



Dialectical Materialism and Social Change: A Marxist Perspective on Societal Transformation

Drona Budhathoki¹

¹Lecturer of Sociology
Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Hetauda, Nepal

Corresponding Author

Drona Budhathoki

Email: dronammc202@gmail.com

To Cite this article: Budhathoki, D. (2026). Dialectical materialism and social Change: A Marxist perspective on societal transformation. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 7(1), 213–224. <https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v7i1.93037>

Submitted: 19 January 2026

Accepted: 15 February 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Abstract

Historical Dialectical Materialism is a Marxist framework that explains social change through the interaction of material conditions and human activity. It posits that history progresses via contradictions within economic and social structures, leading to conflict and transformation. Society's development is driven by the tension between forces of production and relations of production, ultimately shaping political, cultural, and social institutions. This perspective emphasizes that change is not random but rooted in material realities, highlighting the dynamic, interconnected nature of history and society. The Chief objective is to examine how dialectical materialism explains the mechanisms of social change from a Marxist perspective. This study adopts an explanatory research design to investigate the relevance of dialectical materialism in social change. It primarily relies on qualitative data, collected through a review of selected books, academic articles, and critical texts. The research focuses on both global and Nepali contexts, synthesizing insights to analyze how contradictions within economic and social structures drive societal transformation. This study demonstrates that dialectical materialism, as conceptualized by Marx and Engels, provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing social change through the interplay of material forces and production relations. Class conflicts and contradictions within economic structures drive transformation. Technological advancement, inequality, and neoliberal policies create new tensions, confirming their relevance in transitional societies like Nepal. This study is significant as it applies dialectical materialism to analyze how material conditions and class relations drive social change. This study helps fill the gap in research within both the Nepalese and global contexts. It will be valuable for those seeking to understand social dynamics and for providing insights to guide socio-economic transformation.

Keywords: dialectical materialism, social transformation, mode of production, material contradictions, struggle

1. Introduction

Dialectical materialism, formulated by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, constitutes a foundational framework within Marxist philosophy, asserting that material conditions are the

principal determinants of social, political, and historical development (Marx & Engels, 1846,1970). Contrary to idealist perspectives, this approach emphasizes that ideas and consciousness are secondary to the material realities that structure society. Central to dialectical materialism is the concept of contradiction: societal change emerges from conflicts inherent within economic and social structures, which act as catalysts for historical transformation (Stalin, 1938). By integrating Hegelian dialectics with materialist analysis, it provides a methodological tool to interpret class struggle, institutional evolution, and historical progression, thereby offering a robust lens for analyzing social dynamics and the forces that drive systemic change.

Dialectical materialism, as an extension of Hegelian dialectics, frames material reality as the primary determinant of societal structures and historical development (Marx & Engels, 1846,1970). It posits that social phenomena, including human consciousness, emerge from the dynamic interplay of material forces rather than existing independently. Central to this framework is the analysis of contradictions and conflicts within the economic base, which act as engines of historical transformation (Stalin, 1938). By examining these material contradictions, dialectical materialism offers a systematic methodology for understanding social evolution, class struggle, and institutional change. Consequently, it remains a critical analytical lens within Marxist theory for interpreting the processes that drive societal development.

Social Change refers to the transformation in the social structure, cultural patterns, and collective behavior of a society over time. It can occur gradually or rapidly, influenced by factors such as technological advancements, economic development, political movements, demographic shifts, and cultural interactions (Haralambos & Holborn, 2013). Social change affects institutions, norms, values, and roles, reshaping the way individuals and groups interact. While some changes promote social progress and equality, others may lead to conflict, resistance, or inequality. Sociologists study social change to understand patterns, causes, and consequences, emphasizing that it is both inevitable and continuous in human societies.

