

The Historical Evolution and Enlightenment of Marx's View of Civil Society

Tong Xin*

School of Marxism, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, 321004, China

*Corresponding author Email: 2434903826@qq.com

ABSTRACT

In-depth study of young Marx's civil society theory has important academic and practical significance. In terms of academic theory, "civil society" is a red line that runs through the gradual formation of Marx's materialist view of history. Clarifying the development vein of young Marx's view of civil society and clarifying the connotation and characteristics of civil society is helpful to understand the focus of young Marx's philosophical research, so as to grasp the evolution of his ideological history more carefully. In reality, it is of great significance to construct the road of socialist modernization governance with Chinese characteristics to absorb and draw on the theoretical essence which accords with China's national conditions.

KEYWORDS

Marx; Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right; Historical Materialism; Civil Society.

1. INTRODUCTION

At the beginning, "civil society" entered Marx's vision as a problem field, and gradually developed into the research center throughout Marx's life. It is not only the direct motivation to stimulate Marx's political economy research, but also the solid foundation for the great reform of his social history view. There is no doubt that from the Rhine to Brussels, in a sense, every beat and leap of young Marx's thought is inseparable from the analysis and reflection of "civil society". During his tenure as editor of *Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx saw the pure "evil" characteristics of civil society in practical political practice, while Hegel's so-called rational state was unable to solve the complex and sharp interest relations within the society, and the living material interests of the poor people at the bottom remained unresolved. Ironically, the state has gradually become a political instrument for the pursuit of private interests, that is, the false universality and the particularity of representing minority interests are a "complicity" relationship. It was on the basis of Hegel's philosophy of law and focusing on the real presentation of German political right in civil society that Marx's attitude toward Hegel changed from preliminary questioning to thorough criticism. Especially, after the systematic and careful historical investigation made in the period of Klotznach, Marx began to criticize the speculative philosophy of law under the control of Hegel's logic. And under the theoretical support of Feuerbach, he reversed the historical orientation of the state and civil society.

Until the period of the German-French Almanac, the core transitional link for Marx's view of civil society, Marx ushered in the first major progress here. During this period, on the one hand, young Marx continued to analyze the nature and characteristics of civil society from the theoretical perspective of philosophy of law, and on the other hand activated the economic philosophy of civil society, and constantly identified the structural contradictions behind the reality of civil society in the

process. In addition, Marx gradually completed the reform of his own political stand and philosophical idea in the confrontation with Hegel's philosophy of right. This paper focuses on the important theoretical achievements of these two periods, namely, Criticism of Hegel's Philosophy of Right and On the Jewish Question, and aims to vertically sort out the development ideas of young Marx's civil society view in these two periods and horizontally clarify the essential connotation of civil society.

2. THE GERMINATION AND FORESHADOWING OF MARX'S CIVIL SOCIETY THEORY

Judging from Marx's early poems and early experiences, the thoughts of young Marx have always been full of romantic feelings, and this romantic aspect is the potential factor to activate his humanistic philosophy. Of course, at the time when this romanticism manifested itself as explicit discourse in Marx's work, he was still only an amateur philosopher who followed Kant and Fichte. And when he faced Hegel, and in this path of absorbing and inheriting to questioning and criticism, he really started the journey of philosophy. Rather, Hegel was the philosophical guide of young Marx. To borrow Althusser's phrase "to draw a line under it", Marx, who constantly appeared to distance himself from Hegel and tried to distance himself from Hegel's speculative idealism, was in fact unable to avoid Hegel, because, both in the development of the philosophy of science and in the course of the study of political economy, Marx constantly went back to Hegel. As far as the theme of this paper is concerned, Hegel's profound insight into civil society is the theoretical basis for Marx's criticism and construction of civil society. In a word, Hegel's philosophy is not only the origin of Marx's theoretical research, but also the eternal power to promote the in-depth development of the theory. Therefore, to explore Marx's civil society theory, we must first get familiar with Hegel's civil society view.

