

LAW OF VALUE, REPRODUCTION AND SOCIALIST PLANNING: Methodological introduction.

What is Marxist is scientific and vice-versa, or else we would not be Marxist.

Methodological introduction to Historical Materialism.

By Historical Materialism is meant the scientific method of investigation that conjugates the study of the Dialectics of Nature with the study of the Dialectics of History. Hence, Historical Materialism can equally be defined as the Overall Dialectics.

Reality and the Object of study.

According to Giambattista Vico, there exist three realities, Nature, Human institutions and abstract formulations. They are embodied in two great Objects of study susceptible to be apprehended through the use of concepts and of theories. In this sense, if the concepts and theories account for the studied reality, the latter necessarily remains outside of them both; no solipsism is possible. These two sorts of objects of study are *tangible* objects and *intangible* objects. Tangible objects pertain to Nature and are apprehended through natural sciences. On the one hand, intangible objects are constituted by institutional and inter-relational realities (including services), and, on the other hand, by the abstract and logical realities. Intangible objects produced by the Human Spirit or Mind are far from being unreal: they are *objectified* realities. As such, they belong to the so-called material forces that condition human becoming.

Dialectical becoming.

Therefore, the apprehension of reality necessitates both concepts and theories. The younger Benedetto Croce had quite rightly emphasised, although in a restrictive idealist mode, that the first concrete concept is none other than « becoming ». Becoming is dialectical in the etymological sense of the word because it corresponds to its object. Being is no opposed to Nothingness. Chaos is always subjective, it represents the periphery of Being and its immediate environment. Non-Being, as a formal definition of Chaos, is nothing else than an artifice of the logical technique mustered to grasp Being in its own specificity, while risking to corset it in the process into an Aristotelian dualist taxonomy. The same can be said about Dialectical Ethics (if you will the critique of the **Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals** offered by the great dialectician I. Kant). Completing the research conducted by Pythagoras and

Socrates, it strives to distinguish between Ethical Good, Utilitarian Good and Bad. It does this on the basis of the prior demonstration of the ontological equality of all the Human Subjects, therefore of all individual consciousnesses, which remains the primary pre-condition for the existence of discourse and of its intersubjective space. In this sense, individual freedom or *libre arbitre* represents the Aesthetic realisation of Human equality, its accomplished poïetics. Spinoza would talk here of « joy », namely the realisation of Man within authentic demo-crazy.

Dialectical methods.

The first objects, tangible objects, pertain to the experimental scientific method according to the Dialectics of Nature. The second, the intangible objects, pertain to the historical method according to the Dialectics of History – applied to social sciences in a non-idealist Marxist sense. The individual and collective conjugation of these three realities and of these two dialectics constitutes the Overall Dialectics, which encompasses the whole Human praxis.

To avoid idealist, presumably dialectical pitfalls, in particular in the form of Historism, otherwise known as Historicism (Dilthey, Croce etc), a pitfall often found in many Marxists or pseudo-Marxists such as Plekhanov, I have been careful to use the correct expression « Dialectics of Nature ». Naturally, it is extirpated from vulgar materialism derived from a half-digested Diderot. I thus carefully avoid using the expression « Dialectical materialism » simply because ideas and institutions, the objectified forms of Mind or of social relationships, equally embody « material » forces. In the same manner, I use the correct expression « Historical Materialism » in lieu of « Historical Dialectics » because Nature too is concerned with becoming, although, as Vico's shows, in a different manner, which allows it to remain true to itself despite its changing forms. However, this process implies no *ex nihilo* creation, something that was secularly confirmed by Lavoisier. New and artificial materials, for instance those created by the fine manipulations allowed by scanning tunnelling microscopes, in no ways refute the Fundamental Tableau of chemistry, resting instead squarely on its properties. This makes sense since Man reproducing Himself in Nature and History, any study of social relationships necessarily implies a dialectical scientific comprehension of the natural reality that underlines it: Of course, in so doing, the Marxist Dialectics method must avoid being truncated by Positivism such as propagandised by Popper or Prigogine.

One can choose to follow Lenin and Stalin and differentiate between materialist dialectics and historical dialectics without falling into the methodological and conceptual traps derived from Plekhanov's idealism. Distinguishing between Dialectics of Nature and Dialectics of History will not solve the problem; one still needs to keep in mind the difference between « **Distinction** » and « **Opposition** » which are implied by them. Clearly, the stake at play is the conception of dialectical becoming and that of the role played in it by the Historical Subject intended as *a contradictory identity*, the product and mover of the Overall Dialectics. This is precisely what is clarified below.

Distinctions, Oppositions and Overall Dialectics.

The Historical Being or the Natural Object already embodies an expression of social reality but not a perennial one, except in its respective forms of existence which are dictated by its dialectical becoming. Otherwise, it would be monstrous and would never reach the viable statute that characterizes a member of a particular Species, neither abstractly nor concretely. The becoming of a Natural Object is characterized by distinction, that of the Historical Being by opposition. Thus, the becoming of Nature leads to Man but the reverse is not true: We are here dealing with *distinct categories*. Their ulterior evolution does not contradict, no more than they negate, their primordial nature, the scientific study of which is a matter for Experimentation, namely for successive approximations that are increasingly refined. As for the becoming of historical forms, it pertains to the negation of a form by another, a process without which there would be no historical thread or evolution: We are dealing here with different categories which make up the Universe of Oppositions. For instance, the Feudal Mode of Production is not compatible with the Slavery Mode of Production, no more than the Capitalist Mode of Production is with the first: At most, one can verify eventual modes of *coexistence* marked by the domination of one Mode over the other, a process which, in time, fatally leads to the suppression of the least efficient.