In Marxist theory, dialectical materialism serves as both a philosophy of science and a theory of history, offering a comprehensive framework for understanding societal transformation (Marx & Engels, 1846, 1970). It posits that social change is primarily driven by class struggle and conflicts between opposing material interests within the economic base (Stalin, 1938). Each historical epoch emerges through the resolution of contradictions inherent in the mode of production, reflecting the dynamic and conflictual nature of material reality. By emphasizing the interplay between material conditions and social structures, dialectical materialism offers a rigorous analytical lens for interpreting historical development, institutional evolution, and the mechanisms underlying systemic social change (Marx, 1873).

Engels offers a foundational explanation of dialectical materialism, framing it as a scientific approach to interpreting nature, history, and society. In *Anti-Dühring*, he systematically critiques metaphysical and idealist views, arguing that change arises from internal contradictions within material conditions rather than external or supernatural forces (Engels, 1878, 1976). He asserts that progress in both natural and social phenomena follows dialectical laws, such as the unity of opposites and the transformation of quantity into quality. By applying these principles, Engels demonstrates that social change is a necessary outcome of evolving productive forces and class relations, providing a theoretical basis for Marxist historical materialism.

The Marxist perspective is a sociological and economic framework based on the ideas of Karl Marx, emphasizing the role of class struggle and economic inequality in shaping society. According to Marx, society is divided into the ruling class (bourgeoisie) who control

the means of production, and the working class (proletariat) who sell their labor. Social institutions, laws, and ideologies often serve the interests of the dominant class, maintaining inequality and oppression. Marxists argue that social change occurs through conflict between these classes, ultimately leading to a more equitable society through revolution or systemic transformation (Marx & Engels, 1848). This perspective highlights how power, resources, and exploitation influence social structures and human relations.

The Communist Manifesto serves as a seminal text articulating the principle that material conditions and class struggle constitute the primary forces behind historical development. Marx and Engels (1848, 1976) argue that the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles, emphasizing the dialectical relationship between productive forces and relations of production. This framework situates social transformation within the dynamics of economic contradictions, where the ruling and subordinate classes engage in continuous conflict. The manifesto also projects the revolutionary potential of the proletariat as the agent of historical change. By connecting dialectical materialism with socio-economic realities, it provides both a theoretical foundation and a political program for understanding and directing social transformation.

Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks (1914)* offer a comprehensive examination of the fundamental laws of dialectics, positioning them as central to understanding historical development. He emphasizes principles such as the unity and struggle of opposites, which he regards as the essence of dialectical logic, and the transformation of quantity into quality, explaining that incremental quantitative changes culminate in qualitative shifts. Lenin interprets these laws not as abstract philosophical concepts but as dynamic processes governing nature, society, and thought. Through this framework, he emphasizes that contradictions within material conditions drive historical progress, and their resolution leads to revolutionary transformation. Thus, Lenin reaffirms the dialectical method as both a philosophical and scientific approach to analyzing social change (Lenin, 1914, 1972).

1.1 Research Gap

The existing body of scholarship on dialectical materialism and its role in social change demonstrates the theoretical robustness and explanatory power of Marxist analysis. However, a significant gap persists in context-specific studies that address Nepal and comparable developing societies. Most prior research has focused on abstract theoretical frameworks or historical case studies within Western or global contexts, often neglecting the distinct socio-political structures, cultural dynamics, and historical developments that characterize Nepalese society. Moreover, while Marxist theory has been applied to macro-level social transformations, empirical investigations linking core dialectical principles such as contradiction, negation of negation, and the unity and struggle of opposites to contemporary social, economic, and political processes in Nepal remain limited. Bridging this gap is essential for achieving a more nuanced and contextually relevant understanding of the applicability and limitations of Marxist theory in non-Western and transitional societies.

1.2 Research Objective

The chief objective of this is to examine how dialectical materialism explains the mechanisms of social change from a Marxist perspective.