Etymologically, civil society comes from the Latin *societas civilis*, which was incorporated into European discourse in the 15th century. Contrary to modern usage, it does not denote a natural or pre-national type of society. In fact, it is antithetical to the natural combination of conjugal and patriarchal relationships. Rather, it refers to the conditions of living in a sufficiently advanced civilized political community, including urban life, formal laws and regulations, and other cultural refinements. Thus, in its original form, civil society is not equivalent to social or economic institutions and practices outside the state; Rather, it is synonymous with political society - understood as an artificial invention of free individuals. This concept of civil society in the traditional sense, from Aristotle to Hobbes, is called "political community", that is to say, the political state and civil society are in the same historical direction, and there is no clear trend of separation between the two. It was not until Hegel that the concept of modern civil society emerged and was clearly separated from the political state. Civil society in the modern sense, that is, the economic relations based on the "system of needs", exists as an independent field of economic activity. In reality, with the development of commodity economy, the gradual separation of the state and civil society and the development of the opposite relationship is the inevitable trend of history. Hegel's achievement is that he completed the distinction between the two at the academic level, and on this basis, raised the civil society to the height of principle, making it a key link in the system of legal philosophy. We find that Hegel's real intention is to reveal the internal structural tension of civil society, thus proving that the highest link in the development of ethics must be the political state, and only under the restraint of the political state can the self-contradictory civil society become harmonious, and the final result is to sublimate itself and unify in the rational state.

The core of Hegel's political philosophy is embodied in his Philosophy of Right, published in 1821. There, Hegel explains how "man" is freed by the transition from an immediate, natural ethical entity to an intellectual one, and thus both infinitely subjective and sublime enough to attain formal universality, and this freedom is the most worthy and sacred thing in man. The highest stage of this

intermediation is the "ethical life", which is divided into three links, the combination of which encompasses the multifaceted nature of the human system of institutions. They are: the family - the natural or immediate stage of ethical life; civil society - the division and representation of ethical life; the state - universal and objective freedom. Each link is a network of human relations organized according to different principles, and it is the dialectical interaction between these three links that enables us to realize the freedom implicit in the human spirit. In other words, we can summarize it as the following three interrelated patterns: (a) special altruism, (b) general egoism, and (c) general altruism.

How, then, does Hegel define the realm of universal egoism as "civil society"? In short, it is a special field of economic activity based on the exchange of property, an "arena" where private interests lead to mutual separation and confrontation. In the words of Hegel, "Every particular person affirms himself and is satisfied through the intermediary of others, but also unconditionally through the intermediary of the universal form." [1] Here, Specific individuals develop their sense of self and make specific demands for their lack of self and personal autonomy. For Hegel, the creation of civil society by cultivating self-sustaining individual entities was "the great achievement of the modern world." In ancient times, by contrast, the principle of the particularity of the subject was not incorporated into the organizational structure of society as a whole, and as individuals pursued their own interests, their activities were subject to a stifling system of religious and political constraints. However, Hegel was eager to distance himself from the free-market assumptions of the classical economists, that is, he was not absolutely positive about civil society, but rationally identified its structural paradoxes. In civil society, the loss of freedom due to its particularity does not produce a natural order which must be freed from the restrictions and distortions of political intervention, but manifests itself in a vision of luxury and want, and in a degradation of both material and moral qualities: "On the one hand, extravagance and extravagance, on the other hand, poverty and Moral depravity" [1]. However, Hegel did not completely ignore Adam Smith's "invisible hand", but saw it as another form of dialectical reason operating behind the human subject, and thus incorporated it into his own philosophical system. Under the "system of needs," special self-interest and self-determination are the motives for civil society activity, but individuals can achieve this only through mutual interaction with others. Selfishness thus becomes a contribution to the satisfaction of the needs of others, and at the same time serves as the underlying logic of man's separation and interaction with his community, with himself, and with others. In Hegel's discourse, we find that particularity and universality are intertwined and inseparable.