Thus the Dialectics of Nature pertains to the apprehension of the Universe of Distinctions while the Dialectics of History is concerned with the Universe of Oppositions. It was no mere trifle when the great bourgeois and mason B. Croce conceded the superiority of the dialectic method over steady state Aristotelianism and over bourgeois positivism. At that time, the latter was already undermined by the simplistic totalitarian imperialism exercised by the so-called hard sciences, in particular physics which had previously been

amputated from its inextricable totality, namely that constituted by physics-chemistry. I was the first to note that the general law of entropy is reversed by the apparition of biological life.

To this debilitating amputation was quickly added a probabilistic artefact born from a preliminary understanding of the constituents of the atom, in particular the electron, then judged to be inherently evasive. This approach would have enraged Leibniz, the first to propose the use of probabilities to get a better grasp of an Object of study in the temporary absence of better ways to apprehend it conceptually ... Unfortunately, this approach led directly to the laughable contradictions of quantum physics, which delight so many scientists who never took the time to read and even less to understand and further the magisterial critique levied by Lenin in his **Materialism and Empirio-Criticism** (1908). Suffice it to say here, that we are now able to follow the *trajectory* of photons as well as clouds of electrons. Uncertainty and indeterminism are mere stages of more or less relative ignorance. In the best case, when scientific rigor is respected, this can lead to the formulation of *general* laws, that is when *universal* laws cannot still be enunciated – at least for a given Universe –, universal laws always resting on a specific « concrete-in-thought ». We will return on this subject below.

Overall Dialectics.

In no ways does this mean that historical becoming is arbitrary or purely determined by Man's will. Historical forms always rest on natural or objectified substrata. Relations of production and social relations in the wide sense are never independent from the development of the productive forces that can be apprehended by the experimental method. As was written by Marx in his **18 brumaire**, Man makes History but only within the constraints inherited from the past which « weighs on Him as the Alps ». To reach its objective, the Overall Dialectics conjugates the scientific Dialectics of Nature and of History, namely the comprehension of historical evolution of human societies, taken as animal societies conscious of their own role, and consequently conscious of the becoming of their own Being within Nature and History. In his **Politics**, Aristotle had already stated that « Man is a social animal ».

Subject, historical bloc and class.

Properly speaking, the historical Subject is thus a historical bloc. And doubly so. First, from the individual point of view, given that his/her *personality* cannot

be independent from the material possibilities presented by the Mode of production in which s/he lives. Secondly, from the point of view of the social classes which structure the social relationships and, consequently, the possibilities of individual and collective becoming within these social formations. Thus, a social class is a concrete historical Object, a legitimate scientific Object of study, which is immediately linked (position, consciousness, false consciousness) to the relations of production.

However, Nature cannot be a concrete historical Object unless it is linked to the Mode of production, that is to say to the production and distribution domains of the exchange value, as well as with the other material conditions of existence of human communities and groups. The power relationships that are produced and determined by the relations of production structure this space so neatly that one speaks of Nation-States and more precisely of National or Supranational Social Formations. Naturally, this is done without abolishing the subordinate distinctions which characterise them and which continue to subsist with their own contradictions (languages, cultures, shared past experiences etc.) The notions of races, nations or exclusively elected groups are nothing but sectarian, racist and/or theocratic archaisms, prone to foster wars, phenomena that were never tolerated if not at the margin (Marx famously spoke here about « interstices »), and consequently relegated outside the common public and financial spaces.

The contradictory identity as opposed to the illogical idealism of the « unity of the opposites ».

The *contradictory identity* of the historical Subject should be obvious for any Marxist. It debunks the impossible « unity of the opposites » proposed by the idealist Hegelian dialectics and by its avatars, in particular Plekhanovian ones. In effect, the Hegelian dialectics derives from a bourgeois illusion and walks, so to speak, on its own head: This illusion is precisely that derived from the unity of the opposites. It gratuitously asserts that the Being contains within itself the Non-Being! Yet, such a unity is logically impossible; worse still, it discredits dialectics as soon as it falls into awkward hands prone to substitute empty style for content.

Becoming does not come out safely from such an ordeal, not even when it is based on a preliminary phenomenology. The secret of this enigma, one which confused many, including the best classical Marxists, is not susceptible to be

solved by such a conceptual contradiction. This must be the result of given factual data: Namely, Historical Man defined in himself and by himself as a contradictory identity. This is because He is both the result and the mover of the Overall Dialectics which unites within itself the Dialectics of Nature and that of History. More precisely, it alone renders this « unity » or better this conjugation possible, because it alone contains and transforms Nature as well as concrete History, the latter being conceived as the objectified product of its physical and mental activity.

This contradictory identity of the Subject comes from the fact that it must imperatively reproduce itself within Nature and History. The modern philosophy of doubt was reborn with René Descartes and is known for the clear distinction it established between Object and Subject. However, there is no exit out of this duality, not even through the solipsism of the Bishop Berkeley. Nor through idealist dialectics which, thanks to its conception of Being and Non-Being, does purely and simply eliminate Chaos, that is to say the reality which perforce subsists beyond the concepts. Idealist dialectics fatally ends up treating reality as a simple *reflection* of the Great Manifestations of Absolute Spirit. Providence or Ruse of History on top of it all.