1.3 Significance of the Research Study

The present study on dialectical materialism and social change is significant as it provides a systematic framework for understanding the mechanisms driving societal transformation through a Marxist lens. By analyzing the principles of dialectical materialism, such as contradiction, negation of negation, and the unity and struggle of opposites, this

research elucidates how material conditions and class relations shape historical and contemporary social processes. The study addresses a notable gap in context-specific analyses of Nepalese society, offering insights into how Marxist theory can be applied to non-Western, transitional societies. Furthermore, the research contributes to both theoretical and practical discourses, enabling scholars and policymakers to interpret social dynamics, assess structural inequalities, and envision strategies for equitable socio-economic transformation.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

This research study was carried out under the following limitations:

- 1 The principles of dialectical materialism are primarily based on Western historical contexts, making it challenging to fully apply them to culturally diverse and developing societies like Nepal.
- 2 Limited empirical data on contemporary social, economic, and political transformations in Nepal constrain the practical analysis of Marxist theory.
- 3 Globalization, modern political-economic structures, and local cultural diversity pose challenges to traditional Marxist analysis, limiting the scope of the study.

2. Literature Review

The concept of dialectical materialism originates from Hegel's dialectical method, which views development as a dynamic process driven by contradictions. Hegel expressed this process through the triadic structure of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. In his philosophy, historical progress represented the self-realization of the Absolute Idea, emphasizing the primacy of thought over material reality. This approach reflects Hegel's strong idealist orientation, where consciousness shapes existence rather than being shaped by it. While Hegel's framework introduced the notion of dialectical movement and internal contradictions, its idealist foundation limited its applicability to material and social processes. This limitation later prompted Marx to reinterpret dialectics from a materialist standpoint, laying the groundwork for historical and dialectical materialism (Hegel, 1807/1977).

Ludwig Feuerbach, a notable critic of Hegel, rejected the idealist notion that ideas shape reality and instead proposed a materialist interpretation of existence. He argued that human essence is not an abstract individual quality but the "ensemble of social relations" (Feuerbach, 1841/1986). According to Feuerbach, consciousness is a product of material conditions, reversing Hegel's claim that thought determines being. Despite this significant shift, Feuerbach's materialism lacked a dynamic understanding of historical processes. It presented reality as static and failed to incorporate the principle of dialectical contradictions, which are central to explaining change and development. Consequently, his approach, while foundational for later Marxist theory, remained inadequate for analyzing the transformative nature of society and history.

Karl Marx synthesized Hegelian dialectics with Feuerbachian materialism, producing dialectical materialism as a scientific worldview. In his *Theses on Feuerbach*, Marx (1845, 1970) famously stated that "the philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it." Marx inverted Hegel's idealism, asserting that material conditions determine consciousness and that history progresses through the dialectical interaction of productive forces and relations of production (Marx & Engels, 1848, 1976). This transformation positioned dialectical materialism as both a philosophy of nature and a method of analyzing social change through internal contradictions.

Dialectical materialism, as formulated within the Marxist tradition, rests upon several interrelated principles that explain the dynamics of change in nature, society, and thought. At the foundation of this framework is contradiction, which Engels (1878, 1976) identifies as the

central law of dialectics. Contradiction refers to the coexistence of opposing forces or tendencies within any phenomenon, whose interaction generates motion, tension, and ultimately, development. In the social realm, contradictions manifest most prominently between the forces and relations of production. These conflicts create structural crises that necessitate transformative change, illustrating that historical development is driven not by harmonious equilibrium but by the resolution of antagonistic relationships (Khatri, 2022). By recognizing contradictions as the engine of development, dialectical materialism provides a systematic method for analyzing social evolution and the inevitability of structural transformation.

Closely related to the principle of contradiction is the negation of negation, which describes the dialectical progression of development through successive stages. According to Lenin (1914, 1972), a given stage or condition (thesis) is negated by its inherent contradictions (antithesis), and a new stage (synthesis) emerges that incorporates elements of the preceding stage while surpassing its limitations. Historical transitions, such as the shift from feudalism to capitalism, exemplify this process, wherein the new social order preserves certain structural elements of the old while overcoming its constraints. This principle highlights the cumulative and evolutionary nature of social change, demonstrating that development is neither linear nor arbitrary but emerges from the dialectical resolution of conflicts.

