual human beings. Therefore, Spirit is something finite and infinite, particular and universal.

²¹ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p 277.

²² Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 25.

²³ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p 277.

²⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 12.

Moreover, Spirit is not a being, but process of becoming. It is always in movement and transforms itself. Hegel illustrates the transformation of Spirit with a metaphor, the growth of a child. A child, after coming into the world, has slowly grown up with the help of nourishment. After a time passes, the quantitative growth in the child's body leads to a qualitative leap. Likewise, the Spirit makes qualitative leaps and acquires new shapes.²⁵

At this point, I want to return to the critique of Marx, accusing the Hegelian Spirit as being mystical explanation of human alienation. Although at the first glance Spirit, as a word, has a mystical association, Hegel carries the word beyond its mystical senses. Hegel grasps the Spirit as an expression of the full reality. Hegelian philosophy and especially Hegelian Spirit will be more clear in the subsequent part, with the clarification of the concept of Science, one of the problematical concepts in Hegelian philosophy.

2.1.2.2 Science

According to Hegel, while Spirit moves on from one moment to another, the previous philosophers obviously catch the knowledge of the one moment. As a result, the knowledge, held on, is always

²⁵ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 11.

condemned to be falsified, when the Spirit passes into another moment. Hegel defines this kind of knowledge as “partial truth” which is not knowledge of the totality but only of a certain moment. “The True is the whole. But the whole is nothing other than the essence consummating itself through its development.”²⁶ In other words, actual knowledge for Hegel is what he calls “Absolute knowledge” or “Science”²⁷ which is the knowledge of the Spirit, knowing itself. “The Spirit that, so developed, knows itself as Spirit is *Science*; Science is its actuality and the realm which it builds for itself in its own element”.²⁸ Therefore, for Hegel, Science is not a partial knowing but apprehending the whole not as stable, but in the process, since as Spirit matures, Science will also mature.

Hegel believed that he lived in a very special time. Therefore, according to Hegel, partial knowledge can be thrown away and Science can be performed only in this new age, for the reason that Spirit has matured and the veil on it is uncovered, so the Spirit has got the possibility of knowing itself. Nevertheless, Hegel does not mean that Spirit has reached a complete maturity and we have its Absolute knowledge. Instead, he always insists on the instability of the Spirit.

²⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 20.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, § 12.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, § 25.

Besides, it is not difficult to see that ours is a birth-time and a period of transition to new era. Spirit (Geist) has broken with the world it has hitherto inhabited and imagined, and is of a mind to submerge it in the past, and in the labour of its own transformation. Spirit is indeed never at rest but always engaged in moving forward...the Spirit in its formation matures slowly and quietly into its new shape, dissolving bit by bit the structure of its previous world...But this new world is no more a complete actuality than is new-born child; it is essential to bear in mind.²⁹

Thus, this new era carries with it the possibility of performing the Science. Up to this age, the science is misunderstood and “is vulnerable to criticism”³⁰, owing to the fact that the Spirit was not completed and had not acquired its perfect form. Hegel thinks that criticism of Science is unjust since Spirit has recently reached the stage where it has returned into itself.³¹ Therefore, it is the time of apprehending reality, so it is the time of Science.

Who apprehends reality is consciousness, that is, the Hegelian subject. This apprehension would be possible when Spirit has matured or returned into itself. With Hegel’s expression, when the Spirit returns into itself, it at the same time reveals itself to the knowledge of consciousness, that is, it has lifted its veil to be accessible to everyone.³² However, it is very hard to explain the relation between consciousness and the Spirit. On the one hand, the

²⁹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, §§ 11-12.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, § 14.

³¹ *Ibid.*, § 14.

³² *Ibid.*, § 13.

Spirit and consciousness are not actually diverse regarding their ontological essences since as I mentioned above Hegel uses Spirit for both universal and particular consciousnesses. On the other hand, they are different in their manifestations.

Hegel demonstrates how such a perfect Science is possible in his *Phenomenology of Spirit* or *Science of the Experience of Consciousness*. So, before continuing on the discussion, I will now introduce the *Phenomenology*, where Hegel talks about, how the Spirit transforms itself in the dialectical journey of Self-consciousness, what truth is, what knowledge is, what experience is, various dialectical manifestations of Spirit and so on.

2.1.3 About the *Phenomenology*

2.1.3.1 Phenomenology of Spirit

The *Phenomenology of Spirit*, more accurately *System of Science: First Part: the Phenomenology of Spirit*, first published in 1807, is one of the major volumes of Hegel. In this work, Hegel intended to make an introduction to his system; however, the introduction expanded and become a separate and incredibly significant volume.³³ In other

³³ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p.216.

words, *Phenomenology of Spirit* goes beyond Hegel's intentions; it becomes the part of the System as well as an introduction to it.³⁴

As Houlgate claims, "Hegel's mature philosophy begins – historically and systematically – with the *Phenomenology of Spirit*".³⁵ Hegel considers his "*Phenomenology of Spirit*" as a "forepiece"³⁶ work so that he can prepare readers, supposedly full of confusions and misunderstandings, to his system. In his announcement of his new book, *Phenomenology*, Hegel describes it as a new kind of knowledge and declaration of Science:

This volume deals with the becoming of knowledge. The phenomenology of spirit is to replace psychological explanations as well as the more abstract discussions of the foundation of knowledge. It considers the *preparation* for science from a point of view...It includes the various *forms of the spirit* as the stations on the way on which it becomes pure knowledge or absolute spirit...The wealth of the appearances of the spirit, which at first glance seems chaotic, is brought into a scientific order which presents them according to their necessity in which the imperfect ones dissolve and pass over into higher ones which constitute their next truth.³⁷

Then, *Phenomenology* deals with our previous considerations about knowledge and Science, which are seen as not false but partial, and thus incomplete. In the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel provides a

³⁴ Kainz, Howard P., *Hegel's Phenomenology, Part1: Analysis and Commentary*, Ohio University Press, Athens, 1976, p.14.

³⁵ Houlgate, Stephen., "Introduction", *The Hegel Reader*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, USA, 1998, p.47.

³⁶ Findlay, "Foreword to *Phenomenology of Spirit*", in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press, 1977, p.v.

³⁷ Kaufmann, Walter., *Hegel: Texts and Commentary*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame Indiana, 1977 p.4.

detailed phenomenological description of the experience of consciousness and declares that the science is nothing more than the experience of consciousness. In fact, *The Phenomenology of Spirit* is also called as *Science of the Experience of Consciousness*, a subtitle which appeared on some printed copies.³⁸

In brief, with the help of this volume, the reader, namely an ordinary consciousness, can grasp the dialectical voyage through the phenomenological analysis of Hegel. Therefore, while the reader is an “ordinary” or “natural consciousness”, he/she upon reading the *Phenomenology*, becomes a “self-consciousness” and can realize the Spirit. More precisely, while reading *Phenomenology*, the reader reads not only the journey of Spirit but also a story of him/herself; actually they are not so distinct. Therefore, the reader who read the journey of his/herself will become a conscious being, namely, he/she becomes self-consciousness.

Before inquiring what those terms are, natural (ordinary) consciousness, consciousness and self-consciousness, it should be mentioned that while reading *Phenomenology*, the reader is often faced with many ambiguous terms and concepts, such as Spirit, Absolute, Science, Truth, consciousness, Self-consciousness and so

³⁸ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, pp. 216-7.

on. Although, some of them were used in the literature of philosophy before Hegel, what they mean in Hegelian sense is not apparently clear. Hegel does not give us the definitions of these concepts; instead they are unfolded with the whole philosophy of Hegel. For example, the concept Absolute is used by Nicholas of Cusa, as referring to “God” and by Kant, as referring to “ultimate, unconditioned reality”³⁹. These definitions are not untrue for Hegel, but he has assigned a more comprehensive meaning to the Absolute. Therefore, one needs to grasp Hegel’s general aim in order to understand the meaning of Hegelian concepts.

2.1.3.2 Hegel’s Aim with the *Phenomenology*

Since Hegel does not state his aim explicitly, it is not easy to grasp Hegel’s aim. Hegel declares his aim neither in a sentence nor in a paragraph, but he forces the reader to comprehend the whole system or the process’ itself. Therefore, understanding the aim of Hegel would not be possible at the beginning but with the help of the “journey” through his philosophy, the reader would grasp his aim and his result.

³⁹ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p. 10.

For Hegel, as he claims in his Preface to *Phenomenology of Spirit*, stating the aim itself is only a “lifeless universal”⁴⁰, which may conceal the actual process, that is, what he writes about cannot be limited in a mere proposition. Moreover, Hegel thinks that a proposition or a principle may be easily refutable⁴¹. Therefore, instead of declaring a proposition or a result, Hegel prefers to narrate the process, which cannot be reduced either in a proposition or in a result. “For the real issue is not exhausted by stating it as an aim, but by carrying it out, nor is the result the actual whole, but rather the result together with the process through which it came about.”⁴² In other words, what Hegel wants from the reader is to join to the journey or the process’ itself so that he/she can get the result by him/herself.

On the other hand, we can derive some clues about Hegel’s aim from his Preface to *Phenomenology of Spirit*. First, Hegelian dialectics actually aims to come over previous philosophers’ misconceptions and approaches to phenomena. In particular, Hegel was not pleased with the logic of either/or which cannot explain either the complexity of life or the development of self-consciousness.

⁴⁰ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 3.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, § 24.

⁴² *Ibid.*, § 3.

The more conventional opinion gets fixated on the antithesis of truth and falsity, the more it tends to expect a given philosophical systems as the progressive unfolding of truth, but rather sees in its simple disagreements...when the fruit appears, the blossom is shown up in its turn as a false manifestation of the plant, and the fruit now emerges as the truth of it instead. These forms are not just distinguished from one another, they also supplant one another as mutually incompatible. Yet at the same time, their fluid nature makes them moments of an organic unity in which they not only do not conflict, but in which each is as necessary as the other; and this mutual necessity alone constitutes the life of the whole.⁴³

What Hegel is getting at in this passage is that our truth-values and propositions are inadequate to capture the complexity of life and nature. That is, the complex and flux structure of life cannot be reduced to a method or principle, whichfore Hegel does not propose a method or a principle for his philosophy. Therefore, the reader cannot grasp at the start what Hegel wants to say. The only way to understand what Hegel claims is by penetrating into his works. In other words, the reader should follow Hegel's journey as an ordinary passenger, so that he/she can grasp the language of Hegel's works.