But, as Hegel acknowledged, the result of this correlation is not perfect. In Smith's model of civil society, poverty is always marginal, the result of a departure from free market principles. For Hegel, pauperization and alienation are characteristic and unavoidable features of civil society - and, if viewed historically, bourgeois society. If civil society is left in a state of unhindered activity, that is, free will is given free play, the inevitable result is, on the one hand, a greater accumulation of wealth, and, on the other, a greater impoverishment and dependence of the working class. Poverty grows in direct proportion to wealth, and they are two sides of a zero-sum game in which, when luxury reaches its peak, misfortune and depravity equally reach its extremes. This is the internal contradiction of civil society that Hegel discerned, and the fundamental dilemma that the internal structure of civil society cannot be self-consistent. Hegel's entire analysis of civil society revolves around how to overcome this internal contradiction, to overcome the conflict of interests between the rich and the poor. This involves the external constraints of civil society and the historical trend.

For Hegel, the realization of ethical life in the all-encompassing framework of universality begins, but does not end, with civil society. The meaning of universality is first and foremost provided by an interconnected system of needs in which the livelihood and well-being of one person are intertwined with that of all. In this sense, civil society is a "universal family." Second, civil society is naturally divided into different branches, or "guilds," which organize and promote particular interests and needs, through which individuals recognize the value of group membership and restore a certain sense of

belonging characteristic of the nuclear family. Furthermore, civil society includes the administration of justice, judicial mechanisms, whose purpose is to protect property and personal security. When civil society performs these functions, it achieves the unity of implicit universality and explicit subject particularity. In the end, however, Hegel argues that civil society cannot be "self-justified" and become an eternal link, because the universality emphasized here is only the universality of abstract or individual rights. Therefore, civil society still needs to move towards a higher link, which is the "rational state". Civil society is finally absorbed and accommodated by the state, where the narrow unity of universality and particularity rises to a broader and higher universality. As far as Hegel is concerned, he refuses to regard self-interest as the ultimate means of social organization, civil society does not reflect the ultimate goal of human life, and the state should not only safeguard its own interests, but should transcend its own interests. The way in which individuals interact with each other in political life is not motivated by careful calculation, but by solidarity, by the will to live in a community. In general, the state is superior to civil society, or rather, the state determines civil society. As a defender of private property, Hegel believed that it was impossible to eliminate the tension between general public interests and conflicting special private interests, but he believed that this tension could be substantially alleviated through state regulation and public debate. Hegel expressed, so to speak, the Prussian bureaucratic ideology that the interests of the state do not derive from private interests but are independent of them, but at the same time that the state can assume its role as the full expression of human self-consciousness only if it contains within itself a divided civil society.

In general, Hegel interprets the basic characteristics of civil society and the historical trend of its eventual collapse from the critical perspective of modernity, and constructs a systematic and integral theoretical system of modern civil society. However, Hegel's most essential understanding of civil society is obtained by including it in the abstract and closed speculative circle of self-externalization, extension, sublation, and restoration of the absolute spirit, the highest point of the ethical process. This means that civil society in the Hegelian sense is confined to the abstract idealistic framework and is a derivative of logic.

But in the *Rheinische Zeitung* period, Marx gradually questioned Hegel's rational state principle after seeing the sharp conflict of material interests in the social reality. In the forest theft case, Marx is concerned that the "private interests" of the privileged class are in conflict with the rational principles of the "law" that harmonize the interests of the whole, and that the ultimate result is the triumph of privilege over the general whole. In the face of the real interest relationship, the state and law have become a few tools to seek interests, and private interests have attempted and actually reached the arrogation of the so-called reason and law. Marx bluntly points out that the debate in the provincial Council on the "forest theft" is sufficient proof of its true intention to shield special individual interests, in other words, to promote the private interests of a few at the expense of the interests of the majority of the poor people, to reduce the whole state and everything in law to a despicable material means, and that this position is therefore completely contrary to the establishment of the State and the law. The law and the state, the god in reality, which Hegel raises to the height of the universal, frequently give way in reality to private interests, but the reality is always more than blind, because the cunning private interest, by disguising its narrow and empty form as the objective and rational criterion of state activity, "draws our attention either to the external world or to its own reason," To play a big trick behind the law." [2] Marx realized in the "illegal" verdict of the Provincial Council that Hegel's so-called principle of reason did not land in reality, but only suspended in the field of false thinking, this cruel fact strongly affected the young Marx's understanding that is still inherited. The seeds of doubt were creeping in, and he was forced to reconsider Hegel's view of the rational state, which was held up as the principle of the kingdom of Prussia, and further, Marx realized that Hegel's whole philosophy of right needed to be made a sober decision. In the *Rheinische Zeitung* period, Marx saw that the difficult problem of material interests was a real and living problem, so he gradually abandoned Hegel's way of eliminating and solving it by using reason, universality and other abstractions. On the contrary, he faced the essential demands of human reality needs. From this point on, Marx gradually moved to the realistic and scientific materialism road. In a word, Marx started the

process of criticism and construction of civil society theory from the question of Hegel's philosophy of law.

3. THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION AND INITIAL DEVELOPMENT OF MARX'S CIVIL SOCIETY THEORY

Taking the philosophy of law, which is the most conservative in Hegel's philosophical system and at the same time condensed the essence of national philosophy, as a breakthrough, Marx's Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, created in 1843, is the foundation work of his civil society theory, which means that he has officially entered the horizon of philosophical research on civil society.

The breakthrough theoretical achievement of Hegel's Critique of the Philosophy of Right - it is not the state that determines civil society, but civil society that determines the state - is a sign that the fundamental principles and positions of young Marx's civil society theory have been established. This principle, the logical construction of "subject-predicate inversion", was obtained by Marx under the background of the support of Feuerbach's theory. Feuerbach was the first person who shattered Hegel's speculative mysticism in the real sense, and his article "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy" published in 1839 marked a new materialist thought that resolutely shattered the traditional Hegel's speculative idealism. Then, in June 1941, The Essence of Christianity, an important work that criticizes the illusory nature of religion with humanistic logic, deeply promoted the criticism of abstract speculative philosophy represented by Hegel. Here, Feuerbach profoundly reveals that the concept of God is nothing more than the alienation of the essential power of man, placing man in the lofty position of God, and man becoming the subject of discourse, which boils down the essence of religion to the essence of man. Thus, Feuerbach, to a certain extent, realized the revolution of religion in reality. Feuerbach further pointed out that Hegel's speculative philosophy, like the illusory religion, is undoubtedly an inverted world view, and theology strips its own essence from real man and alienates it into the God of the other world, an abstract God who blinds all the forces of reality and manipulates the world on the other side. "Speculative philosophy also alienates man from his essence. It makes man's thinking separate from man and become the so-called absolute spirit of the other world." [3] So perhaps we can borrow Marx's language that Feuerbach realized that the criticism of philosophy and the criticism of religion follow the same path. "We have only to take the object as the subject, the subject as the object and principle, that is to say, by turning speculative philosophy upside down, we can obtain undisguised and obvious truth." [4].

In this period, Marx stood on the standpoint of materialism and inherited Feuerbach's critical method of "subjection-verb-reversal", that is, in the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, he restored the orientation relationship between the state and civil society, which had been reversed by Hegel, and pointed out the core issues of Hegel's philosophy of right. That is, in the category of the idea itself, it divides two limited fields endowed with ideality, the purpose of which is to make the spirit become a self-serving, infinite absolute spirit, which is the overall pulse of the absolute spiritual self-movement. Marx bluntly rejected: "The mysticism of logical pantheism has been exposed here"[2], and further proposed: "The family and civil society are the true constituent parts of the state... It's the way the country exists. Families and civil society themselves turn themselves into states. They are the real driving force." [2] We see that where Hegel regards reality and its relations as the result of the movement of absolute ideas, and where Hegel regards them as the result of the self-infinity of the absolute mind, Marx has made absolute negations and reversals.

On the basis of establishing the philosophical principles of his theory of civil society, Marx continued to explore the essence of the relationship between civil society and the state, which made his theory of civil society further developed. Marx first highly affirmed the modern significance of Hegel's independence of civil society from politicians, and admitted that Hegel saw the irreconcilable contradiction between the two. But Marx goes on to point out that Hegel only takes this contradiction at face value, and that his solution is therefore only formal, not practical. In Hegel's view, the

separation and opposition between the state and civil society is only a transitional link in the development of ideas, and this contradiction is in line with the historical trend of the absolute spirit, and as far as the relationship between the state and civil society is concerned, the state is both the beginning and the end, that is, civil society must return to the state, and the state must overcome civil society. Different from Hegel's pan-logicization of the real problem, Marx explored the essence of the separation of the state and civil society from the perspective of historical development, and gradually presented the opposite situation. In ancient society, civil society, as a material society, existed only as a slave to the political state.