It is customary to repeat that a model is not reality in itself: Needless to say, one should stand on one's own affirmations. Where idealist dialectics only sees Providence as embodied in the Absolute Spirit (infra secularization of the Spirit as understood by Joachim of Fiore), the contradictory identity, which propels the laws of motion of Historical Materialism, points without ambiguity towards the increasingly realized equality and liberty of all the Subjects. The Individual with a capital I praised by Hegel never was meant to be the citizen corseted in his *formal* equality and always prey to the fantasies of Reason on Horseback. The authentic Citizen understands the fulfilment of Liberty as the Aesthetics of the Equality which is of the essence of all the members of the Human species. No one can pretend to be free without full individual and collective emancipation. The subordination of the Other remains an unhealed wound for all. Exclusivism is the essence of cast and class crimes.

We could schematically sum up in the following manner:

Dialectics of Nature : Nature ---//--> Man (Domain of the distinctions: Man is Nature but the reverse is not true.)

||

Overall Dialectics or Historical Materialism: This implies an active historical Subject. S/he embodies the contradictory identity that conjugates both Dialectics in the very same instant s/he reproduces him/herself individually and socially. This act is Human labor, both physical and mental labor, which alone creates the possibility for the existence of exchange value. The Subject is thus ontologically a « historical bloc » in Gramsci's sense, one that simultaneously takes the form of the Individual, with his/her own personality, and that of the class to which s/he belongs, consciously or unconsciously.

||

Dialectics of History: An anterior Mode of production (eg. Feudal)) # current Mode of production (eg. Capitalist). We are here in the Domain of Oppositions : one Mode cannot dominate together with another one; at most, we can witness forms of coexistence characterized by a transient domination from one above the other.

Method of investigation and method of exposition:

Any science is characterized by its method of investigation and by its method of exposition. Man being a conscious subject acting within Nature and History, this action operates through idioms, the most formalised of which, via the potency the written word conferred to memory, is Human language. In his **Cratylus** Plato already remarked that usual language names things, that is to say it apprehends them. Reflection and logic do the rest. Montaigne underlined the illusions created at time on judgement by the senses. Amplifying on this without betraying the subject, we could say that induction is to the method of investigation what deduction is to the method of exposition, both being always at play albeit in different degrees. This is completed by analogical reasoning, reasoning by elimination, reduction ad absurdum etc.

For its part, intuition pertains to the theory of Marxist psychoanalysis laid out in my **Pour Marx, contre le nihilisme** (the second part of which is available in English in the Livres- Books section of the site www.la-commune-paraclet.com). This is because it is tributary to the disinterested love of his/her Object of study by the Subject, « seeing with the heart » being the result of a prolonged effort, at time more sustained than usual, but always present in a latent fashion: among other things, this allows unplanned rapprochements, something known by all those who study the so-called paradigmatic revolutions in a given discipline.

The same applies to all sciences: they never start from scratch – from reason, to employ the Kantian term – and proceed by successive refinements. Althusser shows precisely all these possible stages which go from « experience » or from common and empirical science to the « concrete-in-thought » elaborated by Marx. To reach the « concrete-in-thought » of a scientific discipline allows it to enunciate the *universal* laws within the framework of the Universe to which it belongs.

Thus the Labor Law of Value was anticipated by Aristotle when he questioned the evidence according to which two different commodities could exchange for one another, and consequently evaluate themselves according to a common measuring stick or standard of value. Marx noted that Slavery as a Mode of production characterized the Ancient Philosopher's *forma mentis*, thus impeding him to draw the right logical conclusion. We know that the Ancient Romans had already developed the steam engine but only used it to propel their children's toys.

The emergence of the hegemony of capitalism revealed the central role played by Human labor in the development of exchange value. Notwithstanding, this historical evidence did not find its final logical outcome in classical political economy, say with the Physiocrats, Adam Smith and Ricardo, because they were unable to account for profit endogenously, within the function of production. With his Labor Law of Value, Marx gave political economy its definitive scientific status, squarely resting it on its own entirely elucidated « concrete-in-thought ». The theory could then discover the *laws of motion* of its Object of study, namely Political Economy.

Lavoisier and Darwin operated similar scientific revolutions. By historicizing the essential contribution of I. Kant, Marx noted that, as History unfolds, the general, and at time universal concepts, or « concrete-in-thought », do reveal themselves. However, the researcher or the research team must previously accomplish a rigorous investigation if they ever hope to lay down a worthwhile scientific exposition. The latter will deal either with general laws and at time with universal laws.

The « concrete-in-thought » is understood as the conceptual point of correspondence between the Concept and its Object of study, because, after it is reached, the understanding of the Object is finally opened up. From this, we can arrive at a scientific certitude according to what I called the *puzzle test*. In

effect, at a certain stage, a puzzle always ends up to reveal its Totality despite its incompleteness: Its Universe is then scientifically elucidated, otherwise what would be implied is a transition toward a new Universe, since the stage of general laws conceived outside it, is already left behind. This methodological advance allows us to correct many simplified notions such as those present in Th. Kuhn's paradigmatic revolutions, which treat as science all that is standardised and sold as such, even when it is deprived of a verifiable « concrete-in-thought », for instance, and notoriously, the oft edited textbook of Paul Samuelson.