Secondly, Hegel aims to make a presuppositionless philosophy. According to Hegel, previous philosophers had presuppositions, so they mislead. For example, Ancient philosophy began with "being" or object", perceived as "true knowledge". Modernity, especially Descartes grasped that certain truth is in the "subject", or "*cogito*".⁴⁴

⁴³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 2.

⁴⁴ Ucar, Meryem., "Hegel's Understandig: The Inverted World", Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, August, 2004, p. 12.

Therefore, Hegel initially copes with the previous presuppositions of philosophy, and then he achieves an unconditioned philosophy.

Hegel begins his journey in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, with the traditional questions on knowledge, truth and Science, and he takes an ordinary consciousness' approach to these concepts as his starting point. In his article "Introduction: Hegel and the Problem of Metaphysics", Beiser describes the methodology of *Phenomenology of Spirit* as follows:

Hegel shows how the attempt by ordinary consciousness to know reality in itself ends in contradiction, and how this contradiction can be resolved only through rising to a more inclusive standpoint. The dialectic of ordinary consciousness consists in its self-examination, the comparison of its actual knowing with its own standard of knowledge. The self-examination essentially consists in two tests: the claim of ordinary consciousness to know reality itself is tested against its own standard of knowledge; this standard of knowledge is itself tested against its own experience. The dialectic continues until a standard of knowledge is found that is adequate to the experience of consciousness. This standard is, of course, that of subject-object identity itself.⁴⁵

Consequently, what Hegel aims in his *Phenomenology* is to enlighten the phenomenological experience of consciousness that is indeed a dialectical journey of Spirit, through an unconditioned philosophy. The journey begins with a phenomenological relation. Consciousness wants to know object's essence but it already has the Notion of object. Therefore, consciousness wants to reach a point where the

⁴⁵ Beiser, Frederick C., "Introduction: Hegel and the Problem of Metaphysics", *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, 1993. p.19.

Notion and essence correspond to each other i.e., Truth or Absolute knowledge. Thus, the phenomenological relation is actually a knowing activity between consciousness and object.

While trying to know the Truth, consciousness relates with an object, which is seen as immediate knowledge or truth. Nevertheless, this attempt leads consciousness to realize that the truth is nothing but the relation between consciousness and object. In other words, consciousness notices the identity between knowing and objecthood. As a result, the opposition between subject and object is superseded through this dialectical journey, which is at the same time consciousness' self-certainty. Hence, consciousness becomes aware of itself as a consciousness of consciousness, namely, "self-consciousness". Self-consciousness is a new mode of consciousness in which consciousness is more aware of itself and the process.

2.2 Consciousness and Self-Consciousness

Hegel makes a distinction, which is very important for Hegelian philosophy, between consciousness and self-consciousness. Hegel considers both consciousness and self-consciousness to be specific moments of the Spirit. Further, there is even a some kind of

hierarchical difference between the two moments of the Spirit, respectively consciousness and self-consciousness. In the Hegelian dialectic, the latter moment, which is self-consciousness, always consists of the former one, which is consciousness.

Some Hegel commentators think that the *Phenomenology* begins with self-consciousness. Especially Kojève's influential lectures on Hegel and his well-known book *Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy* maintains that Phenomenology must begin with self-consciousness. Kojève's anthropological reading of Phenomenology emphasizes the importance of the subject but the Hegelian philosophy is unconditional philosophy. He tries to make philosophy without presuppositions so he must show how immediate consciousness mediates itself with itself. So Phenomenology must begin with consciousness.⁴⁶

Consciousness, as a term, is used in both psychology and philosophy to indicate some kind of "awareness of one's own existence;"⁴⁷ namely, it may be called a "mental state distinguishing itself from its surroundings". Similarly, Hegel also uses "consciousness" as "awareness of itself"; however, this awareness is only achieved with the help of an object, which is different from the "self". Both "Kant and Hegel use *das Bewusstsein*"⁴⁸ to denote not only a subject's consciousness, but the conscious SUBJECT himself, in contrast to the object of which he is conscious".⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Uçar, Meryem., "Hegel's Understandig: The Inverted World", Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, August, 2004, p. 13.

⁴⁷ Webster's Desk Dictionary, Gramercy Books, New York, 1993, p. 95.

⁴⁸ German word for consciousness.

⁴⁹ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p. 61.

However, this “awareness of itself” does not mean “awareness of itself as a human being” or as a “self-consciousness“, since it does not know “what it is” at this stage. What is clear at this stage is that one relates with an object and situates itself in contrast to this object so that one will become aware of itself as a subject, or as an I, which is not merely the object. In reality, awareness does not mean “awareness of itself as something”, but it is “awareness of itself in contrast to the other”. Therefore, consciousness for Hegel is something constituted in a relational process with an object. That is, the awareness is a situation of consciousness who knows the disparity between object and itself.

Nevertheless, the disparity between consciousness and object does not amount to subjectivity in Hegel’s philosophy. To articulate an “I” is not sufficient condition for subjectivity. There is more to subjectivity than awareness of itself. As Taylor claims, “Hegel’s theory of the subject was a theory of self-realization”⁵⁰. That is, the “I” necessarily realizes itself in the relation with the object. That which realizes itself and so who returns to itself is the Hegelian subject, namely self-consciousness.

⁵⁰ Taylor, Charles., *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 1977, p. 81.

Self-consciousness is the resultant stage of the process of consciousness, overcoming the disparity between consciousness and object and then returning to itself. In other words, self-consciousness is a position, in which the otherness of the object is superseded through the experience. Basically, “to be fully self-consciousness is not simply to be conscious of oneself in contrast to objects, but to see the external world as the product, the possession, of the mirror image of one’s own self”.⁵¹

Then again, self-consciousness has a divided structure as consciousnesses. If it had not, self-consciousness would not move on anymore, it would be stable, and so it would become empty. Therefore, self-consciousness is always involved in a negative relationship with an other. The relation must be a negative, since affirmative relation consists of the danger of stability. Consequently, self-consciousness will interact with another self-consciousness and then with life. Life is not simply an object for self-consciousness; it is more than that, since it is vivid and active. While self-consciousness produces the life, life produces self-consciousness. More precisely, self-consciousness is a being in life but it can put itself in contrast to life, which leads to self-consciousness’ ability, transforming the life.

⁵¹ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p. 61.

Nevertheless, Hegel does not present the rough story above; processes of consciousness and self-consciousness are both extensive periods, in *Phenomenology of Spirit*. The reason why I explain the two concepts superficially is to indicate that first, that the subject opposed to life is not consciousness but self-consciousness in Hegelian philosophy, but second, that there is a way to self-consciousness, preceded by consciousness. Therefore, before passing through the moment of self-consciousness, we should look at the previous process between consciousness and object.

2.2.1 Consciousness and Object

The relation between consciousness and object starts with knowing activity. However, in this stage, Hegel prefers to use the term “natural” or “ordinary consciousness” since the natural consciousness has some presuppositions regarding knowledge and cognition, and misconceptions about the truth and the Absolute. Actually natural consciousness wants to know the truth; but it believes that this would be possible with either an instrument or a medium. That is, it assumes that cognition is either a medium or an instrument getting hold of the truth or the Absolute. However, observed through an instrument or medium, the object will no longer be the same object. When the object confronts an external thing, it

naturally changes and it would be impossible to know whether what we know is the influence of that external thing or the object's itself.⁵²

Moreover, for Hegel, assuming cognition as an instrument or as a medium leads ordinary consciousness to think that there is a difference between this cognition and us. Furthermore, the ordinary consciousness draws a line between cognition and the Absolute, due to the fact that forms of knowing are to be either mediums or instruments.⁵³ Therefore, the instrument is external to both object and us.

In order to know, consciousness firstly distinguishes itself from something other than itself. In other words, consciousness splits itself from the object, which is known. In this moment, the object is defined as the "moment of truth". Since the object is considered as in-itself, the pure reality, the truth. However, when consciousness inquires to know the in-itself, the object in-itself becomes *for-consciousness*. "Yet in this inquiry knowledge is our object, something that exists for us; and the in-itself that would supposedly result from it would rather be the being of knowledge for us".⁵⁴ This moment is called as "moment of knowledge".

⁵² Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 73.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, § 74.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, § 83.

In brief, we as ordinary consciousnesses seek real knowledge or the truth but we do not know whether we confront with the appearance of knowledge or the knowledge of the appearance. At this point, “natural consciousness will show itself to be only the Notion of knowledge, or in other words, not to be real knowledge.”⁵⁵ Then the object of knowledge is considered as the essence or the truth. Accordingly, natural consciousness draws a distinction between Notion and essence, or, between knowledge and truth. Afterwards natural consciousness examines whether Notion corresponds to the object. In other words, natural consciousness aims the point where knowledge has no longer a “beyond”, that is “where Notion corresponds to the object and the object to the Notion”.⁵⁶ How it is possible to reach such a point may be questioned. Therefore, ordinary consciousness tries to find out a criterion to obtain fixed knowledge of the reality.⁵⁷

However, the question above would not be the true formulation, which leads us to grasp the whole process. Since, how to be known is related with what is known, and what is known is related with how it is known. There is no need to seek for a criterion of knowing, the

⁵⁵ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 78.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, § 80.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, § 81.

criterion is our way of knowing, apprehending the moment of truth and the moment of knowledge. There is no independent truth, the criterion lies between consciousness and object. Therefore, the criterion is hidden in the dialectic whether object confronts our knowledge or our knowledge confronts the object.

Looking closely at the dialectical process, firstly it would be observed that; in order to know, consciousness relates itself with the object. Before relating with consciousness, the object stands as an “in-itself”, which means being external to the consciousness. This is the moment of truth since the object is not mediated with the consciousness. However, the consciousness is necessarily defined as “consciousness of something”. So, the object would become “for consciousness”. Moreover, this second moment can be defined as the moment of knowledge. Since the object reveals itself to the consciousness, it would be from now on “being of knowledge for consciousness”. Its truth is transformed into knowledge of consciousness. Consequently, when consciousness starts to know something it changes at the same time. Therefore, the task of consciousness is to observe those moments and find the criterion within the process, which is dialectics.

