

Compare Marx and Derrida's Criticism of Hegel's Dialectics

Mengyue Wang

School of Central Information, Tianjin University of Technology, Tianjin, China

Keywords: Critical, Deconstruction, Economics, Dialectic spirit

Abstract: This article analyzes Marx and Derrida's criticism of Hegel's dialectics from the following three different perspectives, as well as the similarities and differences in their views, and aims to put forward an effective analysis for the study of their thinking.

1. Introduction

Choosing a critical strategy-the logic of facts and the deconstruction of pure thinking For the theological and mysterious atmosphere of Hegel's dialectical logic system, the judgments of Marx and Derrida are basically the same. They all connected the deductive process of Hegel's dialectics with theological dialectics, and demonstrated the divine factors of their thoughts. The fundamental flaw of Marx's criticism of Hegel's dialectic movement lies in the fact that the idea becomes the subject of self-movement and self-existence, and the systematic arrangement of purely logical deduction is used as the synonym of the dialectical movement; the idea becomes an independent subject, and the reality becomes the predicate of the idea. Marx did not abstractly criticize the abstract deduction process of Hegel's concept, but unfolded it in conjunction with the facts of specific social existence. This characteristic runs through the life of Marx's philosophy development, from the criticism of legal philosophy to religion, national economics and In the process of historical criticism, to demonstrate one's own point of view, abstract and purely conceptual logical and philosophical deduction is not the focus of Marx's focus. This point shows a fundamental difference compared with Derrida. Derrida's criticism of Hegelian dialectics focuses on the deconstruction of the text, reveals the inherent "inability to speak and proves" nature of its own logic, focuses on criticizing the internal structure of the text and the logic of opinions, and does not take the rich social reality as his own argument the main basis.

2. Marx's Strategy of Turning Hegel's Logical Mysticism Upside Down is Based on Actual Social Existence and Destroys the Abstract Logic of Concepts with Factual Logic.

In "The Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law," Marx emphasized that market society is the foundation for the establishment of the state. "The fact is that the state is produced from such groups that exist as members of families and civil society." A factual judgment is also a logical judgment, "(Hegel's) speculative thinking speaks of this fact as the result of ideal activities."^[1] Combining factual logic with conceptual logic and comparing them are the basic ideas of Marx's criticism of Hegel's dialectics. "In fact, the family and civil society are the prerequisites of the state, they are the real activists, and speculative thinking turns all this upside down."^[2] Inverting Hegel's dialectic thought is Marx's basic attitude towards Hegel, and this is the case for both the rational analysis and critical position of Hegel's philosophy of law, and it continues to the logical judgment of religious phenomena, economic movements, and historical development. In "The Holy Family", Marx (and Engels) criticized the abstract logic of "self-consciousness is the individual whose spirit replaces reality", "spirit creates sentient beings, while the body is weak and incompetent." Hegel's dialectics is full of absolute spiritual deduction. "This kind of speculation is the most complete manifestation of Christian German principles."

Derrida pointed out that Hegel's thought, as a speculative dialectics, takes overcoming opposition and dissolving opposition as its main task, but it denies and overcomes all duality and duality, and pursues the transformation of dialectical intermediary. While unifying the development form, it also lacks a respectful and ignorant attitude towards the relatively distant alienity. From

Kant's antinomy to Hegel's destruction of the ghost of things in itself, a logic of continuous integrity that does not allow severance constitutes the dialectic "continuous movement of continuous integrity." There are no transcendents in this movement, only participants. Derrida directly compares and falsifies the divine "Trinity" logic (son, father, and holy spirit) with Hegel's dialectical thinking, and believes that Hegel's imitation, whether intentionally or unintentionally, is similar to God's control impulse, in this sense, dialectics and theology have unity.^[3] In the natural museum, you can only see dead limbs and chilled bones. Dialectics is in a pure and absolute logical system, and you can only ask for perfection and close yourself.

Obviously, Derrida's direct imitation and parody approach is a purely ideological criticism and deconstruction, while Marx uses the power of factual logic when criticizing the abstract interpretation of thought logic, combining criticism and inversion.

3. Borrowing "Economics"-as a Broken Unity or Deconstruction Strategy

Both Marx and Derrida consciously and unconsciously used the term economics together when criticizing Hegel's dialectics, expressing their critical attitudes towards Hegel's dialectics in economic fields and economic terms.

Marx believes that in the analysis of the economic field, labor is indeed a key link, playing a dual role of negation of dialectics and self-confirmation. But "Hegel only knows and recognizes one kind of labor, that is, abstract mental labor."^[4] The nature of labor is consistent with the philosophical nature advocated by Hegel, and perceptual real labor is regarded as the alien link of abstract labor. In the process of abstract and spiritual concept deduction and dialectical movement, all values are exchanged, circulated and consumed step by step in accordance with the logical movement of dialectics, interlinking, negating and affirming each other. In this dialectical unity, he discovered the factor that promotes its break-the production of surplus value, although it is concealed by the illusion of continuous and complete economic movement. Because although the production process of surplus value is included in the actual process of capital production, this inclusion is a kind of deceit, a kind of dissolution, and can never escape the control of capital logic, and is subject to the decision and inducement of capital law and political power.^[5] Marx shattered the halo conferred by this divine logical argument, on the one hand, he returned to the solid economic life itself, narrated his dialectics in a "diametrically opposite" way, and erased the mystical brilliance that dialectics gave things; On the one hand, continue to unearth the breaks in it, and breaks are the starting point for the generation of new meaning.