The Marxist investigation method supposes the scientific-historical revelation of what Marx calls in his Method left in a draft stage, the « concrete-in-thought » specific to a specific Object of study. It should be underlined that Marx, the materialist critical disciple of Hegel and of Feuerbach, borrows his methodological duality from no one else than Immanuel Kant. So far this was universally missed, the poor Kant, one of the real father of the French revolution, of modern democracy and of the modern criticism of the anti-scientific narratives attempting to co-opt them, being misrepresented and deformed from the very beginning. Kant despised what he called paralogisms more than Plato's Socrates did for the sophisms of his time.

I maintain that Marx's « concrete-in-thought » is the scientific homage expressed by Historical Materialism to the greatest epistemologue, the most refined and intellectually honest practitioner of the scientific method, and assuredly, with J.J. Rousseau, Thomas Paine and Babeuf, one of the true fathers of the French Revolution, the great Thinker of Königsberg: Only the concrete-in-thought insufflates becoming to Kant's static but already empirical and highly original and secular approach. At the beginning said Kant are *sensations* and judgement, « a priori concepts » come later through the work of judgement and Reason. The materialism of Kant was far from being vulgar, which probably explains why he was so laboriously and tragically misunderstood, except by Marx. In the last instance, it rests squarely on sensations. That is to say on a materialist phenomenology without which all the discourses on Phenomena and Noumena are fatally nothing else than empty academic chat. Yet, it is antithetical to what Koyré so aptly called « Empirical Baconianism ». Tellingly, for I. Kant, the greatest Ancient philosopher was Epicurus.

The concrete-in-thought of the critique of classical political economy is the dual value of the labor force, namely use and exchange values (see the details in the

exposition below.) Similarly, the concrete-in-thought of linguistics as a specific Object of study, one superbly approached by Wittgenstein, is the **idiom**. By idiom, we intend here the ensemble of languages and formalised expressions, potently backed by memory and later by the written word, inherent to the twofold reality according to which the real is rational and vice-versa, while Man, a species dependent on sexual reproduction, must imperatively reproduce Himself through his/her interactions aimed at transforming this reality and this rationality.

In his confutation of modern positivism – Popper etc – as well as of the sophisms of the so-called Frankfurt School and others, the great Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser showed how, in the apprehension of an Object of study, scientific certitude can only be established when is it possible to elucidate the concrete-in-thought from which it unfolds notwithstanding the residual obscurities.

In his **Scienza nuova**, Giambattista Vico was without doubt the first to differentiate the various degrees of certitude of Human knowledge from the status of established scientific Truth. He summarized this by his famous phrase : *verum-factum*. Nonetheless, the researcher or better still the practitioner – theoretical practice – is not reduced to the stage of preliminary and groping investigation. Before Marx, this was eminently the case for Political Economy from Aristotle down to Smith and Ricardo and to ... Senior. In fact, this was the case for all economists up until my definitive elucidation of the Marxist Labor Law of Value, particularly for the theory of productivity fully integrated within the Equations of Simple and Enlarged Reproduction, against the calculated pretensions – and conscious falsifications - initiated by Böhm-Bawerk and continued by Tugan-Baranovsky and Bortkiewicz to Hicks, Irving Fisher and tutti quanti. (See the Appendix).

Critique of Political Economy as the principal axis around which Historical Materialism unfolds.

With society is born the social division of labor, and consequently the series of exchanges which imply the distinction between *use value* and *exchange value*. As soon as we no longer are able to produce all the objects we need, it is necessary to *alienate* the product of our own work, exchanging it for the product of another person's. Since the material conditions inherent to life in society are ontologically linked to the exchange value, the critique of Political Economy or

Marxist economic science, asserts itself as primordial in order to structure the apprehension of reality. By his sale, the laborer distances himself from the product his own work. It is clear that the social division of labor cannot be abolished except verbally by those who, under the cover of singing praises to the Younger Marx – to the studied exception of his definitive critique of exclusivism in his **Jewish question** - are prone to « return » us to the obscurantism preceding the Stone Age ...

The more the social division of labor and productivity increase, the more the collective worker succeeds in freeing his time. Therefore, the recovery of Man by Himself goes through the collective control of « social surplus value », certainly not through the petty-bourgeois illusions of putting an end to « alienation » in its literal sense. As soon as the goods and services are socially produced for all by all, Man ceases to be *reified* as a commodity: By subjecting himself to collective work, he does in no way lose his control over the surplus value he produced. This individual and collective discipline is exercised within the economic **Realm of Necessity** and constitutes the material foundation of the development of the **Realm of Liberty** within which the citizen-worker can fulfil his/her own personality.

In effect, it is only through the suppression of the capitalist limitations imposed on productive forces and on social relations of production for the sole benefit of private accumulation, that socialist planning tends to permanently reduce the scope of the Realm of Necessity for the benefit of the Realm of Liberty. It does so thanks to the constant widening of the « spaces of freedom » both individual and collective. The objective basis of this process rests on the constant development of productivity and on the sharing of its gains.

Contrary to what some Marxists did pretend, the Labor Law of Value expounded by Marx is an *universal* law simply because it squarely rests on a perfectly elucidated « concrete-in-thought ». Therefore, it is no longer historically dated in its principle but only in the implementation of its forms. *Absolute surplus value* - duration of work – represents the dominant mode of extraction of surplus value for all pre-capitalist Modes. As for *productivity* – or structural intensity of work – it does represent the dominant form of extraction of surplus value within the capitalist Mode of production. Following the indications given by Marx in his **Critique of the Gotha program**, I have demonstrated that *social surplus value* is the dominant form of extraction of surplus value within the socialist Mode of production.