One of the most essential characteristics of Hegel’s philosophical viewpoint is that it involved the realization that our objective world is permeated with the alterations made by subjectivity; and that

subjectivity itself is essentially oriented to, and conditioned and determine by, some type of objectivity. Obviously the reality which we encounter is the result of the interaction between these two poles.⁵⁸

To sum up, the criterion is nothing but merely the relation between consciousness and object. In this stage, consciousness grasps itself through the object, which is called “mediation” in the Hegelian terminology. While consciousness and object are immediate, they are mediated with each other and after this progression; consciousness realizes their unity which underlies the reality, or the truth. At the same time, this progression is called as “sublation” or “supersession”, or in German “*Aufhebung*”.

Aufheben, namely “to sublimate”, is the verb form of *Aufhebung*, which has three meanings: first, to raise or to hold, second, to abolish or to cancel, and third, to keep or to preserve.⁵⁹

Therefore, the knowing relation between consciousness and object is not a contemplative process, on the contrary, it is active since consciousness modifies not only object, not only him/herself but also the relation itself through mediation. After that, the relation will not be the same as before because the immediacy of consciousness is

⁵⁸ Kainz, Howard P., *Hegel's Phenomenology, Part1: Analysis and Commentary*, Ohio University Press, Athens, 1976, p.9.

⁵⁹ Inwood, Michael., *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992, p. 283.

destroyed and the object and consciousness are sublated in a further stage, namely “self-consciousness”.

2.2.2 Self-consciousness

While the relation between the knower subject and the known object is thus explained, the relationship between consciousness and life can not derived merely from the dialectics between consciousness and object, since consciousness must confront another consciousness to grasp the whole relation with life. In fact, when the relation between consciousness and object is sublated, the mode of consciousness is ended that consciousness moves on the further stage, namely, self-consciousness. Hence, we should look at the process of consciousness’s positing its own self, as self-consciousness.

As Hegel claims, “in the previous modes of certainty, what is true for consciousness is something other than itself.”⁶⁰ However, the truth of the otherness of the object of consciousness is superseded in experience, as told in the previous chapter. Thus having looked at consciousness trying to achieve knowledge through the object, Hegel

⁶⁰ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 166.

turns to consciousness' itself. So, at the present there has arisen a new mode of consciousness, which is self-consciousness.

In self-consciousness, the Notion and the object of consciousness are identical so its certainty and its truth are identical since "the Notion of the object is superseded in the actual object".⁶¹ Hegel states, "With self-consciousness, then, we have therefore entered the native realm of truth".⁶² Solomon explains Hegel's idea of "self-consciousness" with Fichte's claim: "Strictly speaking, you have no consciousness of things, but only consciousness of consciousness of things."⁶³ As with Fichte, for Hegel also, self-consciousness, or consciousness of consciousness of things is the real subject, since it experiences not only things but also itself, as consciousness of things.

Remember that, to be a self-consciousness, consciousness makes a distinction within itself as object and Notion, since consciousness always needs to relate to an other. That is, consciousness wants to know its object which consciousness has to negate the object, in order to form a relationship. Nevertheless, when the object of consciousness is consciousness itself, there is not a real split

⁶¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 166.

⁶² *Ibid.*, § 167.

⁶³ Solomon, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel: A Study of G. W. F. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1983, p.425.

between the object and its Notion. If we call the Notion “I”, its object will also be the same “I” and it would be possible to say, “I am I”; however, this claim is only a motionless tautology, not self-consciousness. “In this sphere, self-consciousness exhibits itself as the movement in which this antithesis is removed, and the identity of itself becomes explicit for it.”⁶⁴

However, when we consider only the abstraction $I = I$, we have merely an inert tautology. The movement of self-consciousness, without which it would not exist, requires otherness, that is, the world of consciousness which in this way is preserved for self-consciousness. But it is preserved not as a being-in-itself, as an object which consciousness passively reflects, but as a negative object, as the object which must be negated in order that through this negation of the being-other self-consciousness establish its own unity with itself.⁶⁵

“Self-consciousness is the reflection out of being of the world of sense and perception and is essentially the return from otherness”.⁶⁶

Hence, self-consciousness has two moments: awareness of the sensible world and awareness of itself because appearance and truth are united and one in self-consciousness. However, this unity in self-consciousness is not an end since it does not provide a satisfaction for self-consciousness. To reach a satisfaction, self-consciousness

⁶⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 167.

⁶⁵ Hyppolite, Jean., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1974, p. 158.

⁶⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 167.

needs completion, which “contains nothing alien”.⁶⁷ Therefore, self-consciousness must deal with alien entities. That is why Hegel claims Self-consciousness is possible only in relation to an “other”.⁶⁸ Actually, the otherness is there – namely, external, sensible, vivid life. “Life constitutes the first truth of self-consciousness and appears as its other”.⁶⁹ Taylor speaks about the essentiality of life for self-consciousness’ completion:

Integrity thus cannot be achieved through an inner retreat, in which self-consciousness would cut itself off from the bodily. But once one admits that I am nothing apart from my body, we have also to count with the fact that my body is dependent on the surrounding world, that my life depends on a series of interchanges with this milieu.⁷⁰

The relation where self-consciousness opposes with life is not knowing activity as in the moment of the opposition between consciousness and object. In the previous mode, self-consciousness grasped the criterion of knowledge, lying between consciousness and object. In the new mode, on the other hand, the relation is negatively characterized from the start; that is, self-consciousness is practically driven to cancel the otherness of Life. This adventure of self-consciousness is named “desire”.

⁶⁷ Taylor, Charles., *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 1977, p.148.

⁶⁸ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 167.

⁶⁹ Hyppolite, Jean., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1974, p.161.

⁷⁰ Taylor, Charles., *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 1977, p.149.

2.2.2.1 Desire

Desire is one of the core concepts in Hegel's philosophy because desire seems to be the only way for self-consciousness to assure its self-certainty to the self-consciousness. Remembering that the Hegelian subject in the "consciousness and object" model, tried to know the object, which is considered by consciousness as "truth". But, in this moment, self-consciousness wants to obtain the certainty of itself. This certainty cannot be derived from solipsist self-consciousness, so self-consciousness needs an other.

"Man becomes conscious of himself at the moment when – for the first time – he says 'I'".⁷¹ While self-consciousness posits itself as an I, it then needs a predicate which must be different from the I. However, as I said before the certainty of self-consciousness cannot be obtained only from self-consciousness itself. The relation which will be constructed between self-consciousness and the other can no longer be a knowing activity, which was sublated in the previous moment.

The man who contemplates is "absorbed" by what he contemplates; the "knowing subject" "loses" himself in the object that is known. Contemplation reveals the object, not the subject. The object, and

⁷¹ Kojève, Alexandre., *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1969, p. 3.

not the subject, is what shows itself to him in and by – or better, as – the act of knowing. The man who is “absorbed” by the object that he is contemplating can be “brought back to himself” only by Desire; by desire to eat, for example.⁷²

Therefore, the intentionality of self-consciousness towards the sensible world and towards itself can be named as desire. “Desire that man is formed and is revealed – to himself and to others – as an I, as the I that is essentially different from, and radically opposed to, the non-I.”⁷³ In other words, this desire has two objects. The first is the other and the second is the self. Attempting to find out certainty of itself, self-consciousness inclines towards its other, the independent being, and then reflects from it back into itself. “Self-consciousness which ...directly characterizes its object as a negative element or is primarily desire, will therefore on the contrary, learn through experience that the object is independent.”⁷⁴

The intentionality of self-consciousness towards to sensible world is destructive since self-consciousness needs satisfaction. Kojève states “...the I of Desire is an emptiness that receives a real positive content only by negating action that satisfies Desire in destroying,

⁷² Kojève, Alexandre., *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1969, p.3.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 4.

⁷⁴ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 168.

transforming and “assimilating” the desired non-I”.⁷⁵ That is, through destroying the non-I, which is desired, self-consciousness obtains its subjective satisfaction, or certainty of itself. “...self-consciousness is thus certain of itself only by superseding this other that presents itself to self-consciousness as an independent life.”⁷⁶ In other words, self-consciousness’ desire towards life is satisfied with the destruction of the independence of the other. For example, self-consciousness desires an apple, which makes it possible for self-consciousness to claim, “I desire”. In other words, self-consciousness finds its certainty in desiring the apple. However, to satisfy its desire, self-consciousness eats that apple. After consuming it, the apple would no longer be an other for self-consciousness to satisfy its certainty.

The consciousness of Self as the reality responsible for non-phenomenal constructions, and therefore, lying behind external phenomena, has a more adequate exemplification in the state of Desire, the attitude which seeks to make external things conform to our requirements, instead of merely seeking to discover that they do so. It has also a more adequate exemplification where a phenomenal object is living: a living thing has something of the perpetual direction towards self which is characteristic of the self-conscious subject, and therefore, serves to mirror the latter.⁷⁷

Therefore, the satisfaction of self-consciousness through consumption of the other is not a real satisfaction. For the certainty of self-consciousness is needed an other, but when self-consciousness

⁷⁵ Kojève, Alexandre., *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1969, p. 4.

⁷⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 174.

⁷⁷ Findlay, J. N., *Hegel A Re-Examination*, Routledge, Great Britain, 1958, p. 96.

destroys the otherness of the object of desire, then the certainty or returning from the other cannot be achieved. That is, the consumed other can no longer be a mirror for self-consciousness, and cannot reflect self-consciousness back to it. Remember that, all the work of self-consciousness is aimed at reaching certainty of itself. Self-consciousness can be certain of itself only by superseding this other that presents itself to self-consciousness as an independent life. Self-consciousness is inclined to supersede the other by destroying its independent being. However, since the object conditions satisfaction of self-consciousness, self-consciousness cannot attain true satisfaction in this way.

