

The essence of the wandering man Study on the Triple Definition of Marx's Human Nature Based on Dialectics

Menghao Lv

Department of Marxist College, China Youth of Political Studies, Beijing100089, China

Keywords: human essence, dialectical, triple definition

Abstract: There are three definitions of human nature, that is, the essence of labor, the essence of "the sum of all social relations" and the essence of human need. In fact, the judgment of human nature does not need absolute answer, but dialectical thinking. The study of the triple definition of human nature and the exploration and discussion of dialectics as the basic research method, it is concluded that Marx's definition of human nature is only in the sense of existentialism rather than ontology. It lays a theoretical foundation for exploring human nature at the level of ontology.

1. Introduction

Throughout the development of human history, people's discussion of its own essence has never stopped. Socrates thought that "man is a rational animal ", Aristotle thought that" man is a political animal ". Hegel believes that human nature is free will, which is unremitting exploration and transcendence of human nature. Marx of different periods answered the essence of man from the point of view of practice or historical materialism. In the manuscript of economics and philosophy of 1844, the essence of man is labor; in the outline of Feuerbach, the essence of man is the sum of all social relations; in German ideology, the essence of man is needed. However, Marx's concern for human nature always stays in the field of existentialism, which also leads to the later study of human nature still confined to historical materialism and cannot extricate and transcend. The greatness and science of Marxism unify dialectics and materialism, as well as the study of human nature. Only by exploring the essence of human beings from a dialectical perspective can we better adhere to the historical materialism and realize the breakthrough of human essence in the ontological sense in a more pluralistic way.

2. Dialectical thinking of the first definition: Labor is not the essence but the means

The first redefinition originated from the Manuscript, in which Marx had a preliminary discussion of the nature of human beings and concluded that:" the whole characteristics of a species, the class characteristics of a species lies in the nature of life activities, and free conscious activities are precisely human class characteristics." [1] In short, the conscious activity of freedom is that labor is the nature of human beings. Marx was based on the difference between man and animal, he once said:" animals are only built according to the scale and needs of the species to which they belong, but people know how to produce according to the scale of any species, and know how to apply the internal

scale to the object everywhere; therefore, man is constructed according to the law of beauty." [2] The difference between man and animal is that people already have the real value presupposition before the actual production process, that is, they already have the model frame on the whole, and the process of labor is the creation of people according to their own value scale. Animals are only instinctively productive and living. Therefore, human nature is more universal than animals. Specifically, "whether in humans or in animals, the physical aspect of life is: people (like animals) live on the inorganic world, and the more universal people and animals, the wider the inorganic world of human life." [3] Human nature and animals have a common natural basis, cannot develop independently from nature and all objectification activities are constantly drawn from this nature to maintain people's basic needs. Not only that, Marx said: "Animals do not distinguish themselves from their own life activities. It is its own life activity. Man makes his life itself the object of his will and consciousness. He has conscious life activities." [4] At the level of class life, human beings have more universal meaning than animals. The life of animals is only objectified between itself and object, and human life is not only objectified to the object, but also objectified to the person itself. In addition, the universality of human beings compared with animals lies in the existence of human beings. Marx has made it clear directly in the manuscript that class is the general nature of human beings, that is, the common, universal and general nature of human beings. Whether based on common natural attributes or on the level of class life and nature, human nature is more universal than animals. There are still several points to explain the first definition of Marx's nature. First, Marx's definition of "class" is essentially different from Feuerbach. Marx pointed out that "through practice to create the object world, transform the inorganic world, people prove that they are conscious of the kind of existence, that is, such a kind of existence, it regards the class as its own essence, or regard itself as a kind of existence." [5] People practice to transform the world, but also constantly transform themselves. The reason why people are human is through practice, this kind of objectified activity to prove themselves and transform themselves, in which the object of practice also includes society, nature, Marx's definition of human nature not only Feuerbach's shadow was also influenced by Hegel. Marx praised Hegel's interpretation of human nature to some extent in the manuscript: "Hegel regards human self-generation as a process, objectification as a lost object, externalization and sublation of this externalization." [6] Hegel takes idealism as the starting point and classifies human nature as self-consciousness rather than labor. In the Manuscript, Marx has a further clarification of labor, that is, alienated labor. The introduction of human nature is an important achievement of Marx's discovery of alienated labor. The development of human nature is closely related to the great discovery of alienated labor. Although the first definition of human essence is not analyzed from the perspective of historical materialism, Marx takes the difference between man and animal as the breakthrough point and interprets the nature of human nature from the perspective of universality, which lays the foundation for the second definition.