Social surplus value is eminently coterminous with the socialist Mode of production. It simultaneously eliminates the exploitation of Man by Man, together with the resulting alienation or reification, without evidently eliminating the social division of labor. This explains the title of this work centered as it is on the essential role played by socialist planning and by its necessarily new Marxist statistics. These must urgently be developed on the basis of the integration of the Marxist function of production, that characterises the sectors and sub-sectors of production as well as the individual enterprise, within the Equations of Simple and Enlarged Reproduction, as demonstrated below. These scientific, hence Marxist, statistics are necessary to inform *Socialist democracy* in so far as it will determine the list of priorities dictating the allocation of available resources through planning.

The Marxist exposition of the critique of Political Economy would follow the plan which I developed in the very beginning of the 80's:

My starting point is the Marxist Labor Law of Value and consequently, the intimate nature of *the labor contract, which contains within itself all the other dimensions of power specifically those engendered by the Mode of production in question, including its juridical relationships*. The family and/or the household themselves rest on a power relationship structured by the sexual reproduction of the Human species and the reproduction of the labor force as a function of the considered Mode of production and of its epochs of redistribution.

This is of paramount importance to foresee and plan for social change. It is a simultaneously contradictory and coherent process that aims at the establishment of a well-rounded social structure, a process toward which all *social transitions* tend. It is equally crucial in « normal » times to devise the *mediations* imagined to palliate the social contradictions raised by the refusal of some classes to strive for the greatest systemic coherence. This was emblematically the case with the reaction of H. Truman when he won his primaries against Wallace and abruptly ended the deepening of the Welfare State conceived by F. D. Roosevelt's « Brain-trusters ». I then wrote the following:

« In his *Matériaux* (reproposed by Christian Palloix) Marx shows how the immediate process of production contains a labor process and a process (of production) of valorisation. Palloix sums up thus: $P_i = P_v + P_w$.

Taking my cue from this I want to show :

1) That **the relations of exploitation** contain a triple aspect and that the *nexus* between the three rests on this triad.

a) The **objective relations of exploitation** which designate the material aspect of the labor process; it is characterized by the objective aspect of exploitation, i.e., the extraction of absolute surplus value, relative surplus value, productivity and social surplus value.

b) The subjective relations of exploitation:

bi) relations of distribution in the narrow sense: The relation of exploitation presents itself here as an exchange relationship, namely an allocation of the product. Every own obtains his/her share: salary or profit. These relations of distribution within the relations of exploitation mask the reality of a valorisation of capital which rests on the appropriation by the Owner of the Means of production of part of the use value created by the worker.

bii) Juridical relationships: meanwhile these relations of distribution comprised within the relations of exploitation are ratified by the labor *contract* in which each contracting party appears as formally free, thus leading to the juridical relationships within the relations of exploitation.

2) **The relations of distribution**, intended here in a larger sense since they no longer are confined to the sphere of relations of exploitation. These relations of distribution send us back to the macro-economic policies enacted by the State (Book II of **Capital**), in particular fiscal and monetary policies with their effects on the distribution/redistribution of the national revenue and on inter-sectorial exchanges.

3) **The juridical relationships:** They include the whole legal framework that is imposed by the State and maintained over the National Social Formation. This legal framework is equally defined by the relations of property, of possession and dispossession as well as by the norms defining the rules for political representation, both for individuals and

groups (i.e., the democratic regime and its particular forms; the laws and/or statutes that define the fundamental rights of individuals and groups; the legal statute of economic associations and such (ex., the Combination Act of 1799 en UK and its modification in 1825, the Anti-trust etc.) »

First parenthesis: determinism and indeterminism; object and subject.

From the abridged exposition of the dialectic method of Historical Materialism given above, it should be apparent that the old and rather stale dualities, which could be called « Aristotelian » if they were not anterior to Aristotle, are debunked as soon as the Overall Dialectics and the concrete-in-thought have been clarified. This is true for the pseudo-opposition between determinism and indeterminism. Nowadays, an abusive use of the theory of probabilities is made in the sciences, notably in quantum physics. This happens despite the cruel fact, for instance, that it only masks a series of shibboleths intentionally spun in more or less « complex » propositions, all derived from the probabilistic approach to the structure of the atom and of the electrons. This approach was first developed to turn persistent difficulties and to advance science, but no one in his/her right mind would have pretended having resolved the existing ontological and methodological difficulties by the sole recourse to this practical subterfuge.

It is astounding that all those who practice this peculiar gymnastics, do pretend to impose on us not only the incertitude implied but, moreover, this incertitude erected into an axiom. Obviously, they have forgotten or better betrayed their Leibniz. He had been the first to propose this method to approach reality at least until science could better prevail. Of course, Leibniz did not ignore the essential and generally applicable remark made by Aristotle to the effect that it is possible to rise from the particular to the general even though the opposite is not necessarily true.

As far as the probabilities were concerned, he only applied a new tool to the old Socratic method of investigation proposed by Plato in his **Republic**: When a reasoning proves inconclusive, one does not simply abandon the research, instead s/he starts from a new angle and applies different logical tools and strategies. Plato spoke here of the « theatricity » of reasoning modes. In so doing, one never loses track of one's own Object of study and, above all, one never substitutes a narrative pseudo-theory in lieu of the specific reality that begs to be scientifically apprehended.