Generally speaking, the I of Desire is an emptiness that receives a real positive content only by negating action that satisfies Desire in destroying, transforming, and “assimilating” the desired non-I. And the positive content of the I, constituted by negation, is a function of the positive content of the negated non-I. If then, the Desire is directed toward a “natural” non-I, the I, too, will be “natural”.⁷⁸

Thus, the object should reflect self-consciousness’ negative activity. For this reason, the object must be capable of independent self-negation just like self-consciousness. Only this could provide a perfect reflection of the negative activity of self-consciousness in relation to its object. Subsequently, object cannot be superseded by a merely negative relation and it must also carry out the negation of

⁷⁸ Kojève, Alexandre., *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1969, p.4.

itself by itself. In other words, when self-consciousness abolishes the object then it turns out to be positive again and “desire is never exhausted”⁷⁹. Kojève describes that kind of desire as “animalistic desire” and “human Desire must be directed toward another Desire”.⁸⁰ Therefore, the object of the self-consciousness must be another self-consciousness. As Hegel announces, “Self-consciousness achieves its satisfaction only in another self-consciousness.”⁸¹

The manner in which the living organism abolishes articulate otherness and in which ordinary desire does so, are merely undeveloped versions of the abolition of otherness which occurs in the mutual recognition of two self-conscious persons.⁸²

2.2.2.2 Desire for Recognition

When Hegel claims that another self-consciousness is needed for the satisfaction of self-consciousness, he actually refers to the satisfaction of Spirit. To complete itself, Spirit first overcame the duality between consciousness and object. Then it posited itself as life and self-consciousness, so as desire. In this moment, self-

⁷⁹ Hyppolite, Jean., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1974, p.163.

⁸⁰ Kojève, Alexandre., *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1969, p.5.

⁸¹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 175.

⁸² Findlay, “Analysis of Text”, in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 176.

consciousness seeks its own certainty, its own essentiality as an individual. For self-consciousness, the other, which is considered as ordinary objects like being of Life, is a negatively characterized unessential object. With the help of desire, self-consciousness tried to return into itself from the mirror of life. But abolishing the independency of life did not provide a satisfaction to self-consciousness. Afterwards, self-consciousness needs to settle account with another self-consciousness. Repeatedly the two self-consciousnesses are nothing but the self-division of Spirit.⁸³ Therefore, Hegel begins with “Self-consciousness exists in and for-itself when, and by the fact that, it so exists for another”.⁸⁴ This indicates not only distinct moments but also a whole process.

Self-consciousness lives outside of itself in another self-consciousness, in which it at once loses and also finds itself. Self-consciousness is intrinsically set to eliminate this alien self-hood, but in being so set, it is both set to eliminate the other in order to achieve its own certainty, and also to eliminate itself in the process, since it is itself that other.⁸⁵

At the beginning of the process, losing the certainty itself, self-consciousness attempt to find it out in another self-consciousness. When self-consciousness is faced with another self-consciousness, first it has to lose itself, for it finds itself as another being; secondly in

⁸³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 177.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, § 178.

⁸⁵ Findlay, “Anaylisis of Text”, in Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 179-180.

doing so, it has superseded the other.⁸⁶ For it does not see the other as an essential being, but in the other sees its own self. Therefore, “it must supersede this otherness of itself”⁸⁷, which is equally a return into itself. Because firstly, through this supersession, it receives back its own self because by superseding its otherness it again becomes equal to itself. For it saw itself in other but supersedes this being of itself in the other thus lets the other again go free. Therefore, they recognize themselves as mutually recognizing one another.⁸⁸

Nevertheless, demanding its own certainty, self-consciousness faces with another self-consciousness. However, for the self-consciousness, the other is an unessential negatively characterized object. They have not yet exposed themselves to each other as self-consciousness. “Each is indeed certain of its own self but not of the other and therefore its own self-certainty still has no truth.”⁸⁹ For it to be true, it must be recognized by the other as an independent self-consciousness in a relation of recognition.

Life and death struggle is the main determination of who will recognize and who will be recognized. In this struggle, “each seeks

⁸⁶ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 181.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, § 180.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, § 181.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, § 186.

the death of the other”⁹⁰. Nevertheless, the individual, who has not risked his life, will lose essentiality of his self-consciousness whereas the individual, who will not be attached to any specific existence and not attached to Life, will gain his recognition.

Afterwards, one posits itself as a pure self-consciousness and the other is self-consciousness but in “the form of thinghood”⁹¹. Namely, the former becomes Master while the latter is Slave. Master posits itself as a self-consciousness, “he is the power over this thing [things as such the object of desire] and this again is the power over the other [Slave]”⁹².

2.3 The Relation between Self-consciousness and Life in Hegel

At the first glance, we observe that Master overcomes his animal parts and so Life. He posits himself as a Master of both Life and Slave who sinks back to the Life, since Slave relates himself to his animal part. However, after this point, Master-Slave dialectic progresses in a surprisingly different way. It turns out that the Master, who is the winner of the Life and Death struggle, is dependent on the

⁹⁰ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 187.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, § 189.

⁹² *Ibid.* § 190.

Slave both for his recognition and his productions.⁹³ That is to say, Master, mediates himself with the Slave. On the other side, the Slave works for the Master and by working, he individualizes himself on his works and he suspends on his desires. Thus, by working for another, he raises himself above life. Through his service, he rids himself of his attachment to natural existence in every single detail; and gets rid of it by working on it. That is, Slave ends of better than the Master does in that it covers more ground in attaining self-consciousness.⁹⁴

Moreover, the Slave has experienced the fear of death, which is the Absolute Lord. Nevertheless, this pure universal moment is the simple essential nature of self-consciousness, absolute negativity. Through work, the Slave is able to express this essential nature of itself in an object.⁹⁵

Although Slave liberates himself from his animal part, he still does not postulate himself as a completed self-consciousness, because he needs the recognition of the Master. Hence, both Master and Slave are dependent consciousness. In this way, consciousness or worker comes to see in the independent being (of the object) its own

⁹³ Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977, § 192.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, § 193.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, § 194.

independence. Therefore, Life is very significant in the Hegelian philosophy since bounding to life is the origin of all production.

Accordingly, we can say that while self-consciousness produces or conditions life, life also conditions and produces self-consciousness. But, I would like to remind that the Phenomenology continues with various other forms and transformations, self-consciousness goes through but I stop at the end of the Master-Slave dialectic.

CHAPTER III

DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE IN MARX

3.1 Introduction to Marx's Philosophy

Since it is impossible to detach Marx's philosophy from his political posture, I do not know how to begin telling Marx, whether I should begin with Marx as a successor of Hegel, or with his 11th thesis - Marx against philosophy – or with his political impact and economic analyses. Actually introducing Marx should cover all of these aspects. Since his theory is a composition of his philosophical, political and economic considerations, Marx cannot be captured by only as a thinker or as a political performer.

In this sense, Karl Marx might be the last renaissance thinker in that he was interested in philosophy, sociology, anthropology, history, politics, and economics; in addition, he participated in worker's organizations, strikes, and demonstrations. While Marx was

performing his theories, he theorized about the practices of his age. We could therefore, define Marx as “a thinker of his age”, but he also made predictions on later periods, and his impact has continued to be influential in our world also, which means that he is not only the thinker of his age but also of our ages. As Singer claims, “Marx’s impact can only be compared with that of religious figures like Jesus or Muhammad”⁹⁶.

It may be convenient to begin with; the historical development of Marx’s thought. As Hook claims, looking at the early periods of Marx’s development is not only due to academic or historic interest, but also it is more than that. “...the doctrines and attitudes which Marx opposed in the forties of the last century still flourish to-day in distorted form as essential parts of influential contemporary ideologies.”⁹⁷ We could take a short look at this period, it is important to understand the roots of Marx’s thought. Marx’s philosophy has been influenced by several sources and understanding these sources will help us to understand better the philosophy of Marx.

In general, Marx’s thought was formed under the influence of three factors; “German idealism”, “the French Revolution”, and “the Industrial Revolution, in England”. These three grounds led Marx to

⁹⁶ Singer, Peter., *Marx*, Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford, New York, 1980, p.1.

⁹⁷ Hook, Sidney., *From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1950, p. 77.

develop a materialist understanding of world. With the critique of German idealism, he builds up a materialist philosophy, in which state of affairs are not managed by god or any transcendental being but explained by merely material determinants. Moreover, the French Revolution and its three tenets, freedom, equality and brotherhood have a great influence on Marx developing a revolutionary theory. Furthermore, the Industrial revolution and the classical economy theories in England led Marx to analyze the capitalist system and the role of the proletarians.⁹⁸

Although the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution have great impacts on Marx's thought, these issues are not directly related with the subject matter. Therefore, they will not be dealt with in detail in this study. His attitude towards German Idealism, on the other hand, is closely related to the focus of the subject matter. In fact, Marx began his intellectual life among the Young Hegelians, who had a certain stance towards German Idealism. Consequently, German idealism and Young Hegelians are going to be mentioned briefly in this section.

⁹⁸ Lenin, V. I., *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Sol yayınları, Ankara, 1997, p. 18.

3.1.1 German Idealism and Marx

The period in which a certain kind of philosophy was dominant in Germany between the late eighteenth and the middle of the nineteenth century is called German Idealism. This period is actually begins with Kant and ends with Hegel. German Idealism might be portrayed as a movement aiming to complete the Kantian project, namely deriving principles of both knowledge and ethics from the spontaneity and autonomy of mind or spirit⁹⁹. In other words, Kant aims to obtain a rational ground of not only scientific knowledge, but also principles of ethics. More precisely, the Kantian project, which is not legislated by Kant himself but by the philosophers after Kant, is an endeavor to overcome the disparity between the factual and the valuable.

The disparity between morality and deterministic nature is also called Enlightenment dualism, which is “an expression of an alienated world that cannot reconcile morality with nature because it has fallen out of touch with real life context”¹⁰⁰. The Enlightenment view of nature is that of Newtonian science the subject has a passive role in such a deterministic nature, so there is no room left for morality. Yet

⁹⁹ Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, from the article on German Idealism.

¹⁰⁰ Parkan, Barış., *Alienation*, A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts, Philosophy at The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May 1996, p. 5.