Another fundamental law is the transformation of quantity into quality, which emphasizes that gradual, incremental changes eventually lead to fundamental qualitative shifts. Engels (1878, 1976) contends that both natural and social phenomena operate according to this principle. For instance, in social systems, the continuous accumulation of minor economic, political, or cultural changes can reach a threshold that precipitates revolutionary change. This law underscores the non-linear character of development, indicating that qualitative transformations are rooted in the accumulation of quantitative pressures.

Dialectical materialism asserts the unity and struggle of opposites as a central dynamic governing all phenomena. Lenin (1914, 1972) explains that opposing tendencies coexist in a unified whole, yet their interaction generates conflict and motion. In capitalist societies, the interdependent yet antagonistic relationship between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat exemplifies this principle. The struggle between these classes drives historical change, culminating in the potential emergence of a new social order. By conceptualizing development as arising from the dialectical interplay of opposites, this principle provides a rigorous framework for understanding both stability and transformation in social systems.

Kasula's (2021) study offers a rigorous examination of the applicability of Marxist theory to the analysis of social institutions and processes within Nepalese society. By focusing on key institutions such as marriage and family, alongside social processes like birth rates, the paper demonstrates how the materialist conception of history elucidates the interplay between class relations, economic structures, and societal organization. Kasula effectively situates Nepalese social phenomena within the framework of Marxist analysis, providing empirical examples that underscore the practical relevance of dialectical materialism. The study contributes to sociological scholarship by bridging theoretical Marxist principles with concrete observations, highlighting the structural determinants of social dynamics and the mechanisms through which systemic change occurs.

Pokhrel's (2023) study provides a critical analysis of the social and political dynamics of the Nepal Communist Party (Unified Marxist-Leninist) and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist Centre) through a Marxist lens. The research examines the evolution of these parties' social policies and identifies the factors contributing to deviations from their original Marxist ideological frameworks. By situating the parties' strategies within the broader socio-political

context of Nepal, the study highlights the structural and institutional challenges they face in interpreting societal needs while operating within a parliamentary system. Pokhrel demonstrates how these challenges have constrained the parties' capacity to effect substantive socio-economic transformation, offering valuable insights into the practical limitations of implementing Marxist principles in contemporary Nepali politics.

Yadav's (2023) article provides a comprehensive examination of Marxist interpretations of human nature and societal change, with particular reference to the Nepali context. The study emphasizes Marx's conception of the dialectical relationship between individuals and their social environment, challenging static or traditional understandings of human nature. By tracing Nepal's historical evolution from feudalism and monarchy to the establishment of a republic in 2008, Yadav situates theoretical discussions within concrete socio-political developments. The article effectively demonstrates how Marxist frameworks can elucidate the mechanisms of social transformation, highlighting the interplay between material conditions, class relations, and institutional change. This research contributes to a nuanced understanding of the applicability of Marxist theory to Nepalese society.

Budhathoki (2023) presents a comprehensive and well-organized examination of the intersection between migration, property ownership, and capitalism, effectively situating individual economic behaviors within broader structural frameworks. The article traces the historical transition from subsistence-oriented property acquisition to strategic economic agency, portraying property as a capital asset and emphasizing core capitalist principles such as private ownership, wealth accumulation, and investment. The discussion of cash crop cultivation illustrates the profit motive, linking agricultural practices to market-oriented objectives and reinforcing capitalist imperatives. Furthermore, the analysis of property expansion into higher-standard areas demonstrates strategic economic decision-making. While conceptually strong, the work would benefit from empirical examples to substantiate key arguments. Overall, the article provides a nuanced foundation for understanding the interplay between personal aspirations, economic incentives, and systemic dynamics, offering significant directions for future socio-economic research (Budhathoki, 2025).