However, because of the restriction and limitation of social environment, Marx's first definition of human nature is not mature. First, the deviation of the research object leads to the concrete one-sidedness of the conclusion. Feuerbach's old materialism and Hegel's theory of labor had a deep influence on Marx at the beginning. Although he was based on practice and divided with humanism and spiritual labor, Marx's elaboration of the concept of "class" in the manuscript made Marx inevitably too rough to explore the nature of human beings. The concept of class is the meaning of universality and integrity, and the analysis of the concept of human nature has an implicit premise. Marx's essence is to explore every flesh and blood reality of the individual rather than the great discussion of human characteristics. If the "class nature" and "class nature" of human beings are the object of study, then Marx's final conclusion must be the same as Feuerbach's so-called religious sense. Man is a living individual in reality, and every realistic person can carry out free objectification activities. The proposal of "class" is one-sided view of human nature in the whole and universal sense

without focusing on every real person. That is, although Marx explores human nature from the perspective of human and animal differences, the difference between man and animal is essentially a macroscopic difference between two categories, and the difference is very obvious. Second, the one-sidedness of the research conclusion leads to the emergence of mechanical materialism. Human nature is labor cannot be equated with human nature. Because the essence of man is not mechanical labor, labor is only the means of forming human essence, not the original existence of human essence. The direct equivalence of labor to human nature is the biggest misreading of human beings and animals. Just as artificial intelligence is now a free and conscious activity, because man can only work mechanically as long as the material conditions are satisfied, but the nature of man must not be so. The essence of artificial intelligence is human intelligence, the product of human essence objectification, and a production tool of human essence. Therefore, Marx's first definition of human nature has some limitations, whether it is the one-sidedness of the research object or the mechanical nature of the research result itself, which leads to the misreading of human nature. Therefore, labor is not the essence of man but the means.

2.1 The Dialectical Understanding of Second Definition: Social Relations is not the Essence but the Step

Because Marx had just been influenced by Feuerbach's humanism, it was not accurate to explore the breakthrough of human nature. His second definition of human nature is from the natural difference between man and animal to the social difference between man and human, and from this perspective to re-examine the nature of human. In the Outline, Marx put forward the second definition: "the essence of man is not a single inherent abstract, in its reality, it is the sum of all social relations." Marx no longer studies from the sense of universality, but from the standpoint of historical materialism to explore the formation of human nature. Through the theory of alienated labor, Marx reveals that alienation will occur between people under the operation of capital, for example, after alienated labor, landlords and peasants or capitalists and workers, etc. However, all labor, including alienated labor, is carried out in social relations. Not only that, it is the social nature that makes people achieve themselves, Marx believes that "non-object existence is right and wrong." [7] According to the first definition, the nature of human class is realized through objectified activities, that is, labor. People's objectified activities include not only production activities but also social activities between people, and the media of all objectified activities lies in the social relations between people. Marx made it clear in the introduction to "critique of Hegel's philosophy of law" that the essence of "special personality" is not the nature of man's beard, blood abstract body, but human social characteristics." [8] It can be seen that Marx at this time is in the reality of social relations to study the specific reality of human existence, and the reality of human research object is of multiple significance. First of all, the proposal of reality is opposite to abstraction. Marx made it clear in the outline that Feuerbach attributed the essence of religion to the essence of man. However, the nature of man is not an abstraction inherent in a single person. Marx criticized Feuerbach for seeing man as an isolated, abstract man rather than a real man, and Marx based himself on historical materialism to discuss man himself from the perspective of real life. Second, reality and practice are closely combined. Marx made it clear in the outline that "it is understood only in the form of objects or visual objects, not as human perceptual activities, as practice", [9] Marx criticized Feuerbach only in the theoretical sense to study people themselves, not in the practical activities of reality, the development of social relations of human reality benefits from the actual production activities carried out by people, that is, in the actual life. The practical activities carried out by people are realistic. Third, the proposal of reality is the backtracking of Marx's second definition to the first, and the development and formation of "the sum of all social relations" has its foundation in reality. Marx at this time has been a thorough

materialist and in the perspective of historical materialism, the concrete and realistic clarification of human nature, not only in the sense of universality, but from abstract to concrete in depth.