Enlightenment philosophers, most notably Kant, struggle to reserve a special place for human subjectivity and morality. This dualism causes a split between the subject and its immediate environment.¹⁰¹

To overcome the Enlightenment dualism, philosophers after Kant, such as Jacobi, Reinhold, Fichte, and Schelling wanted to complete the Kantian project by overcoming Kantian dichotomies like the distinction, between mind and reality or understanding and sensibility. Since these philosophers understood reality either as existing for the mind or as a content of mind, they are called “idealists”. In trying to overcome Kantian dichotomies, these German Idealist philosophers developed different systems. However, they all supported the idea that reality is something organic and vivid; therefore, while these distinctions are not illusory, they are different stages of the reality’s development towards its self-realization.¹⁰²

Actually the idea is similar to Hegel’s one, in which the Spirit, through its self-realization process passes from different stages and the distinct forms of the Spirit is the result of being Spirit on those stages

¹⁰¹ Parkan, Barış., *Alienation*, A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts, Philosophy at The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May 1996, pp. 5-6.

¹⁰² Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, from the article on German Idealism.

This atmosphere influenced not only Marx, but also his intellectual contemporaries, called “Young Hegelians”¹⁰³. Marx, like German Idealists, wanted to solve these conflicts between the two opposite poles, especially “what is” i.e., the factual and “what should be” i.e., the valuable, as he was studying law. For Marx, the philosophical notions explaining what should be were true. However, they were not sufficient to explain the facts.¹⁰⁴ He means that philosophical notions offer us “truths” and “what should be”, nevertheless in “reality” we are faced with facts which do not correspond to the values of philosophy. In other words, philosophy proposes an abstraction but this abstraction is not compatible with the concrete factual. To sum up, Marx was concerned with the angle between “truth” and “reality”.

In a letter of Marx to his father written in 1837, he told his puzzlement about concrete facts and philosophical abstractions about the truths:

Particularly, I was greatly disturbed by the conflict between what is and what should be, a conflict peculiar to idealism... [The nature of] the triangle induces the mathematician to construct it, to demonstrate its properties, but it remains a mere representation in space and undergoes no further development...On the other hand, in the concrete expression of the living world of thought –as in law, the state, nature, philosophy, as a whole- the object itself must be studied in its development; there must be no arbitrary classification; the Reason of the thing itself must roll forward in all its contradictoriness and find its unity in itself.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Young Hegelians are told in the next part.

¹⁰⁴ Howard, Dick., *The Development of Marxian Dialectic*, Southern Illinois University Press, USA, 1972, p. 6.

¹⁰⁵ Marx, Karl., from *The Development of Marxian Dialectic*, by Dick Howard, Southern Illinois University Press, USA, 1972, p.9.

At that time, Marx could notice that the solution of the problem lies under a dialectical conception of reality but for Marx the reality could not be assigned to the realm of mind or spirit. In other words, Marx had the same problem that the German Idealists' had, but he rejected their solutions and he was trying to find another way of mediation between the two poles. During his intellectual survey, coming across Hegel facilitated him to form his thought. The period is called the "Young Hegelian" period of Marx.

3.1.2 Young Hegelians and Marx

The Young Hegelians, also called Left Hegelians, is a group opposed to the orthodox interpretation of Hegel. They were trying to refine Hegelian philosophy from its the mystical and religious aspects. Preserving the Hegelian dialectical process, they supported French enlightenment and materialism. Besides, they strongly criticized traditional religion and political institutions. They interpreted Hegelian philosophy not as the history of God, Spirit or Mind but instead only as the history of human being's emancipation.

So the Young Hegelians thought Hegel's philosophy both mystifyingly presented and incomplete. When rewritten in terms of the real world instead of the mysterious world of Mind, it made sense. 'Mind' was read as 'human self-consciousness. The goal of

history became the liberation of humanity; but this could not be achieved until the religious illusion had been overcome.¹⁰⁶

On the one hand, Young Hegelian philosophers had great achievements in secularizing the Hegelian philosophy. In this movement, in addition to Marx, Strauss, Bauer, Ruge, Stirner, Hess, and Feuerbach had taken place. Marx as a Young Hegelian followed the secularization movement of the Hegelian philosophy. From his early writings, Marx has developed his materialist philosophy as opposed to Hegel's idealist one. To this end, he took into consideration their critiques of German Idealism and Hegel's philosophy. From Bauer Marx took incisive criticism of religion, from Feuerbach radical humanism instead of Hegel's supremacy of Idea, from Stirner going beyond Feuerbach's static humanism, and from Hess ideal of communism¹⁰⁷.

On the other hand, Marx disapproves of Young Hegelians for the reason that they cannot rupture from the Hegelian philosophy. Their criticism remained in border of Hegelian philosophy. According to Marx, Young Hegelians grasp fixed concepts, thoughts and ideas in a society as the products of consciousness. Although they are right, they only struggle against these products, or illusions of consciousness, which is their mistake. In *Economic and*

¹⁰⁶ Singer, Peter., *Marx*, Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford, New York, 1980, p. 15.

¹⁰⁷ Bottomore, Tom., *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, 2nd edition, Blackwell, USA, 1991, p. 592.

Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, and *German Ideology*, Marx presents a total critique of Hegelian dialectic and philosophy. In this critique, Marx criticizes Young Hegelians and their critiques of Hegel. Marx condemns Young Hegelians as “critics like *Strauss* and *Bruno Bauer* still remain within the confines of the Hegelian logic” and their “expressions do not even show any verbal divergence from the Hegelian approach, but on the contrary repeat it word for word”¹⁰⁸.

Since, according to their fantasy, the relationships of men, all their doings, their chains and their limitations are products of their consciousness, the Young Hegelians logically put to men the moral postulate of exchanging their present consciousness for human, critical or egoistic consciousness, and thus of removing their limitations. This demand to change consciousness amounts to a demand to interpret reality in another way, i.e. to recognise it by means of another interpretation. ...The only results which this philosophic criticism could achieve were a few (and at that thoroughly one-sided) elucidations of Christianity from the point of view of religious history; all the rest of their assertions are only further embellishments of their claim to have furnished, in these unimportant elucidations, discoveries of universal importance.¹⁰⁹

With an exception, Marx appraises Feuerbach’s critique of Hegel in contrast to that of other Young Hegelians. However, he also criticizes Feuerbach, which is discussed in the next part. While Marx offers his critiques to Feuerbach and other materialists, he also repeats his comments on German Idealism and Hegelian philosophy. In a few words, during this period, Marx got the idea that philosophy must focus on the issues of the actual world. Therefore, a materialistic

¹⁰⁸ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 106.

¹⁰⁹ Marx, Karl., “German Ideology”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 149.

philosophy must be developed but this does not mean a philosophy based only on the empirical facts, it needs to mediate with human being's interference. For Marx, while philosophy becomes worldly, the world will become philosophical.¹¹⁰

After this period, Marx needs to make a comprehensive critique of Hegel and to improve his materialistic worldly philosophy. Hence, Marx is not satisfied with the solution to the dilemma between "what is" and "what should be" that is offered by German Idealists or Young Hegelians. Therefore, Marx formulates his own critique and develops his worldly philosophy.

3.1.3 Feuerbach and Marx

3.1.3.1 Innovation of Feuerbach

Marx states that Feuerbach is the only thinker making a materialist critique of Hegel. In his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx reserves an exceptional place for Feuerbach, different from other Young Hegelians. He claims, "*Feuerbach* is the only one who has a *serious, critical* attitude to the Hegelian dialectic and who

¹¹⁰ Howard, Dick., *The Development of Marxian Dialectic*, Southern Illinois University Press, USA, 1972, p. 22.

has made genuine discoveries in this field.”¹¹¹ Although Marx preserves Feuerbach’s materialist critique of Hegel in his philosophy, he goes on further and transforms this critique into a new philosophy.

For Marx, Feuerbach’s success is based mainly on the three elements of his critiques on Hegelian philosophy:

(1) Feuerbach defines philosophy as a religion or as a form of estrangement of human beings.¹¹² For Feuerbach, the concept of Absolute used for God by both German Idealists and Hegel is nothing, but merely an estrangement of human beings. “Then Feuerbach goes beyond religion, arguing that any philosophy which concentrates on the mental rather than the material side of Human nature is a form of alienation.”¹¹³ He defends that the needs and the desires of human beings are presented as properties of God. Subsequently, minimizing themselves, human beings created an imaginary and transcendental being. Feuerbach explains the situation as human beings’ estrangement. In other words, according to Feuerbach what lies under neat belief in religion and God are human needs and desires.

¹¹¹ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 107.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 107-8.

¹¹³ Singer, Peter., *Marx*, Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford, New York, 1980, p.19.

Therefore, Feuerbach is the foremost philosopher reducing theology into anthropology. "So Feuerbach put at centre of his philosophy neither God nor thought, but man."¹¹⁴ Furthermore, Feuerbach accuses Hegel of bringing together philosophy and religion, which are never gotten together.¹¹⁵ These strong critiques of Feuerbach influenced Marx's thoughts about religion and the idea of God. However, according to Marx, the base of human alienation is neither religion nor philosophy.

(2) Marx enumerates second success of Feuerbach as his stress on social relation of human beings. The base of Feuerbach's philosophy is the social relation between man and man, which is the true materialism for Marx.¹¹⁶ In place of the relation between man and the Spirit, explained in Hegelian philosophy, Feuerbach puts the relation between man and man. Since as mentioned above Feuerbach denounces the concepts like Spirit, Absolute and God as the estrangement of human beings, he accounts for the relation between man and Spirit as a social relation among human beings.

¹¹⁴ Singer, Peter., *Marx*, Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford, New York, 1980, p.17.

¹¹⁵ Cevizci, Ahmet., *Felsefe Sözlüğü*, Paradigma, İstanbul, 1999, p.345.

¹¹⁶ Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 108.

(3) Feuerbach objects that “negation of negation” in Hegel turns out to be an “absolute positivism”.¹¹⁷ In Hegelian dialectics, negation of negation results in a kind of self-affirmation, that is, the self returns into itself from the other through negating it. Where it returns into to itself there is only a positive (affirmative) being without any contradiction. In addition, without any contradiction the self cannot move forward. However, contradiction is necessary for the self to progress. Therefore, Feuerbach criticizes Hegel’s understanding of transformation of negation of negation into self-affirmation.