Budhathoki (2024) provides a comprehensive analysis of the socioeconomic transformations driven by cardamom cultivation in Dhankuta, eastern Nepal. The study illustrates how the transition from subsistence to cash-crop farming has diversified household income, improved living conditions, and expanded access to education and health services. By linking local agricultural practices to broader market dynamics, the research highlights both opportunities and vulnerabilities arising from market dependence and environmental instability. Empirical insights reveal that while cardamom farming strengthens economic resilience, price volatility and limited technical support hinder sustainable growth. Overall, the article contributes significantly to understanding rural livelihood transitions in Nepal and underscores the need for policy interventions fostering climate adaptation and agricultural modernization.

Chaitanya Mishra's scholarship offers a critical Marxist analysis of social change and development in Nepal, addressing both historical and contemporary socio-political dynamics. In *Sociology in Nepal: Underdevelopment Amidst Growth*, Mishra (2002) examines structural underdevelopment, highlighting the limitations of Western sociological frameworks and advocating for a Marxist approach to understanding Nepalese society. In *Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective*, he situates Nepal's underdevelopment within historical relations with British India, emphasizing the enduring effects of treaties such as Sugauli and the 1950 Friendship Treaty on the country's peripheral position in global capitalism (Mishra, 2004). Furthermore, in *The Maoist Crossroads in Nepal: 'Postponing' New Democracy or Sensing Limits of Agency?* Mishra (2013) analyzes the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist Centre), exploring the challenges and contradictions

in pursuing revolutionary transformation under global capitalist constraints. Collectively, these works provide a nuanced framework for understanding Nepal's socio-economic transformations through the lens of dialectical materialism and Marxist theory.

Social change is largely shaped by economic inequality, class relations, and historical structures of power. Sociologist Chaitanya Mishra explains that Nepal's social transformation is closely linked with class conflict, uneven development, and the dominance of elite groups over resources and state power. He emphasizes that poverty, exclusion, and exploitation create tensions that push society toward structural change. Similarly, historian Mahesh Chandra Regmi highlights that traditional landownership systems and agrarian relations played a major role in shaping class divisions and social hierarchy in Nepal. These economic conditions gradually influenced political movements, social awareness, and demands for reform. Thus, from a Marxist perspective, social change in Nepal is understood as the outcome of class struggle and transformation in material conditions (Mishra, 2007; Regmi, 1978).

3. Materials and Methods

This study is grounded in a Marxist perspective, which offers a critical framework for analyzing societal structures and processes of social change. Since its development, Marxist theory has been widely incorporated into educational curricula from school to university levels, demonstrating its enduring significance within the social sciences. In Nepal as well as globally, extensive scholarly literature comprising books, journal articles, and research studies has examined Marxist thought. Building on this body of work, the present study explores the relevance of Karl Marx's concept of dialectical materialism in understanding social transformation, with particular emphasis on the dynamic relationship between material conditions and social relations. To achieve this objective, the study employs a comparative-historical research design based on secondary sources, including key works such as *Theses on Feuerbach*, *Marx's Philosophical Notebooks*, *Dialectical Materialism*, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, *The German Ideology*, *The Communist Manifesto*, Mishra's *Underdevelopment Amidst Growth*, and other relevant texts. Using an interpretive qualitative approach, the research synthesizes insights from selected books, academic journal articles, and critical writings to examine how contradictions within economic and social structures drive societal change. This approach enables a comprehensive interpretation of dialectical materialism and underscores its continued relevance in explaining contemporary social phenomena.

4. Data Analysis and Presentation

The study of Historical Dialectical Materialism and Social Change critically investigates the influence of material conditions and class relations on societal transformations. By systematically analyzing both historical and contemporary data, it interprets social dynamics through a Marxist framework, highlighting recurring patterns, inherent contradictions, and the underlying causal mechanisms that drive structural change and societal development over time.