Different from Hegel, Marx explored the separation and essence of the state and civil society from the perspective of historical development, and analyzed the relationship between the state and civil society in different periods. In ancient society, the people are the state, the two are the same relationship of substance, they do not participate in productive labor but as the subject of political activities, on the contrary, slaves are the specific subject of production activities, so civil society is nothing but self-alienation into "slaves of the political state." In the Middle Ages, civil society and the political state were linked into an inseparable whole under the intermediary role of the hierarchy, so there was no absolute division of the two. However, because each caste acted in its own way and performed its own duties, the people lost their status as "free men" in the ancient sense of society, and the function of the state, to a certain extent, also dissolved its universal nature as a social function and was reduced to the privilege of a particular caste. In the case of the disintegrated feudal society, "the political state is an abstraction from civil society"[2], that is, the political state representing the general interest is separated from the civil society in which the private interests of the few occupy the high ground. The political state here is nothing but an illusory, abstract community. Marx further pointed out that the direct consequence of the separation of the two is the dualization of the identity of the subject, that is, the same person is not only a citizen of the community sphere - the political state, enjoying the political rights of citizens, but also a member of the private sphere - civil society. In other words, the external separation and contradiction between civil society and the state result in the internal division and opposition of the subject. This means that in order to bridge the inner nature of human beings, it is urgent to overcome the antagonistic relationship between the state and civil society, and to clarify its own alienation in reality. On this basis, Marx and Hegel put forward two diametrically opposite solutions: Hegel believed that essential contradictions could be restrained by external forms, so civil society operated under its external structure and the discipline and control of the political state, while Marx argued that internal contradictions needed to be solved by self-revolution, that is, the political state needed to return to the real world. Returning to the real civil society, in this way, contradictions can be eliminated in the internal revolution of civil society when the special nature of various fields is understood. We find that with the in-depth investigation of young Marx on the relationship between the state and civil society, the factors of social revolution are quietly revealed here. Then, in the second half of Hegel's Critique of the Philosophy of Right, Marx further reveals that civil society is essentially a humble symbol of "materialism" in response to the problem of "dualism of subject identity", "Modern civil society is a completely realized principle of individualism, and individual survival is the ultimate goal; Activity, labor, content, etc., are nothing but means "[2], the dualism of man in civil society, that is, the cruel fact that man's essence is opposed to man himself, is revealed here. In fact, it is the theoretical predecessor of the thought of alienated labor in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844.

In short, in Hegel's Critique of the Philosophy of Right, Marx no longer sees the political state as a solution to social problems, The State gradually "abdicated" and "disappeared" in Marx's vision[5]. On this basis, Marx began to draw a clear line with Hegel's speculative philosophy from the dimension of political criticism of philosophy of law, and laid the necessary foundation for the formation of his materialist view of history.

It is worth noting that Marx skipped the chapter "civil society" in the Principles of Philosophy of Law, and only discussed the part of "State law". It should be said that Marx did not have the research

perspective of economics at the stage of the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, and his understanding and interpretation of civil society was still limited to the Hegelian context of political philosophy of right. Although in the end of the text, Marx also involves the analysis of economic issues such as private property, hierarchical elements, real estate and inheritance rights in civil society to a certain extent, but it can only be called a superficial dabble. Because the interpretation at this time was more of an abstract rationalist implication, Marx's argumentative discourse was actually speculative, and the underlying logic behind the pure malignancy of civil society, that is, its structure and essence, was still a mysterious force covered by Marx. In addition, as far as methodology is concerned, Marx's interpretation of civil society and his investigation of the above-mentioned similar economic categories at this time are still confined to the Feuerbach pattern of subject-predicate inversion of binary opposition, which makes the perceptual logic of idealism and humanism become the overwhelming logic of this period, while the real economic, historical and dialectical logic are only fragments in some links. Thus, although he saved civil society from the state in principle, his grasp of its whole and essence did not reach the height of Heger. The necessary requirement for the real realization of transcendence is to penetrate from this external analysis into the essence of the explanation, that is, to grasp the civil society from the civil society itself, and the period of the German-French Yearbook is a good beginning.