Thus, for instance, after superseding religion, after recognizing religion to be a product of self-alienation he yet finds confirmation of himself in *religion as religion*. Here *is* the root of Hegel’s *false* positivism, or of his merely *apparent* criticism: this is what Feuerbach designated as the positing, negating and re-establishing of religion or theology – but it has to be expressed in more general terms.¹¹⁸

Consequently, Marx highlights the three points of Feuerbach’s critique of Hegel. Moreover, he repeats these points several times. For example, he states in his *Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right: Introduction*, “man makes religion, religion does not make man”.¹¹⁹

Religion is, indeed, the self-consciousness and self-esteem of man who has either not yet won through to himself, or has already lost

¹¹⁷ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 108.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.118.

¹¹⁹ Marx, Karl, “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right: Introduction”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p.53.

himself again. But *man* is no abstract being squatting outside the world. Man is *the world of man* – state, society. This state and this society produce religion, which is an *inverted consciousness of the world*, because they are an *inverted world*.¹²⁰

Moreover, Marx insists that man is a social being living in a concrete world. Therefore, man should understand the world in which he lives instead of theorizing about an abstract consciousness. Understanding the concrete social relations is the actual self-realization of man, not returning into itself as stated in Hegelian philosophy.

3.1.3.2 Marx's Critique of Feuerbach

Although Marx credits Feuerbach's critiques for being worthwhile achievements for materialist philosophy, he states that materialist philosophy of Feuerbach is inadequate and defective. Marx enumerates his critiques of Feuerbach in his *Theses on Feuerbach*¹²¹:

(1) Marx accuses Feuerbach of disregarding the active role of human beings in the objective world. According to Marx, Feuerbach grasps

¹²⁰ Marx, Karl, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 53.

¹²¹ Marx, Karl., "Theses on Feuerbach", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

reality as something purely objective without any intervention of human activity.

The chief defect of all hitherto – existing materialism that of Feuerbach included – is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the *object or of contemplation*, but not as *sensuous human activity, practice*, not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the *active* side was developed abstractly by idealism – which, of course, does not know real, sensuous activity as such.¹²²

In this quotation, Marx disagrees with the existing materialism and Feuerbach, defending an immediate objectivity. Therefore, Marx puts the stress on the “sensuous human activity or practice”. On the other hand, Marx highlights that German Idealism or precisely Hegel could see the active role of human beings although they consider the reality as merely an idea.

(2) Marx claims that Feuerbach does not perceive the role of practice while deciding on the objective truth. The question whether thinking has reality or not is merely a scholastic problem for Marx. Instead, the reality or the validity of thought must be proved in a practical process.¹²³ Hegel’s Master Slave parable is a good illustration of this situation. After the struggle, the defeated Slave achieves his/her recognition through his/her products from Life. On the other hand, the

¹²² Marx, Karl., “Theses on Feuerbach”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, thesis 1, p. 143.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, thesis 2, p.144.

Master loses his/her certainty, since he/she does nothing to prove his/her certainty in practical Life.

Hegel unites ontology and epistemology in “Sense Certainty”¹²⁴. As I repeatedly mention in the part “Consciousness and Object”, when consciousness tries to know the ontological essence of the object, both consciousness and object change through this relation. Through this process, consciousness grasps that ontological status of the object is altered with the knowing activity. Therefore, there is a strong connection relation between epistemology and ontology.

In this context, Marx also observes a strong connection between the practical activities of human beings and epistemology. He states, “human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question”.¹²⁵ According to Marx, “the reality of human thinking” or “objective truth” is a matter of human practice. Otherwise, it becomes the problem of scholastics.¹²⁶

(3) Like previous materialist thinkers, Marx admits that human beings are determined by the circumstances; however, unlike them, Marx claims that those who modify the circumstances and themselves are

¹²⁴ “Sense-certainty” is a title of a part in “Phenomenology of Spirit”.

¹²⁵ Marx, Karl., “Theses on Feuerbach”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, thesis 2, p.144.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, thesis 2, p.144.

also human beings. For Marx, human beings must educate themselves to alter the circumstances; which is identified by Marx as a revolutionary practice of human beings.¹²⁷

(4) In the fourth thesis, Marx claims that Feuerbach makes a distinction between the religious world and the secular world. In addition, eliminating the religious one, Feuerbach believes, will solve social problems regarding the secularization of the world and institutions, such as family, education and so on. However, Marx raises the problem that the institutions or the world in which we live already create the religious forms. Therefore, eliminating religion and “religious self-alienation” is not adequate for the substantiation of secularization. Additionally, what is needed is the removal of other precedent institutions. “Thus, for instance, after the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family, the former must then itself be criticized in theory and revolutionized practice.”¹²⁸

(5) While Feuerbach criticizes conceptualizing the essence of human beings on the basis of religion, he disregards the fact that the essence of human beings is not an abstraction derived from every single individual; for Marx, it is an “ensemble of social relations”.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Marx, Karl., “Theses on Feuerbach”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, thesis 3, p. 144.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, thesis 4, p. 144.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, thesis 6, p. 145.

Therefore, Marx claims, Feuerbach cannot observe that religion is also product of social relations.¹³⁰

(6) Marx criticizes previous materialism as contemplative materialism. He thinks that all concepts of thought and phenomena must be considered in the realm of human practice.¹³¹ Moreover, he concludes his critiques with his famous statement: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it.”¹³²

3.1.4 Marx’s Political Theory

I always want to put a stress on the political position of Marx. Without speaking of his political theory and economic analysis, Marx would be missing. Whereas he began his intellectual life as a philosopher, he continued as a political theoretician. In fact, he remarks that both philosophical and political problems result from the contradictions of the substructure, which is the economic organization of society. He distinguishes the substructure from the superstructure, which refers to forms of state and social consciousness, and which is conditioned by the substructure, the economic base. “The social organization

¹³⁰ Marx, Karl., “Theses on Feuerbach”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, thesis 7, p. 145.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, thesis 9, p. 145.

¹³² *Ibid.*, thesis 12, p. 145.

evolving directly out of production and commerce, which in all ages forms the basis of the state and of the rest of the idealist superstructure.”¹³³

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general.¹³⁴

Marx states that men are distinguished from animals by their productions.¹³⁵ Men produce their material life and needs with the help of extant means of production. Who owns the means of production varies from society to society and era to era. Besides, the owners of the means production have got the economic control and political power. In fact, organization of production, distribution of means of production and distribution of products determine the structure of society and its politics. Accordingly, Marx classifies ages and societies along the lines of their economic organizations. Except for private communal era, in every age, a certain class, the owner of the means of production, exploits the other class, which serves the former.

¹³³ Marx, Karl., “German Ideology”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 176.

¹³⁴ Marx, “Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 4.

¹³⁵ Marx, Karl., “German Ideology”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p.150.

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.¹³⁶

Marx defines his own era as “capitalism”, in which the bourgeoisie exploit the proletariat, the working class. The bourgeoisie came on the scene in the feudal system and overthrew it with the help of industrial development. Then this system founded by the bourgeoisie has generated the proletariat and the latest class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has begun. According to Marx, proletariat is the class which will remove power from the bourgeoisie and establish a new system in which the exploitation will be minimized – socialism – and even eliminated in time – communism. Marx presents this process as a necessity. In other words, the capitalist system is condemned to end. “What the bourgeoisie therefore produces above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.”¹³⁷ Heilbroner explains Marx’s argument:

The technical base of capitalism was industrial production. Its superstructure was the system of private property, under which a portion of society’s output went to those who owned its great technical apparatus. The conflict lay in the fact that the base and

¹³⁶ Marx, “Communist Manifesto”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, pp. 473-4.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 475.

superstructure were incompatible. Why? Because the base of industrial production-the actual making of goods-was a highly organized, integrated, interdependent process, whereas the superstructure of private property was the most highly individualistic of social systems.¹³⁸

In brief, Marx believes that proletariat will make the revolution and establish a socialist and then communist system. To this end, Marx always joins into all the revolutionary activities of proletariat. For Marx, philosophers must have a political posture, since “philosophy can only be realized by the abolition¹³⁹ of proletariat, and the proletariat can only be abolished by the realization of philosophy”¹⁴⁰. As I said before, Marx gives preference to the base, substructure, which conditions superstructure. Therefore, the economical base also conditions philosophy and philosophers. “The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force.”¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ Heilbroner, Robert, L., *The Worldly Philosophers; The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1972, p.122.

¹³⁹ In the original text, the word is *Aufhebung*.

¹⁴⁰ Marx, *Contribution to Critique Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction*, from Tucker, p.65.

¹⁴¹ Marx, Karl., “German Ideology”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 172.

3.2 Marx on Hegel: A Settling of Account

3.2.1 Critique of Hegel's Philosophy in General¹⁴²

While Marx was presenting a comprehensive critique of Hegel, he began to form his capable philosophy. These critiques provide us to understand Marx's unique materialism. Therefore, I take a look at Marx's critique of Hegel and his theory of alienation related with his critiques, in his 1844 Paris Manuscripts¹⁴³. Marx in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, asks, "How do we now stand as regards Hegelian dialectics?"¹⁴⁴ As mentioned above, through this question, Marx claims that Young Hegelians have ignored making a total critique of Hegelian philosophy and especially Hegelian dialectics. Therefore, Marx deals with Hegel's *Logic* and *Phenomenology* in order to characterize idealist aspects of Hegelian dialectics.

Although Marx briefly mentions Hegel's *Logic*, he actually focuses on the *Phenomenology*. "Let us take a look at the Hegelian system. One

¹⁴² This title is used by Marx, in his "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

¹⁴³ Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

must begin with Hegel's *Phänomenologie*¹⁴⁵, the true point of origin and the secret of the Hegelian philosophy."¹⁴⁶

3.2.1.1 Marx's Positive Critiques

Before encountering Marx's negative critiques of Hegel, it can be mentioned that Marx stresses on several positive achievements of Hegel's philosophy. These positive critiques are the following:

(1) Marx emphasizes the importance Hegel's innovation of *dialectic of negativity*, which leads to motion and progression.¹⁴⁷ Speculative logic of Hegel leads to destroy all fixed thoughts and universal concepts. With the Hegelian dialectics, definite concepts and independent fixed thoughts are explained with estrangement of thought of human being.¹⁴⁸

(2) Hegel perceives self-formation of man as a process. In other words, man is a being developing himself in a period.¹⁴⁹ In Hegelian philosophy, essence of human beings is not fixed, but open to interaction and change.