As far as Physics is concerned, someone could object that such assertions are not legitimate unless they come from trained physicians: However, by recalling the starting premises and the warning of Leibniz, it seems to me that this critique cannot be falsified unless one proposes a better theory of the atom than a narrative based on a scientific approximation according to which something can simultaneously be here and there. Ashby's cat getting closer or farther from the source of heat is quite endearing and simultaneously reassuring: That of Schrödinger was repugnant to Einstein as much as Gödel was to Wittgenstein.

It gets even worse with Hegel's unity of opposites. The critique we proposed above provides the supplement to the incomparable critique of scientific epistemology and methodology proposed by Lenin in his **Materialism and Empirio-Criticism** (1908). The same argument applies to the hilarious application of Chaos theory to the « dismal discipline » and to the study of the « facts » empirically taken from the oscillations of the Dow Jones. Opposite forces of the same intensity cancelling themselves, it always occurred to me that Lorenz's butterfly could never falsify the first pages of the vectorial calculus theory, having instead to complete it here and there when it is legitimate to do so.

Obviously, the argument can be much simpler at a more general level understood by all of us: I have always maintained in my books and elsewhere that the theory of probability could never enlighten the understanding of economic risk within all versions of bourgeois theories, most and foremost Marginalist theories. These ignore that prices depend on exchange value, and are equally unable to account for the genesis of profit and for the difference between profit and interest.

With the extreme speculative financialization of Western economies and of their GDP indicators, we immediately grasp the danger inherent in such a pseudo-science without soul or consciousness. When a Mandelbrot pompously pretended to clarify the subject through an analysis of the « factual » data taken straight from the Dow Jones, one cannot repress the urge to laugh his/her head off, although such instinctual reaction should quickly leave way to the deontological duty to sound the alarm bell in the hope to save at least a few students. The great mathematician Henri Poincaré refused to sanction the shibboleths of a Bachelier. I might underline here the verifiable fact that a North-American newspaper had tried to prove me wrong without quoting me – and thus giving me a right to respond – only to conclude that a housewife could

do, on average, as well as any trader. I hasten to add that High Frequency Trading does not alter this fact, although it will amplify the sheepish behavior of the market and the devastating effect of informatics bugs. Facts already demonstrate that this kind of trading leads to an extreme concentration given the oligopolistic tendency engendered by the volumes actually exchanged.

Similarly, referring back to my concept of « contradictory identity », which constitutes the heart or, if you will, the beating spirit of the Overall Dialectics of Historical Materialism, we see without much ado for nothing and without grand and superfluous discourse that the traditional dualist vision opposing determinism and indeterminism, is untenable. It proposes an object and a subject which interact in a non-elucidated scientific manner. This is true, for instance, with Karl Popper who transforms this lacunae into an gratuitous axiom presenting human understanding as a « miracle » beyond explanation, or for an eclectic « Marxist » such as Ernst Bloch who remains desperately Leibnizian on the matter (and thus, in this end, very religiously inclined because between Man and the Spirit understood as consciousness there can be an interaction while between Man and God, there cannot possibly exist any ultimate similitude except by analogy.)

Before Marx how many contortions did Western and World philosophy execute in sheer Masochist joy or in blissful and deep tragic suffering, instead of accounting for the obvious role of the Subject thanks to a good ontology, a good epistemology and a good methodology that would be worth of it. What remains perfectly stupefying is that long after Marx, we still need to endure this vacuous « principle of Hope » voluntarily amputated and subordinated, and, in effect, entirely contrary to the process of Human emancipation. Which is particularly true for all the versions given in the form of more or less bilateral *reflection* theories and other so-called more or less unstable and shaky structures-superstructures Logo constructions. Already in the Middle Ages, the impoverished French poet Rutebeuf sarcastically wrote : « L'espérance des lendemains, ce sont mes fêtes », the hope for tomorrow are my sole ...

Second parenthesis: a brief history of bourgeois economic falsifications.

What has been said above with respect to probabilities is equally true for the abuse of mathematics in the discipline. The problem is not only the disrespect for methodology but more generally speaking a much more perverse ontological and voluntary degeneration of the discipline. The consequences that flow from

this are even worse than the known cognitive dissonance according to which perceptions are substituted for reality, fatally leading in time to a correction imposed by sheer facts either in an incremental manner or by a shock. Here one feigns to believe that reality is mathematical, the concrete world merely reflecting it with more or less success, although neither Pythagoras, Socrates or Plato or for that matter any other sane theoretician would ever dream confusing Ideas and Numbers, the latter being conceived as logical techniques that are useful to formalise and apprehend the different Objects of study.

Pythagoras and his disciples studied the universes of Numbers, something Wittgenstein re-discovered and later developed when he finally understood that there was not a single mathematics but a plurality of mathematics. Logic is the queen of sciences. Arghiri Emanuel aptly described mathematics as a stenography of logics. I have shown that their congruence with the studied reality depends on the measuring unit which imposes the attributes that define its universe. This evidence was missed or forgotten by the Ancients and René Descartes for the doubling of the cube problem as well as by the more modern theoreticians in particular Peano and Bertrand Russell.