However, Marx's study of human nature still does not find the ultimate answer. Although the research perspective is no longer discussed by universality, but focuses on the particularity of people, it has not yet been implemented to every specific reality. First, there are still deviations in the research object. In Marx's criticism of Feuerbach's "Outline", it expounds how people are different from others from a clear perspective, and then discusses the nature of people. First, is the difference between people the essence of man? Second, it is concluded that human characteristics-social relations are human nature, but social relations cannot be used as the original definition of human nature. The study of the difference between people is the depth of Marx's perspective, but the difference is not the essence. After all, it is impossible to say that the difference between people causes the essence of human beings. Because the above particularity or difference always exists in it, so the research object still exists deviation. Second, the conclusion of the study is too arbitrary. The second definition can sum up the essence of human being is the sum of all social relations, of course, on the basis of reality. In short, the essence of man is equal to all social relations in reality. If the essence of human beings is equal to that of social relations, even in reality, there is no meaning, and if people become people only because of social relations, then there is nothing left in the end. Because social relations, as the existence of acquired nature, rather than innate necessity, equate social relations with the essence of human beings, can it be concluded that people do not only rely on labor to survive the social relations between people? Is it natural to conclude that human nature is caused by social relations without its own necessity? "The sum of all social relations" is the ladder for people to meet their needs to achieve the essence of human beings, because in social relations talent can be divided and exchanged, and division of labor and exchange greatly promote the development of productive forces.

3. Dialectical Understanding of the Third Definition: Human Needs are not Essence but Existence

Marx's third definition of human nature comes from German ideology, that is, human nature is human needs. He said: "in any case, individuals 'always start from themselves', but because they are not unique in the sense that they do not need to have any connection with each other, because their needs, that is, their nature, and the way they seek satisfaction, connect them (gender relations, exchange, division of labor), they must have mutual relations." [10] From this discussion, we can draw the conclusion that Marx has observed the essence of man from the perspective of historical materialism and has retraced and sublimated the definition of human essence made before, because Marx has always been based on the reality of the person and with the reality as the foothold and starting point. Marx's conclusion has its theoretical and practical basis. First, when discussing historical materialism in German ideology, Marx and Engels clearly pointed out: "the premise that we begin to talk about is not arbitrary, not dogma, but some realistic premises that can only be set aside in imagination. These are some realistic individuals who are their activities and their material living conditions, including those they already have and created by their own activities. Therefore, these premises can be confirmed by purely empirical methods." [11] From their elaboration, we can judge that human needs must be objective. People themselves must be an objective material, and if people want to continue to develop, they must depend on a certain material basis, and these material bases must also be objective existence and not be transferred by human will. Of course, since human needs are objective, they are enough to show that people themselves are realistic people, because only realistic people consciously have these objective needs, and only realistic people can realize these objective needs through labor. Therefore, Marx and Engels said: "the first premise of all human history is undoubtedly the existence of living individuals" Second, Marx once said: "the first need

that has been satisfied itself, the activities to meet the needs and the tools that have been obtained to meet the needs have created new needs, and the emergence of this new need is the first historical activity." [12] Marx not only clarified that human needs come from real people themselves, but also explained the ladder-social relationship of human needs development. Human needs are not only natural needs, but also material needs or spiritual needs have evolved from low to high, and people are satisfied with the lowest level. With the development of productive forces and the emergence of production tools, people's social attributes play an important role in promoting human needs. The social relationship between people is the booster of the development of human needs. Through the exchange and cooperation of people in the production process and the division of labor and exchange, people's needs are constantly deepened, of course, the greater the subjective initiative of human beings; People's initial objectification activity is the exchange between human beings and nature. Under the action of human's special attribute-social attribute, the objectification activity of human beings transitions to human beings, and finally forms a clear evolution: on the basis of objective reality, the survival needs of people, such as food, clothing, housing and transportation, push people to work, and in the process of labor, people and people also have universal contact and objectification activities, thus creating a higher level of needs, and the new needs are the same promoters of people's labor, so, cycle, But every new need must be based on the previous productivity, so "need is the inner basis and mode of existence of human life ." Marx's concern for human beings has realized the development of three stages from abstract to concrete. He thinks that it is because of the needs of some people that human history can continue to develop and advance. However, dialectically, Marx's discussion of human nature is still immature, because even need is only the study of existentialism, not ontology. Marx's triple definition of human nature is a milestone in the revolution of human science, because it represents the great transformation from abstract to concrete, subjective to objective, metaphysical to revolutionary practice. However, Marx's discussion of human beings is still to answer how people can survive rather than to answer how people become adults, which is different from the ontology of existentialism. Whether it is labor or social relations or the need for Marx is how the activists can live or how people can survive better. Many scholars believe that the third definition is Marx's ultimate answer to human science, but man is not a collection of needs. Need is an important proof of human existence, but it does not mean that need is also the essence of the dead. According to Marx's position, it always stands on the human level of historical materialism and reality to study the nature of human beings, but the dead are also the existence of reality and more objective existence, but the dead do not need it. Marx once said:" does not point out the category difference explanation is not its interpretation." [13] Marx's study of human nature has indeed entered the field of historical materialism, but there is no dialectical elaboration on the level of essence. The real "dialectics does not worship anything, in its essence, it is a critical revolution." The essence of the discussion itself is multidimensional, not only in the level of reality. Marx said that "real individuals are their activities and their material living conditions." [14] This shows that the meaning of human existence is to realize the material living conditions, and its origin lies in the human needs, that is, human labor is to meet the needs of people, that is, material living conditions, And social relations are only a stable relationship between people when they work. But there is a problem, people's existence is not necessarily human nature, existence itself is a problem. Paul Tillich, in Systematic Theology, says that the question of "existence or non-existence" is in this sense an ultimate, unconditional, holistic and infinite concern" [15] Therefore, Marx has not entered the ontological level for the triple boundary of human nature, but his human logic and continuous breakthrough of human essence lay a theoretical foundation for the future study of human essence.