4. THE EXPANSION OF MARX'S CIVIL SOCIETY THEORY ON A NEW PHILOSOPHICAL STANDPOINT

The period when the German-French Yearbook was founded was a period of great changes in Marx's thought, and his thought began to change from one stage to another. First, Marx continued to insist on political philosophical analysis of civil society, and in this case, its methodological basis is still based on the legal philosophical materialism formed in the period of Klotzner. Second, after discussing and analyzing many problems and contents, Marx turned his criticism to the Jewish spirit of private property in civil society. In addition, after criticizing this, he realized the criticism of the alienation of money. Thus, Marx began a turning point between economic philosophy reflection on civil society and critical economic ethics. This change also means that Marx shattered the hope of Rousseau-style "real democracy" and completely abandoned the illusion of a rational state. In this case, there is no doubt that the German-French Yearbook is a major reflection of Marx on the dialectical analysis of the political liberation of civil society, so as to raise the liberation to the ideological level of real human liberation. At the same time, for Germany to make a leap of principle, it seemed to him that the revolutionary practice of the proletariat to a special class of civil society must be carried out, and that this practice must, in addition, achieve a perfect unity of revolutionary theory and reality. This critical reflection, for the first time, fully expounds the historical task of the proletariat, also for the first time puts forward the fundamental proposition of "practical materialism", and introduces the whole critical purpose of the civil society view proposed in the period of the German-French Yearbook into the historical era of socialism.

When Marx was looking for a breakthrough to further criticize civil society, the main category of philosophical humanism proposed by Feuerbach was concerned by Marx at this time, and played an active role in promoting the development of Marx's thought. Marx mainly from the perspective of Feuerbach philosophy, through the concept of "real man" as the center, not only deeply revealed the dual opposition between civil society and the state, but also elaborated the alienated nature of civil society. In short, Marx launched a deep exploration and development of the relevant theories of civil society. The book "On the Jewish Question" fully reflects Marx's ideological understanding at this stage. Marx's view of civil society in "On the Jewish Question" can be summarized in the following aspects:

First, the problem of religious theology is transformed into a problem of secular history. In the early 1840s, the bourgeois opposition in Germany began to oppose the semi-feudal politics of Germany,

which was the background of the era in which Powell expressed his views in his essay *The Jewish Question*. In Powell's view, the emancipation of the Jews was, by its very nature, a political emancipation, and was therefore subject to the laws of political emancipation in general. He went on to not only advocate that Jews should consciously renounce the Jewish faith in order to be free from its imprisonment. At the same time, he also proposed that only by eliminating Judaism from both the national and political levels can Judaism completely disappear and the Jews be completely liberated. All these show that Powell's understanding of the nature of the Jewish question only stays in a simple religious perspective. He equated the essence of Jewish emancipation with anti-feudalism, that is, removing restrictions on religion from politics and pursuing political emancipation. From Marx's point of view, Powell's understanding of the problem is still too abstract and biased. Marx believed that only to clarify, only to discuss who should be liberated? Or by whom? Obviously, these "in any case is not enough"[2], it is also appropriate to explore: What kind of liberation? The question of which kind of liberation belongs. Marx, unlike Powell, integrated the issue of Jewish liberation into the struggle against capitalist society and applied it to the revolutionary struggle for a complete transformation of the whole society. Powell's problem, he stressed, was to mix up the relationship between political emancipation and universal human emancipation. In order to make clear Powell's errors, Marx elaborated on the manifestations of the Jewish question in various countries: in Germany, the Jewish question was a question of religion and theology alone; In the case of France, this is because political freedom is not sufficiently represented; For the individual states of North America, this should be a matter of criticism of the political state itself, because it is a political state in a developed situation. Based on the analysis of American institutions, customs and religious conditions, Marx put forward the view of "whether the national political system is complete", so as to correctly understand the relationship between religion and the state. In addition, we should also start from the nature of the country and find the true meaning of the problem.