The ultimate perversion engendered by this logical degeneration, one which betrays the legitimate role of heuristic tools, is offered by the fallacious if conscious narrative imagined by a foolish Gödel. He was set on a self-conferred secret mission to block the road to science, in particular the science of his time developed by Turing who applied and surpassed the theories of Babbage, notably for the conception of the universal machine. The refutation of his ill-intentioned system is relatively easy; it consists in revealing the initial logical subterfuge he uses to later conclude that any open axiomatic system is ontologically incomplete, the others being limited by definition. He thus concludes fallaciously that there is an inherent limit to Human Reason, which, in the end, merely hides an attempt to reverse the theory of *becoming* known to lead to a general emancipation of mankind through the rising of the level of education and the development and honest transmission of science. It suffices to underline that all Cretans cannot be liars all the time to see his paradoxical self-referring system collapse. In fact, if this were the case, then they could simply not be viable as Beings and thus would not belong to the Human species which remains over-determined by the Dialectics of Nature – *natura naturans*, says Spinoza – and by the Dialectics of History, both eminently scientific although in a different manner.

I believe there exists true and false paradoxes. The former points to the necessity to change the Universe of reference so as to be able to continue the scientific investigation work. False paradoxes on the other hand send one back to a logical contradiction between major and minor premises which fatally leads one to draw wrong conclusions. Often this is the result of conscious and ill-intentioned falsification which aim at blocking the road to science and thus to «human emancipation. At times it is merely the result of confusion. For instance, Zeno d'Elea's Paradox is a typical example of false paradoxes because it confuses the abstract conception of a point with the substantial nature of a distance travels by natural bodies. In brief, the concepts and the theories are no longer congruent with their Object of study.

This being said, it is of paramount importance not to confuse Gödelian incompleteness – a different form of the pseudo-logic of indeterminism and uncertainty – with becoming, which by definition, is not foreclosed but nevertheless remains scientifically apprehendable, at least in the domains that already rest on a specific « concrete in thought ». By analogy, let us say that the Universe of whole numbers is infinite ($n+1$) although it is perfectly amenable to precise rules strictly connected to the attributes of their Universe. These rules allow various quantitative applications though they remain scientific and useful in practice albeit their horizon is not foreclosed. The same applies to History.

As far as the discipline is concerned, let us recall that Jules Ferry congratulated Léon Walras – the Université in France had refused his candidature – for his mathematical formulation of the discipline. This conferred to it a scientific allure while making it less understandable to the common of mortals.

Furthermore, in so doing Walras brought to its logical conclusion the project initiated by Jean-Baptiste Say when he used to implications of Ricardo's « paper currency » in order to unilaterally reformulate all the components of the function of production in money terms, namely in exchange value terms, thus evacuating use value, in particular the use value of labor power. This had the advantage to occult the genesis of profit that lies within the relations of exploitation. As we know, profit come from the fact that the use value of the labor power is used by the Owner of the Means of production, who pockets the difference, over and above what is socially needed to reproduce it. Walras was so bold as to pretend that his amputated system was socialist and scientific a character which Marx had rightly claimed for his Labor theory of value.

Interestingly, the forays of the bourgeois theoretician of Lausanne into cooperatives ended very badly.

We know that Auguste Walras had advised his son Léon, who seemed obviously overtaken by the inegalitarian circles active in Lausanne, never to forget the social presuppositions and finalities of the discipline. The latter pushed the ontological and methodological difficulty aside, arbitrarily setting two complementary disciplines, his own economic « science » and social economy. Nonetheless, contrary to what Maurice Allais, a Walrasian well-intentioned citizen, thought, one cannot coherently inform the set of equations of the first with the empirical data provided by the second because they are strictly interdependent. This contradiction is far more lethal than the effect produced at times by changes in the parametric conditions of a given system.

Joseph Schumpeter sized upon Walras's distinction between economic (Marginalist, of course) science and social economy and simply transformed it into an ontological dichotomy. Schumpeter did not ignore that in so doing he was occulting the abyssal contradiction which condemns all bourgeois economic theories, including Keynes's own system, namely the impossible reconciliation between micro and macroeconomics. Walras's liquefied « market of the markets » does not lift this contradiction and is incapable to explain general equilibrium, even through successive trials. The *ex ante/post hoc* that the forger Böhm-Bawerk wrongly imputed to Marx, does in fact characterise all versions of the bourgeois economic sciences. The Marxist function of production, which I have elucidated for the theory of productivity coherently integrated within the Equations of Simple and Enlarged Reproduction – RS-RE – is the only one capable to lift this otherwise lethal contradiction.

Keynes has proposed to do it in an exogenous fashion when he justified the regulatory and planning intervention of the State in the economic realm. In his conception this was necessary to free capitalism from his own crisis-brewing « animal spirits ». In the end this amounted either to the acceptance of the logical contradiction that begged to be dealt with or to an admission of Schumpeter's dichotomy. R. Solow aggravated things further when he backtracked towards the conception of the hegemony of the « market » with its razor-hedged equilibrium. This applied to the labor market which, according to him, would then automatically lead to full-employment, something negated by all known facts. Moreover, he did so without being able to incorporate technology in his system in an endogenous fashion. As Marx had noted, the unceasing

development of productivity characterises the revolutionary contribution of the Capitalist Mode of production to History. This remains true, at least up until the development of the productive forces come into contradiction with that of the relations of production, for instance due to the non-equitable sharing of the productivity gains between capital and labor.

The best refutation of this pseudo-mathematical hoax imposed on the discipline consists in demonstrating the successive falsifications which, in accordance to the usual method, strive to falsify or, failing that, to occult the unequaled scientific contributions offered by Karl Marx, notably in his **Capital**. Needless to say Marx's magnum opus alone had finally established the discipline as a science in and by itself.