In the process of analyzing the cells of capital production, the logic of cell growth and division not only reflects the growth momentum of capitalism, but also predicts the inherent inevitability of contradictions. In the analysis of surplus value, Marx's surplus value theory is different from the value theory of national economics. Market value, cost value, trinity value composition, and classical labor theory of value all appear loopholes due to the analysis of Marx's surplus value theory. Hundreds of times, the original production model, circulation formula and calculation formula have all changed as a result. It can be said that as one of Marx's greatest discoveries, the surplus value theory embodies the destruction of the original value theory; it is obviously impossible to complete Marx's work within the established logical framework. The rule of "dialectical consistency" that is shaped will inevitably break under Marx's piercing eyes. Only then can the secret of surplus value be produced and obtain sufficient practical support.^[6]

Criticizing the metaphysics of political economy is a natural reflection of Marx's criticism of Hegel's dialectic logic. Marx himself "does not learn the appearance of a national economist" and does not want to cover his eyes and ears with a logically abstract "invisible hat", but sees "the peculiarities of the materials studied in political economy (national economics)", Summoning the fiercest, most despicable, and worst feelings in people's hearts, and summoning the nemesis representing private interests to the battlefield"⁶ to oppose the opposite research method, which makes the raising and solving of many problems limited to their own design The logic of definiteness is a kind of fog of knowledge, a state of concealment of metaphysical logic.

Different from Marx, Derrida criticizes Hegel's dialectics in the sense of plain text, and his quotation of economic terms has only metaphoric meaning. In an annotation of "Writing and Differences", Derrida enumerates and analyzes economic principles and economic concepts. The economic concepts and principles he understands are not textual descriptions of classical economics and modern economics, but guide Mach The economic principle of thinking and Affinarius's principle of least effort.^[7] This obviously refers to an optimal feature pursued by philosophical thinking, and is a metaphor of efficiency and rules of logical deduction. Derrida criticized Hegel's dialectics from the perspective of general economics to special economics. He referred to Hegel's dialectics under the guise of the scientific rules of economics and deconstructed Hegel's absolutes into special relativity. Formally in this sense, Derrida often refers to Hegel's dialectics as "speculative dialectic" on many occasions to distinguish it from other dialectics.

Marx had a high evaluation of Hegel's dialectics. He believed that he was the first to comprehensively and consciously narrate the general movement of dialectics. He was a master of German classical philosophy. He consciously applied the critical spirit of dialectics to the theory, legal rights, The cover of ideology is exposed; Derrida sees the consistency of the description of the beginning, nature, and characteristics of scientific research and the pursuit of "speculative dialectics" from the preface of Hegel's work. Because in the Hegelian era and Hegelian thinking, science was regarded as the crown of the spirit of the world. He referred to logic as scientific logic, and called his dialectics the science of dialectics or scientific dialectics. respect. In the age of scientific suspicion, Derrida naturally regarded this scientific belief as a kind of obsession of rational metaphysics, and Hegel's thought as the peak of the development of rational form and rational thinking. His criticism of Hegel's dialectics It is an attempt to expose the deconstructive factors. Derrida's emphasis on economic terminology, such as capital accumulation as a metaphor for literary development, currency as a metaphor for language, economic value as a metaphor for metaphysical effects, and economic rules as a metaphor for logical rules, etc. The meaning is that it is the most scientific and scientific in modern social sciences. Criticism of logic, universality, and daily economics found that the deconstruction factor of logic movement in it, economics is just a deconstruction strategy.

4. The True Spirit of Dialectics-"Critical Breaking through the System" or "More Critical Than Critical"

Although the two criticized Hegel's dialectics in different styles and tactics and different goals, one focused on the transformation of reality and the other focused on the deconstruction of the text, their focus was almost the same, and they both hoped to dissolve the Hegelian philosophy system. The mystery saves the revolutionary spirit of dialectics.

The old Hegelians insist that the system of Hegelian thought is inseparable, which makes Hegel's dialectics be conservative, compromised, and comfortable with conceptual interpretation. Through the interpretation of the young Hegelian, another face of Hegel has become more prominent: he has a strong sense of self and struggle passion, and a ruthless criticism of reality. Under the gaze of these two faces, Marx walked out of the great shadow of Hegel. He not only insisted on the dialectical argumentation method of the unity of thinking and existence, combined the logical analysis of dialectics with criticism in the real field, but also made use of the inherent qualities of dialectics. Criticism and analysis function, see through the structure and development of reality. In Marx's mind, there are many forms of dialectics. Plato, Hegel, and himself are all one of them, and only the dialectics of "reasonable form" is what Marx pursues. It does not belong to the privileged stratum, nor the ostentatious literati, but the manifestation of the normal, reasonable existence and development of things; every grasp of the current existence and development trend of things can only be temporary and continuous movement and change. The application of dialectics can take a variety of forms, not just in the fixed form determined by Hegel or Plato. Although the forms and forms of application of dialectics are diverse, their essential attributes are common and are "critical". "And revolutionary", this is the true attribute of dialectics, and it is also an extremely important criterion for criticizing whether it belongs to dialectics.