Second, the secular opposition between the political state and civil society. Having turned the theological question into a secular one, the next task is to go deep into the secular, to look realistically at the crux of the Jewish problem. Contrary to Powell's insistence that the Jewish question is a question of the relationship between religion and the state, Marx argued that the Jewish question arises from the secular opposition between the political state and civil society. The real causes and secular roots of the Jewish problem are mainly based on the contradiction, conflict and opposition between the political state and the civil society that is its foundation. This secular contradiction, conflict and opposition also lead to the existence of real differences between religious and political people, between members of civil society and citizens of the state. In other words, the dualism of man proposed by Marx in the second half of his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* is enhanced here: "In civil society man is a worldly being... On the contrary, in the state, where man is a class being, he is a fictitious molecule of imaginary sovereignty; here he loses his real personal life and is filled with unreal universality." [2]The fact that man is both political and secular shows that Marx understood that the essence of the Jewish problem is mainly due to the conflict between the political state and civil society. Therefore, the practical way to solve the problem must go deep into the civil society to find.

Third, the analysis of private property and money alienation. Marx pointed out that "practical need, egoism is the principle of civil society, and as soon as the political state is completely born from within civil society, this principle is naked, and the god of practical need and selfishness is money." [2]In other words, the center of the whole civil society is private property. To be more detailed, first of all, the struggle for private property is the struggle of civil society with private property as the core, and it is the predatory manifestation of civil society. Secondly, the establishment, regulation and maintenance of private property and its egoistic rights are the basis of private law on which civil society is built and rotated. Finally, the extreme desire, fanatical pursuit and worship of private property is the religious spirit of the civil society. In Marx's conclusion, the worship of money is a practical need of utilitarianism and egoism, and it is this need that enables the Jewish spirit to be embodied to the greatest extent. People should be liberated from the predatory nature of civil society,

from the extreme desire for private property, the fanatical pursuit and the religious spirit of worship. Among them, the most direct manifestation is that human beings should be liberated from the alienation of money. Only when the alienation of money is completely eliminated can the Jewish spirit and the religion of private property in civil society be completely eliminated, and then the Jewish question can finally be completely solved. Then society will become a real society of men, and man will become a social, real class being.

Fourth, from the political emancipation of civil society to the universal emancipation of man. Marx elaborated the relationship between political liberation and human liberation by revealing the secularization root of religion in a deeper level. He believed that the relationship between political liberation and religious liberation had long been the relationship between political liberation and human liberation. [2]At the same time, Marx also opposed and criticized Powell's view that political emancipation should be used to abolish religion, and elaborated on the profound connotation of political emancipation. In Marx's view, unless political emancipation itself is criticized, Only then can this problem be truly transformed into a contemporary universal problem. [2]In addition, in his view, political liberation mainly refers to "the liberation of civil society from politics", which means "the dissolution of the old society on which authoritarian power rests", so it also promotes the further development of society. Political emancipation separates people from the old direct political community and thus becomes a self-centered, independent individual, and in this sense affirms human freedom. However, the political revolution of civil society mainly focuses on taking civil society, self-centered, independent individuals and private rights as the "foundation of one's own existence", rather than revolutionizing the main forming elements of civil society itself. Therefore, the political revolution and the political liberation it achieves have limitations. Political emancipation makes man a member of civil society, a self-centered and independent individual; on the other hand, it makes man a citizen and a legal person . [2]The alienation between civil society and political state has not been effectively solved through the political emancipation of civil society, and it is only achieved by the dualization of human beings, but the dualization of human beings is actually the alienation of human beings. Based on the situation of political emancipation, man belongs to an alienated person, and human freedom does not belong to a freedom with authenticity, which is also the reason why, in Marx's view, political emancipation undoubtedly does not represent human emancipation. [2]However, the main condition leading to human emancipation lies in political emancipation, and in Marx's view, "in the period when human self-emancipation is striving to take the form of political self-emancipation, the state can and will reach the point of abolishing religion and eliminating religion." But this step can only be achieved by means of the abolition of private property, the capping of property, the confiscation of property, and the introduction of progressive taxation ", by "violently contravening one's own living conditions and declaring the revolution to be uninterrupted" [2]. In elaborating "human liberation", Marx mainly started from the basic point of view of Feuerbach's philosophy, and took "real man" as his core category, so his understanding still seems to be general, not very specific, in Marx's view, "only when the real individual is at the same time an abstract citizen, and as an individual, When man becomes a class being in his own experiential life, in his own personal Labour, in his own personal relations, only when he realizes his' original power 'and organizes it into a social force and thus ceases to separate it from himself as a political force, only then will human emancipation be complete." [2].