4.1 How Dialectical Materialism Explains Social Change

Dialectical materialism, as conceptualized by Marx and Engels, offers a framework for understanding the dynamics of social change by emphasizing the interaction between material forces and relations of production. Social structures and institutions are shaped fundamentally by the economic base, which consists of productive forces, tools, technology, labor, and resources, and the social relations that organize production (Marx & Engels, 1970).

Contradictions within this structure, particularly between different classes, generate tensions that drive transformation. Class conflict serves as the motor of history, compelling societies to evolve through stages of development as contradictions are resolved, either peacefully or through revolutionary struggle. For instance, the antagonism between feudal lords and serfs under feudalism or between bourgeoisie and proletariat under capitalism illustrates how material contradictions propel historical progression (Engels, 1878,1976; Lenin, 1914,1972).

4.2 Stages of Social Development

According to the Marxist schema, societies evolve through identifiable stages of development: primitive communism, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism, and ultimately communism. Each stage reflects a specific organization of production and corresponding class relations. Primitive communism, characterized by communal ownership, transitions to slavery as surplus production allows for exploitation (Budhathoki, 2025). Feudalism develops with agrarian hierarchies, giving way to capitalism with industrialization and wage labor. Socialism emerges as the working class seizes control of the means of production, with communism envisioned as a classless society where material abundance removes structural contradictions. Empirical evidence from historical case studies, such as the transition from feudalism to industrial capitalism in Europe, provides partial validation of this model, though deviations and local variations are evident in non-Western societies like Nepal (Kasula, 2021; Pokhrel, 2023).

4.3 Contemporary Relevance

Dialectical materialism continues to serve as a critical framework for analyzing contemporary socio-economic structures, particularly within the context of global capitalism and neoliberalism. The contradictions that Marx identified remain visible in modern society, where technological advancement, automation, and digitalization reshape labor-capital relations, creating new forms of class conflict and reinforcing socio-economic stratification (Budhathoki & Aryal, 2025). Furthermore, persistent global inequalities and the exploitation of peripheral economies underscore the structural imbalances of the capitalist world system. Environmental crises further intensify these contradictions, reflecting the unsustainable nature of profit-driven development. By emphasizing the role of internal tensions in driving historical transformation, dialectical materialism provides valuable insights into the systemic challenges facing humanity and the possibilities for collective resistance and transformative social change (Yadav, 2023).

4.4 Evaluation

While dialectical materialism retains significant explanatory value, it has been subject to sustained critique. Scholars contend that the framework often demonstrates deterministic tendencies by overemphasizing economic structures while marginalizing culture, ideology, and individual agency. Historical experiments with socialism in the 20th century, most notably in the Soviet Union and Maoist China, highlighted its practical limitations, including bureaucratic centralization, political repression, and the failure to deliver equitable outcomes. These shortcomings have led contemporary theorists to propose more adaptive approaches that integrate dialectical materialism with insights from modern social theory, thereby recognizing the interplay between material conditions and complex socio-political forces. Such critiques underscore the necessity of contextualizing Marxist analysis, ensuring its relevance for understanding patterns of social transformation in diverse historical settings (Mishra, 2013).

5. Result Analysis and Discussion

The analysis indicates that dialectical materialism provides a robust framework for understanding social change by emphasizing the interaction between material forces and relations of production. Marx and Engels (1970) assert that social structures and institutions are fundamentally shaped by the economic base, where contradictions between classes generate tensions that drive transformation. Historical transitions, such as the conflict between feudal lords and serfs or the bourgeoisie and proletariat, exemplify class struggle as the motor of history (Engels, 1878,1976; Lenin, 1914, 1972). The study of Nepalese society, through the works of Kasula (2021), Pokhrel (2023), and Yadav (2023), demonstrates that class relations, institutional arrangements, and material conditions significantly influence social processes, from marriage and family structures to political and economic policies. Mishra's (2002, 2004, 2013) research further contextualizes these dynamics, linking Nepal's historical underdevelopment and contemporary socio-political challenges to materialist contradictions within global capitalism. Collectively, these findings underscore the explanatory power of dialectical materialism in both historical and contemporary contexts, highlighting its relevance for analyzing structural change and societal evolution.