¹⁴⁵ *Phänomenologie* is the actual German name of the *Phenomenology*.

¹⁴⁶ Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p.159.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.163.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

(3) Hegel is the first philosopher who speaks of the objectification and estrangement of man. Therefore, Hegel grasps objective man as man's own *labour*. That is, labour appears as the objectification of man.¹⁵⁰

Thus, by grasping the *positive* meaning of self-referred negation (although again in estranged fashion) Hegel grasps man's self-estrangement, the alienation of man's essence, man's loss of objectivity and his loss of realness as self-discovery, manifestation of his nature, objectification and realisation. In short, within the sphere of abstraction, Hegel conceives labour as man's act of *self-genesis* – conceives man's relation to himself as an alien being and the manifestation of himself as an alien being to be the emergence of *species-consciousness* and *species-life*.¹⁵¹

3.2.1.2 Marx's Negative Critiques

Marx's negative critiques of Hegel's philosophy in his EPM can be presented in six points. First Marx claims that all the concepts used by Hegel and the way he conceives the institutions corresponds to abstract entities. Secondly, human beings is also considered as an abstract entity. Thirdly, Marx states that Hegelian dialectics is situated in purely abstract thought. Fourthly, what Hegel means by "labour" is also mental. Fifthly, estrangement or alienation is not real but mental processes. Sixthly, this estrangement is not the manner to be given up, but it should be maintained to be a self-consciousness.

¹⁵⁰ Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 163.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.176.

(1) Marx asserts that in the *Phenomenology*, Hegel uses some words such as wealth, state-power, object, and subject etc., which do not correspond to concrete entities in Hegelian philosophy; instead, they are purely abstract entities. He states that they are the forms of the estrangement of philosophical thought, so they are beings in thought.

152

(2) Moreover, according to Marx, in Hegel's philosophy man appears only as a mind or self-consciousness.¹⁵³ In other words, for Hegel, the essence of human being is self-consciousness which is not real or corporeal man, whose feet are firmly on the solid ground.¹⁵⁴ Actually, "...it is quite false to say on that account *self-consciousness* has eyes, ears, essential powers".¹⁵⁵ That is, self-consciousness is an abstraction of the human being. However, for Marx, human being is an objective being, not an abstraction. For the reason that Hegel entitles consciousness and self-consciousness as the manifestations of Spirit, Marx identifies self-consciousness as a moment of Spirit or as a form of thought. Hence, Marx describes Hegelian self-consciousness or man as pure thought.

¹⁵² Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 110.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

(3) As I mentioned in the second chapter, Hegel usually takes these concepts in paradoxical relations. For example, the object and the subject, the “in-itself” and the “for-itself”, consciousness and self-consciousness, and so on, are used to indicate opposing relations. However, as seen in Hegelian philosophy, since they are different manifestations of the Spirit, these contradictions are resolved and these negations are affirmed in the voyage of the Spirit. In other words, such contradictions are revealed to be nothing but the result of the estrangement of thought.¹⁵⁶ Accordingly, Marx states that the contradictions in Hegelian dialectics are not real oppositions but the abstract splits in mind. As a result, Hegelian dialectics is a movement happening merely in mind.¹⁵⁷

(4) Therefore, the products of human beings are seen as the products of thought or abstract mind.¹⁵⁸ That is, in Hegelian philosophy, both labour and products of human beings are considered intellectual. Marx accuses Hegel by saying that “the only labour which Hegel knows and recognizes is *abstractly mental labour*”¹⁵⁹.

¹⁵⁶ Marx, Karl., “Theses on Feuerbach”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 161-2.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 162-3.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

(5) Then in Hegel, the estrangement of human being is the estrangement of self-consciousness happening in the realm of thought.¹⁶⁰ In contrast, according to Marx, the objectification or estrangement is not happening in mind but rather it takes place in the objective world between the concrete man and his concrete products.¹⁶¹

(6) Nevertheless, according to Marx, Hegel cannot see the negative characteristic of labour. “He [Hegel] grasps *labour* as the *essence* of man...he sees only the positive, not the negative side of labour. Labour is *man’s coming-to-be* for himself within *alienation*, or as *alienated* man.”¹⁶² Hence, as stated the previous part, according to Marx, Hegel takes labour as self-genesis of man. However, for Marx, labour and its “natural” consequence alienation are negative processes for human beings. Although Marx sometimes claims that alienation as the natural consequence of labour, he actually refers to alienation of the labour in the capitalist system. Therefore, to understand why alienation and labour have negative consequences, it is necessary to look into Marx’s economic analyses.

¹⁶⁰ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 166.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p.168.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 164.

3.2.2 Alienation and Capitalism

At this point, as I go on to Marx's theory of alienation, I want to remind that Marx uses the terms "worker" or "proletariat" and "capitalist" or "bourgeoisie", instead of Hegel's Slave and Master. Unlike Slave and Master, "worker" and "capitalist" refer to definite classes. But similarly, the worker serves the capitalist, who owns the capital or namely, the "means of production". While the worker produces for the capitalist, he/she consumes him/herself. This is the most clear negative aspect of labour.

Labour is defined as "an interaction between the person who works and the natural world such that elements of the latter are consciously altered in a purposive manner"¹⁶³. Like Hegel, Marx considers that the productive interaction between man and nature alters not only nature but also man. However, in the capitalist system, "labour does not only create goods; it also produces itself and worker as a *commodity*".¹⁶⁴ Within capitalist relations, labour becomes a power which causes the worker to become a commodity, that is, "the worker puts his life into the object, and his life then belongs no longer to

¹⁶³ Bottomore, Tom., *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, 2nd edition, Blackwell, USA, 1991, p.297.

¹⁶⁴ Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p.121.

himself but to the object.¹⁶⁵ Therefore, the alienation of the worker is the “natural” outcome of labour in the capitalist system.

Man is alienated in two senses: first, the vast majority of men (and perhaps all men) have lost control of the products of their own activity, which now confront them as inhuman ruling powers; secondly, in the process of work itself most men are not productive in the sense of exercising freely their natural powers, but are constrained to perform uninteresting and degrading tasks.¹⁶⁶

In addition, Marx identifies several aspects of labour and four types of alienation, which are summarized in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*:¹⁶⁷

(1) The worker is alienated from the product of labour, since, in the capitalist system, the worker is not the owner of his/her products. The worker produces for the capitalists who sell the products of the worker. The labour and products of the worker become alien commodities for the worker.

(2) In the capitalist production mode, the worker is alienated from the process of production. As the worker is not the owner of his/her products, he/she is not in charge of his/her own laboring activity, either. The worker who works for the capitalist does not produce

¹⁶⁵ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 122.

¹⁶⁶ Fromm, Erich., “Foreword”, *Early Writings*, trans. and ed. T. B. Bottomore, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Toronto, London, 1964, p. 5.

¹⁶⁷ Marx, Karl., “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

voluntarily. "Although they receive a wage, they are actually slaves; they must work in order to survive."¹⁶⁸

(3) The first two forms of alienation bring the third form of alienation, which is alienation from "man's species being"¹⁶⁹. According to Marx, the laboring activity of human beings is what distinguishes them from animals. Unlike animals, human beings produce not only in order to survive but because "production is [their] active species life"¹⁷⁰. However, in the capitalist system, their productive activity appears only as a means of survival; they lose the reason of their production activity. Therefore, the worker in capitalism as a member of human species is alienated from his/her own species being.

(4) In addition to the three types of alienation described above, the capitalist mode of production leads to a fourth kind of alienation, which is the alienation of human beings from each other. Capitalism creates classes as the capitalist and working class. While there is a struggle continuing between classes, there is also competition among the members of the same class.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁸ Stumpf, Samuel Enoch., *Elements of Philosophy: An Introduction*, 4th ed., McGraw-Hill, Boston, 2002, p. 499.

¹⁶⁹ Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 77.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 76.

¹⁷¹ Stumpf, Samuel Enoch., *Elements of Philosophy: An Introduction*, 4th ed., McGraw-Hill, Boston, 2002, p.498-500.

To sum up, for Marx, the capitalist mode of production alienates both man and human species. Therefore, the working class must alter the capitalist system and in its place build a socialist society, in which alienation will be reduced.

3.2.3 Man versus Self-consciousness

In my opinion, the most important innovation of Marx to (or against) the Hegelian philosophy is, as Marx himself said, that Marx puts Hegel's mystical dialectic "on its feet". For that, Marx replaces Hegel's abstract subject, "self-consciousness" with the concrete "man". From now on philosophy dealt with the concrete man, and his concrete relation, productions, and so on.

Marx states in his *German Ideology* "consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual life-process".¹⁷² Subsequently, Marx takes consciousness as abstract reflection of concrete practices of human beings. In other words, for Marx, consciousness is something, which is produced and formed by the material activities of human beings. However, German philosophy, Marx claims, constructs the relation between consciousness and man conversely. German philosophy begins with

¹⁷² Marx, Karl., "German Ideology", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 150.

consciousness and derives from it the corporeal man. On the contrary, Marx begins with the corporeal man to understand his forms of consciousness, such as, morality, religion, metaphysics, and ideology.

In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. That is to say, we do not set out from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life-process we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life-process.¹⁷³

Therefore, Marx's takes man not as a state of consciousness but in his real life process. What he means by "real life process" is that man produces his material life, which is the most important distinction from animals.¹⁷⁴ In other words, Marx considers man in a relation with the material life and this relation is production. In my opinion, this consideration of Marx is similar to Hegel's one. Similarly, Hegel mentions about Slave producing the life.

3.3 The Relation between Consciousness and Life in Marx

The question about the relation between consciousness and external reality, or life, is important issue for also Marx's philosophy, too. Marx takes this question seriously, since the relation between

¹⁷³ Marx, Karl., "German Ideology", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 150.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

consciousness and life is a very significant topic not only understanding but also transforming the life or reality.

However, as I stated before, if the relation is taken in a hand abstractly then it becomes a scholastic problem. Therefore, Marx considers the problem as a matter of human practice. So, Marx begins with the economical ground underlying the dialectical relation, since Marx aims to save dialectics, which “mystified in the hands of Hegel”.