Derrida's deconstruction of Hegel's dialectics is very similar to Marx. On the one hand, both of them use Hegel's dialectical logic to attack Hegel himself, showing the inherent contradiction between Hegel's thought and system. Derrida's deconstruction strategy is good at using Hegel's own writing to reveal the inherent deconstruction factors of his logical text object: Deconstruction is not shaped by someone but by the text itself. Derrida uses Hegel's logical contradictory attitude towards the preamble to deconstruct his own logical legitimacy. This is very similar to Marx's method, Marx repeatedly pointed out the inherent contradictions of the Hegelian logical system itself. In the appendix of his doctoral dissertation, Marx clearly revealed the inherent flaws of Hegel's philosophy. He pointed out that Hegel used contingency to prove the existence of "god" and pointed out that theology used accidental miracles to prove the existence of God. Recognizing contingency is the essential requirement of theology: God exists because contingency exists, and Hegel, in order to prove the existence of God, precisely denies contingency, and ultimately must deny God. ^[8] Here, the young Marx is not superstitious of Hegel's dialectics, and uses Hegel's conclusion to oppose his premise. This critical approach can also be seen in Marx's analysis of Hegel's alienation (labor) thought, the essence of dialectics, spiritual essence, freedom, etc.: Under the constraints of an overly dense and prosperous system, many of Hegel's dialectic thoughts have to be Incomplete, conciliatory, and compromised methods have emerged, and the revolutionary and critical nature of dialectics that destroys the established boundaries of things has been overwhelmed and even suffocated. This involves another similarity between Marx and Derrida's criticism of Hegel's dialectics, that is, breaking through Hegel and saving the true spirit of dialectics.

Derrida's deconstruction is not strictly speaking to save dialectics. Deconstruction is to understand the authenticity, universality or "legitimacy" of construction itself, because deconstruction itself cannot be defined, and even this word does not exist in the dictionary. Therefore, deconstruction can only be "deconstruction of itself" and not anything else. Derrida believes that this "synonymy" can best reflect the characteristics of deconstruction. Derrida proclaimed the end of metaphysics and humans, and developed Heidegger's *destruktion* into deconstruction. It was out of the call for critical weakness and helpless and disappointed reflection, because in modernity's logical rules and systems (these can all be in the field where the text exists), all criticism is restrained by tangible and intangible factors. Many people in it are totally ignorant of this, showing their pursuit and yearning for absolute knowledge and value. Derrida, through his investigation of the history of philosophy, believes that the development of Western metaphysics is determined by a linear and endless cycle. "All criticism, from Aristotle to Bergson, is within this limit." Hegelian System Both the cyclical nature and the cycle of Heidegger's hermeneutics have this characteristic. The pursuit of formal necessity has become an inevitable basic element for the creation and realization of criticism, and Derrida is to explore a kind of alienation, a kind of "inadequacy as contingency, authenticity, potential, cycle, "Weak presence, etc."^[9], the process of deconstruction is the process of his pursuit of difference, and the process of his critical thoughts fully unfolding: Criticism has the indeterminacy of deconstruction, and what it expresses is not theoretical content and results, but one An absolute critical spirit and deconstructed attitude that "asks all questions". The deconstruction of Hegel's dialectics should also be viewed in the same way.

5. Conclusion

As a result, the last remaining "deconstructed trail" of deconstructing Hegel's ideological system is similar to the revolutionary and critical spirit of Marx's criticism of Hegel's dialectics. Both of them hope to release the control of the mysterious logic center, Seeking an absolute deconstruction and absolute criticism. Absolute deconstruction is a kind of criticism that is "more critical than critical." Therefore, it is in the "critical nature" that deconstruction and dialectics have similarities, which can promote the eventual encounter between Marx and Derrida.

References

- [1] “The Complete Works of Marx and Engels”, People's Publishing House, Vol.1, pp.252-253, 1972.
- [2] “The Complete Works of Marx and Engels”, People's Publishing House, Vol.1, pp.250-251, 1972.
- [3] Derrida, Dissemination, The University of Chicago Press, p25, 1981.
- [4] Marx: “Manuscript of Economics and Philosophy in 1844”, People's Publishing House, pp.117, 1979.
- [5] Selected Works of Marx and Engels, People's Publishing House, Vol.2, pp.218, 1972.
- [6] “Selected Works of Marx and Engels”, People's Publishing House, Vol.2, pp.208, 1972.
- [7] Derrida, Writing and Difference, The University of Chicago Press, p20, 1985.
- [8] “The Complete Works of Marx and Engels”, People's Publishing House, Vol.40, pp.285, 1982.
- [9] Derrida, Margin of Philosophy, The University of Chicago Press, p60, 1982.