4. The Dialectical Negation of Human Essence

Although Marx did not answer the essence of man, his dialectical thinking can still guide us to achieve a continuous breakthrough in the essence of man. Marx's dialectics is based on both practice and history, that is, there is a subjective dynamic process and an object subjective development process, both the meaning of thinking and the truth of material existence. Generally speaking, Marx's dialectics is the unity of thought and existence, and the highly fusion of matter and consciousness. Marx believed that "in the place where speculation ends, in the face of real life, it is the place where the real empirical science begins to describe people's practical activities and the actual development process." [16] Marx's exposition of human nature is a discussion in the sense of existentialism. It is not wrong in itself, but it is not deep enough, but the study of human existence mode has theoretical inevitability and practical inevitability. Only by answering "how do people exist" can we get the important foundation of human achievement and complete man. Marx's dialectics has answered the basis of the existence of human reality, and as a "critical revolution dialectics" to achieve self-negation and transcendence on its basis, the generation of human essence is to constantly realize self-transcendence and dialectical negation. It is to break through dialectically in the multiple contradictions between objective and subjective, perceptual and rational, nature and society, limitation and infinity, and even survival and death. These contradictions are the basis of human essence, but also the condition of human essence surpassing itself, and the reason why they can be realized lies in dialectics itself. Marx's dialectics regards human nature as an eternal process of movement. His triple definition of human nature is actually a continuous breakthrough and dialectical negation in the field of existentialism.

References

- [1] Marx. *1844 Manuscripts of Economics and Philosophy* [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House
- [2] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol .1* [M]. People's Publishing House, 1995, p.46.
- [3] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol .1, [M].* People's Publishing House, 1995, p.45.
- [4] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol .1* [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995, p.35.
- [5] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol .1, [M].* People's Publishing House, 1995, p.48.
- [6] *Complete works of Marx and Engels, vol .3* [M]. Beijing: people's Publishing House, 1960. Page 23.
- [7] Marx. *1844 Manuscripts of Economics and Philosophy* [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2000.
- [8] *Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol .1, [M].* People's Publishing House, 1995, p.1.
- [9] *Complete Works of Marx and Engels Vol .1*[M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995
- [10] *Complete works of Marx and Engels, vol .3*[M]. Beijing: people's Publishing House, 1960.
- [11] Marx. *German Ideology* [M]. and Beijing: People's Publishing House,
- [12] *Selected works of Marx and Engels (Vol .1)* [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995, p.79
- [13] Marx, Engels. *Complete works of Marx and Engels: vol .1*[M]. Beijing: people's Publishing House .256.
- [14] Marx, Engels. *Selected works of Marx and Engels: vol .1*[M]. Beijing: people's Publishing House, 1995. Page 95.
- [15] Paul Tillich. *Systematic Theology* [M]. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- [16] Marx, Engels. *Selected works of Marx and Engels: vol .1*[M]. Beijing: people's Publishing House, 1995. Page 153.