The mystification which suffers in Hegel's hands, by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell.¹⁷⁵

Therefore Marx, different from Hegel, constructs his world view on a more concrete ground to save dialectics from its mystical interpretation. Accordingly, Marx puts economy at the centre of his theory as a concrete starting point. Since, for Marx, explains his ideas with some kind of different terminology than Hegel's terminology. For instance, Marx prefers to use the terms “worker” and “capitalist” instead of Hegel's “Slave” and “Master”, because to be a worker and to be a capitalist are determined by class which that one belongs.

¹⁷⁵ Marx, Karl., “Afterword to the Second German Edition to *Capital*”, *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978, p. 301.

The most celebrated passage in the *Phenomenology* concerns the relationship of a master to a slave. It well illustrates what Hegel means by dialectic, and it introduces an idea echoed in Marx's view of the relationship between capitalist and worker.¹⁷⁶

As Singer stated, the relation between Master and Slave in Hegel's philosophy is the origin of Marx's economic analysis between capitalist and worker. Nevertheless, capitalist and worker are not two self-consciousnesses in a struggle for recognition in Marx's philosophy. I want to remind that according to capitalist and worker refer to the definite classes, namely, bourgeoisie and proletariat. Besides, the two classes formed in the change of economic base. Their formation does not belong to an abstract drive, such as, desire for recognition, but it is a historical necessity, considering on the transformation of economic base.

In contrast to Hegel, Marx believes that the freedom of proletariat is not inherited in his/her labour, transforming the life. Whereas Slave obtains his/her recognition through the reflection of his/her products, proletariat estranges in stand to his/her products and becomes a commodity. Therefore, the relation between life and worker turns out to be an alienation process. The worker must liberate itself from the alienated labour for the emancipation.

¹⁷⁶ Singer, Peter., *Marx*, Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford, New York, 1980, p.12.

In brief, according to Marx, consciousness does not refer to a corporeal man. Nevertheless, Marx prefers to deal with the corporeal man, which is conditioned by the economic base. Throughout the history, man has different economic relations, which leads to different considerations of man. In his age, Marx takes man as worker. However, the destiny of the worker is not the same with that of the Slave. The worker's freedom is possible only in an economic system, in which there is no alienated labour. Therefore, the worker must alter the capitalist system by overthrowing the bourgeoisie.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I restate some points, which are stated in the previous chapters. Moreover, I want to stress on the importance that Hegel and Marx have diverse objectives. To begin with, their different objectives, I attempt to make clear the grounds why Hegel and Marx have different attitude towards the dialectical relation between consciousness and life.

As explained in chapter 2, Hegel aims to construct a philosophy to compromise all the previous ideas, but this philosophy must be presuppositionless unlike the previous philosophers. To this end, he attempts to show that contradictory ideas are the reflection of the different manifestations of the reality, in the Hegelian terminology, Spirit. Spirit has a dialectical transformation, which can be formulated as affirmation, negation and sublation, although Hegel does not use such a formulation of dialectic.

Besides, Hegel grasps all the opposing relations as the moments of Spirit. In this study, it is mentioned some opposing relations proposed by Hegel, such as consciousness and object, self-consciousness and life and self-consciousness and another self-consciousness, Master and Slave, Slave and Life. Proposing as opposing relations, Hegel actually mentions the own division of Spirit. Therefore, they are not the actual divisions; they are only the consequence of divided nature of Spirit. In every moment, the divisions are sublated. So, again the new contradiction begins with an affirmation.

Although Marx endeavors to find out a unified solution to the Enlightenment dualism, Marx argues with Hegel's unification. Marx opposes Hegel in that Hegel achieves this unification through the concept of Spirit. Therefore, Marx accuses of Hegelian dialectics, suffering from the mystification. Marx finds his solution in the inversion of Hegelian dialectics. This inversion is that Hegelian dialectics is situated on a materialist ground.

Marx's materialistic 'subversion' of Hegel, therefore, was not a shift from one philosophical position to another, nor from philosophy to social theory, but rather a recognition that the established forms of life were reaching the stage of their historical negation.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁷ Marcuse, Herbert. *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1960, p. Xiii.

Marx's materialism is not merely putting matter instead of Spirit. Besides, it is not eliminating religious elements of Hegelian dialectics, either. Otherwise, Marx's materialism could not exceed Feuerbach's materialism. For Marx, the materialist ground of dialectics is an explanation of the economic relations throughout the history. Moreover, Marx presupposes the materialistic world. Without presupposing the materialistic world, the philosophy would be mystified. Thus, the aim of Marx is to make a worldly philosophy. According to Marx, the problems of philosophy should be overcome within the human practice.

Mentioning briefly both Hegel's and Marx's aims, then I continue with the differences in their grasping the dialectical relation between consciousness and life. These differences are in order:

(1) In Hegel's philosophy, the subject appears as both consciousness and self-consciousness, respectively. Consciousness and self-consciousness have different awareness degrees, as explained in chapter 2. Self-consciousness is the actual equivalent of Hegelian subjectivity.

However, Marx contends that self-consciousness does not refer to the actual subject, since self-consciousness is the representation of

thought, not the body of man. According to Marx, self-consciousness is an abstraction, which cannot represent the reality and the concrete man. Therefore, Marx emphasizes the concrete and corporeal man.

(2) Moreover, consciousness refers to “consciousness of a society” or “class consciousness” in Marx’s philosophy. Consciousness has an abstract existence, since it is conditioned by sub-structure, the economic base.

(3) The intention of self-consciousness towards life is named as “desire” in Hegel’s philosophy. That is, at first, Hegel defines a self-consciousness and then he constructs self-consciousness’ intention towards life. On the other hand, for Marx, man is born into a life. So, man is always considered in his life. Unlike Hegel, Marx sees desire as a natural drive to meet a need of human beings, not a means for self-consciousness to achieve certainty of itself.

(4) In Hegel’s philosophy, at the basis of formation of self-consciousnesses as Master and Slave, there is the “desire for recognition” which leads to a struggle between the two self-consciousnesses. Hegel defines this struggle as “life and death struggle” which is the main determination of who will recognize and who will be recognized. The self-consciousness who cannot risk

his/her life becomes Slave and the other become Master over the Slave.

On the other hand, in Marx's philosophy, the struggle occurs between the two classes. Marx defines these classes as ruling class and the working class. He does not mention desire for recognition, since the struggle between the classes is the result of the economic relations.

(5) Hegel states that while Slave produces for his/her Master, he/she recognizes him/herself in the productions. Production provides the certainty to self-consciousness, in the position of Slave. Nevertheless, Marx disagrees with Hegel because of the reason that the while the worker produces, he/she consume him/herself. In addition, labour does not provide emancipation for the worker, but it alienates the worker.

Consequently, diverse objectives of Hegel and Marx lead them to develop different understandings on the dialectical relation between consciousness and life. While Hegel aims to give a comprehensive ontological and epistemological explanation of consciousness-life relation, Marx takes this relation as the matter of practice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beiser, Frederick C., "Introduction: Hegel and the Problem of Metaphysics", *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*, ed. Frederick C. Beiser, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 1993.

Bottomore, Tom., *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, 2nd edition, Blackwell, USA, 1991.

Brudney, Daniel., *Marx's Attempt to Leave Philosophy*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1998.

Cevizci, Ahmet., *Felsefe Sözlüğü*, Paradigma, İstanbul, 1999.

Findlay, J. N., "Analysis of Text" in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977.

Findlay, J. N., *Hegel A Re-Examination*, Routledge, Great Britain, 1958.

Fromm, Erich., "Foreword", *Early Writings*, trans. and ed. T. B. Bottomore, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Toronto, London, 1964.

Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller, Oxford University Press, 1977.

Heilbroner, Robert, L., *The Worldly Philosophers; The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1972.

Hook, Sidney. *From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1950.

Houlgate, Stephen., *The Hegel Reader*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, USA, 1998.

Howard, Dick., *The Development of Marxian Dialectic*, Southern Illinois University Press, USA, 1972.

Hyppolite, Jean., *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1974.

Inwood, Michael. *A Hegel Dictionary*, Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, USA, 1992.

Kainz, Howard P., *Hegel's Phenomenology, Part1: Analysis and Commentary*, Ohio University Press, Athens, 1976.

Kaufmann, Walter., *Hegel: Texts and Commentary*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame Indiana, 1977.

Kaufmann, Walter., *Hegel A Reinterpretation*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1978.

Kojève, Alexandre., *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1969.

Lauer, Quentin. *A Reading of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, Fordham University Press, New York, 1993.

Lenin, V. I., *Marx, Engels, Marxism*, Sol Yayınları, Ankara, 1997.

Löwith, Karl., *From Hegel to Nietzsche: The Revolution in Nineteenth Century Thought*, trans. David E. Green, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc. USA, 1967.

Lukacs, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness*, trans. Rodney Livingstone, the Mit Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1960.

Marx, Karl., "Afterword to the Second German Edition to *Capital*", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

Marx, Karl., "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

Marx, Karl., "German Ideology", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

Marx, Karl., *Early Writings*, trans. and ed. T. B. Bottomore, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Toronto, London, 1964.

Marx, Karl., "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

Marx, Karl., "Theses on Feuerbach", *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. W. W. Norton, New York, 1978.

Parkan, Barış., *Alienation*, A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts, Philosophy at The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May 1996.

Pinkard, Terry. *Hegel: A Biography*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.

Singer, Peter., *Hegel: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 2001.

Singer, Peter., *Marx: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press., Oxford, New York, 1980.

Solomon, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel: A Study of G. W. F. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1983.

Stumpf, Samuel Enoch., *Elements of Philosophy: An Introduction*, 4th ed., McGraw-Hill, Boston, 2002.

Taylor, Charles. *Hegel*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1975.

Uçar, Meryem., "Hegel's Understandig: The Inverted World", Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, August, 2004.

Warminski, Andrzej. "Hegel/Marx: Consciousness and Life", *Hegel After Derrida*, ed. by Stuart Barnett, Routledge, London and New York, 1998.

Wood, Allen. "Hegel and Marxism", *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*, ed. Frederick C. Beiser, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 1993.