In *On the Jewish Question*, Marx analyzed the secular opposition between the political state and civil society, explored the mutual relationship between private property and civil society, criticized the alienated reality of the Jewish spirit and the essence of money in civil society, and expounded the historical task of the proletariat, a special class of civil society. It points out the revolutionary practice process from the political liberation of civil society to the general liberation of human beings, so that his civil society theory has been greatly promoted.

From Hegel's *Critique of the Principles of the Philosophy of Right* to *On the Jewish Question*, Marx's critique of civil society has realized an important transformation from political criticism to political

economy criticism, and the focus of criticism has also shifted from religion and speculative philosophy to civil society itself. These important changes pointed out the way forward for him to continue to explore civil society, private property and communism in the field of political economy in the subsequent period of the Paris Manuscript, and also paved the way for Marx to analyze the capitalist world from the historical dimension and finally form the great achievement of historical materialism.

5. PERORATION

In this paper, through the study of young Marx's civil society theory, specifically, through the vertical review of the theoretical evolution process and horizontal analysis of the connotation of the theory, it is not difficult to find: The theory of civil society put forward by Marx in his youth started from Hegel's criticism of the philosophy of law, and he regarded the theory of production relations as the key achievement and harvest, which was a constant logical clue from Marx's initial thought to the complete establishment of Marxist theory. In this sense, Marx's civil society theory is closely related to the establishment of historical materialism, and it is an inseparable part of historical materialism. Although young Marx himself did not specifically elaborate on the theory of civil society systematically, he only took civil society as a starting point and conducted in-depth research in the fields of political economy and philosophy in this complex, moving and contradictory civil society. Therefore, in terms of theoretical research, there is no doubt that civil society is enough to become the cornerstone of our study of Marx's thought.

In terms of reality, young Marx's theory of civil society also produces new interpretations with the operation of time and space, and western Marxist thinkers extend the extension of Marx's theory of civil society on different theoretical horizons. For example, Gramsci's civil society theory is mainly based on the destruction and reconstruction of the existing system, and hopes to rebuild a future social system to realize the harmonious unity of political society and civil society. The civil sociology theory proposed by Habermas aims to reconstruct civil society on the basis of criticizing the existing system. It not only provides people with a more rational living environment and way of life, but also transforms and rebuilds civil society to improve the legitimacy of capitalist countries.

Now, when we look again at the development of civil society and its actual evolution, we should pay attention to the great changes and developments of the present era, and we should always bear in mind: Marxism is not only a written dogma, but an open system, it is not only a scientific generalization of the past philosophical achievements, but also contains a great deal of innovation and a wide range of possibilities. Therefore, it is important for us to seek truth from facts and keep pace with The Times. We should study the basic principles of Marxism and use them to respond to the new and happening realities in society, and deepen our understanding and use of Marxist philosophy in the midst of such changes.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hegel, translated by Fan Yang and Zhang Qitai. Principles of Philosophy of Right [M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press,1961.
- [2] The Complete Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 1 [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House,2002.
- [3] Huang Nansen et al. The first volume of the revised History of Marxist Philosophy [M]. Beijing: Peking University Press,1987.
- [4] [De] Feuerbach, translated by Rong Zhenhua, Li Jinshan et al. Selected Works of Feuerbach's Philosophy (Vol. 1) [M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press,1984.
- [5] Han Lixin. From the State to Civil Society: Study on the Jewish Question and Introduction to Hegel's Critique of the Philosophy of Right [J]. Hebei Journal,2016,(05):15-21.
- [6] The Complete Works of Marx and Engels: Volume 3 [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House,2002.