The study also confirms the applicability of key dialectical principles, contradiction, negation of negation, transformation of quantity into quality, and the unity and struggle of opposites in explaining social development and change. Societies progress through stages, from primitive communism to feudalism, capitalism, socialism, and ultimately communism, with each stage reflecting specific class relations and modes of production (Kasula, 2021; Pokhrel, 2023). Contemporary global challenges, including technological advancements, widening economic inequality, and neoliberal economic policies, reveal emerging contradictions that continue to drive social transformation (Yadav, 2023). Nonetheless, critiques of dialectical materialism highlight its deterministic tendencies and the limitations observed in real-world socialist experiments, necessitating adaptation for modern social analysis (Mishra, 2013). Overall, the findings indicate that while dialectical materialism provides a systematic method to interpret social evolution, its application requires contextualization to address cultural, political, and economic complexities, particularly in non-Western transitional societies like Nepal.

However, the findings also highlight notable limitations. Critics point out that dialectical materialism can lean toward determinism, emphasizing structural inevitability at the expense of cultural and political variation. The failures of several socialist experiments in the twentieth century further underscore the risks of applying the model rigidly (Mishra, 2013). These shortcomings suggest that while dialectical materialism remains a powerful interpretive tool, it requires contextual adaptation to capture the complexities of societies such as Nepal, where caste, ethnicity, and cultural practices intersect with class-based contradictions (Budhathoki, 2025).

6. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that dialectical materialism, as conceptualized by Marx and Engels, offers a comprehensive framework for analyzing social change by foregrounding the interplay between material forces and relations of production. Historical evidence, both global and Nepali, confirms that contradictions within economic structures, particularly class conflicts, serve as catalysts for societal transformation. The research underscores the applicability of key dialectical principles, including contradiction, the negation of the negation, and the transformation of quantity into quality, in explaining social development across distinct stages from primitive communism to capitalism and beyond.

Historical dialectical materialism explains social change through the dynamic relationship between material conditions and class struggle, emphasizing material production

relations over ideology. In the context of Nepali society, the transformation from feudalism to modern capitalist structures can be analyzed through this perspective, where class inequality, land ownership systems, and forms of labor exploitation have historically shaped structural change. The transition from traditional land relations such as *guthi*, *jagir*, and *rakam* to modern land reforms and a capitalist market economy reflects the dialectical process that continuously drives social change. Thus, historical dialectical materialism provides a theoretical framework for understanding the socio-economic and political transformations that have occurred in Nepal.

The study highlights the contemporary relevance of dialectical materialism in understanding global socio-economic phenomena, such as technological advancement, widening inequality, and neoliberal economic policies, which generate new contradictions and tensions. While critiques emphasize the framework's deterministic tendencies and limitations in practical socialist experiments, the findings affirm that dialectical materialism remains a valuable analytical tool. Its application, however, requires careful contextualization to accommodate cultural, political, and economic complexities, particularly in non-Western transitional societies like Nepal, thereby bridging theoretical insight and empirical analysis of social change.

7. Recommendations

Based on the works of Karl Marx, this article, which examines the Marxist perspective, its proponents, and the practical application of Marxism in Nepal and the contemporary world, provides the following recommendations.

1. Policymakers should incorporate class and material condition analyses when designing social and economic policies to reduce structural inequalities in Nepal.
2. Academic curricula should include Marxist perspectives and dialectical materialism to enhance understanding of social change mechanisms.
3. Conduct additional context-specific studies applying dialectical materialism to diverse regions and communities in Nepal to inform localized development strategies.

References

1. Budhathoki, D. (2024). From fields to futures: Examining the socioeconomic shifts from cardamom cultivation in eastern Nepal. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 5(3), 170–179.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v5i3.68523>
2. Budhathoki, D. (2025). Capitalism and global inequality: Core–periphery relations in the context of world-systems theory. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 6(4), 89–98.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i4.85258>
3. Budhathoki, D. (2025). Caste and poverty intertwined: The livelihood challenges faced by Dalits in Makawanpur, Nepal. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 6(3), 78–90.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i3.83018>
4. Budhathoki, D. (2025). Cultural influences on consumerism and lifestyle choices: An analysis of college students in Makawanpur, Nepal. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 6(1), 175–186.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i1.78070>
5. Budhathoki, D., & Aryal, U. (2025). Cultural continuity and identity formation: A study of the Gopali community in Makawanpur District, Nepal. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 6(5), 176–188.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i5.89086>

6. Budhathoki, D., Sharma, B., Bhattarai, T., Neupane, R. P., & Shrestha, S. (2023). The extended access created by the capitalist economy. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 4(4), 57–65.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v4i4.61931>
7. Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2025). *Dialectical materialism*.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/dialectical-materialism>
8. Engels, F. (1976). *Anti-Dühring* (Vol. 25). Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1878)
9. Feuerbach, L. (1986). *The essence of Christianity*. Harper & Row. (Original work published 1841)
10. Haralambos, M., & Holborn, M. (2013). *Sociology: Themes and perspectives* (8th ed.). HarperCollins.
11. Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of spirit* (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1807)
12. Kasula, B. (2024). *Applying the Marxist perspective on particular social institutions and processes in the context of Nepal* [Unpublished manuscript].
13. Khatri, T. B. (2022). Dialectical materialism and its theory of knowledge. *Patan Prospective Journal*, 2(2), 255–267.
14. Lenin, V. I. (1972). *Philosophical notebooks*. Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1914)
15. Marx, K. (1873). Marx's views on dialectical materialism and the materialistic conception of history. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 45–52.
16. Marx, K. (1970). Theses on Feuerbach. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *The German ideology*. Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1845)
17. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). *The Communist manifesto*. Penguin Classics.
18. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *The German ideology* (C. J. Arthur, Trans.). International Publishers. (Original work published 1846)
19. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1976). *The Communist manifesto*. Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1848)
20. Mishra, C. (2002). Sociology in Nepal: Underdevelopment amidst growth. *Occasional Papers in Sociology and Anthropology*, 6(1), 1–20.
<https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/OPSA/article/view/1146/1552>
21. Mishra, C. (2004). *Development and underdevelopment: A preliminary sociological perspective*. ResearchGate.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250192039>
22. Mishra, C. (2007). *Essays on the sociology of Nepal*. FinePrint.
23. Mishra, C. (2013). *The Maoist crossroads in Nepal: "Postponing" new democracy or sensing limits of agency?* Chr. Michelsen Institute.
<https://www.cmi.no/file/2570.pdf>
24. Pokhrel, R. (2023). Social character in the politics of Nepali communist parties. *Voice of History*, 31(1), 1–15.
25. Regmi, M. C. (1978). *Landownership in Nepal*. University of California Press.
26. ScienceDirect. (2025). *Dialectical materialism: An overview*.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/dialectical-materialism>
27. ScienceDirect. (2025). *Historical materialism: An overview*.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/historical-materialism>
28. Stalin, J. (1938). *Dialectical and historical materialism*. Foreign Languages Press.
29. Wikipedia. (2025). *Dialectical materialism*.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialectical_materialism

30. Wikipedia. (2025). *Historical materialism*.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/historical-materialism>
31. Yadav, P. K. (2023). Marxist perspectives on human nature and societal change in Nepal. *The Annapurna Express*.
<https://theannapurnaexpress.com/story/46835>