The falsification started with Böhm-Bawerk when he came up with a forged contradiction, which I debunked, between Book I and Books II and III of **Capital**. Bortkiewicz and Tugan-Baranovsky proposed to lift this supposed contradiction with a recourse to quadratic equations. As I demonstrated in the late 70's, in so doing they were falsifying further the problem of general equilibrium – namely that of Reproduction. This was done by substituting to the scientific Equations of Simple and Enlarged Reproduction - SR-ER – demonstrated by Marx, a set of equations uniquely chosen to be resolved with a simultaneous resolution. This hoax was soon upheld by all except the Bolshevik theoreticians or those inspired by them, among whom the great Louis Althusser.

It goes without saying that this mathematical system has nothing to do any longer with the problem of the microeconomic and macroeconomic determination of the exchange value of commodities, which sends one back to the Marxist SR-ER. Hicks was one of those who contributed the most in the consolidation of what was called « bastard Keynesianism » because he sent bourgeois economic science back to a synthesis much less innovative than that offered by Keynes and developed further notably by Piero Sraffa, Joan Robinson and Harrod. Hicks was inspired by the simultaneous resolution method in his disillusioned attempt to generalise Marshall's system, which was limited to two commodities, essentially capital and « corn », corn being conceived as a sort of primitive basket of consumption.

Meanwhile, Irving Fisher, a avowed disciple of Böhm-Bawerk, contributed in consciously liquidating the substance of the function of production, capital and labor power, in indiscriminately transforming everything in to an « income

stream ». He was thus evacuating capital, labor, profit and rent, that is to say the objective basis of class struggle which Marx had proposed to analyse in Book III of **Capital**. He was thus bringing to its logical term the original falsification initiated by Jean-Baptiste Say and Walras, namely that which consists in considering the component of the function of production solely in terms of price, in abstraction of any consideration of the use value.

As we know, use value is the necessary support of exchange value and consequently it cannot take the eviscerated and subjective form of « utility » and of « marginal utility », notions which were already debunked by anticipation in the chapter entitled « The last hour of Senior » (Book I of **Capital**) at least when this chapter is fully understood. In effect, the product of the process of production must be coherently and proportionally allocated among all the components of the function of production. This scientific truth was definitively established with my demonstration of the Marxist law of productivity.

The Fisherian falsification corresponded to the assertion of financial capital, thus of a new form of interest functioning in relative autonomy with respect to profit, although it only forms a subaltern part of it. Worse still, it aggravates the general capitalist tendency, one totally misunderstood by all bourgeois economists. This consists in confusing interest and speculative interest. This becomes particularly true when the latter usurps the role of profit which it irrationally taps (ROE, etc) as is fully the case since the abrogation of the Glass Steagall Act of 1999. Fisher, who pretended to apply mathematics to the discipline, equally and consciously contributed to the assertion of the grotesque tautology which, for all versions of bourgeois economy, passes for a theory of money and of its circulation. One learns without surprise that all his predictions were false, in particular the optimistic ones he made just before the unfolding of the Great Depression and again before the start of the so-called Recession in the Depression of 1936-37. As we know he ended up ruined, a development which no doubt, albeit it occurred a bit late, did entice him to conceive his own version of the « 100 % money » theory in an ultimate attempt to contain the speculative monster he had contributed to unleash with his « income stream » vacuous generalisation.

Today, this perverse degeneration reaches new heights with the pretention to erect microeconomics as a mathematical science totally abstracted from macroeconomics. These unashamed forgers often officiate in private

universities in which they militate to retrain plurality in the discipline. Likewise, in their ivory towers, they officiate in favor of transnationals' interests substituting them to the legitimate interests of Nations-States and of their citizens.

Of course, not only would they be at a loss to explain the genesis of profit, but obviously they never took the time to consider the genesis of their Supply and Demand Curves. In order to draw it, the Supply curve supposes demand schedules in prices which are provided in an empirical and exogenous manner. And vice-versa to draw the Demand curves. After which, crossing both curves, the hallucination happens in the guise of equilibrium price, with an eventual shift to the right or to the left! It goes without saying that these wonders of bourgeois microeconomics entitles these conscious forgers to a batch of pseudo-Nobel Prices conferred by the Swedish Central Bank ... The Nations-States, cradles of the sovereignty of the people finally substituting itself to divine rights after centuries of struggles, are thus increasingly subordinated to these self-chosen though over-represented hegemonic great priests. Similarly, formal bourgeois democracy just recently extirpated from its original Censitarian cast, is « once again » substituted with shareholder democracy, which is itself over-determined by the unequal distribution of socially produced wealth.

Third parenthesis: on the mediation versus intermediation.

The intermediation between Subject and Object is the priests' and rabbis' rituals, an old and stale religious trick. In the scientific fields, it took – pace Galileo, Bruno and Spinoza – the forms of Inquisition and of ostracism in the name of « the deference due to Authority », and consequently to the Syllabus and the Index. In the modern forms, it appears in the guise of academic and social exclusion and in that of the selective capitalist financing of scientific research.

On the other hand, the Marxist « mediation » corresponds to a more modern world predisposed to Enlightenment through the use of Historical Materialism and of its concrete-in-thought. Mediations attempt to deal with systemic contradictions and are either scientifically or empirically determined. When the latter are temporarily unavailable, we fall back on the general statements and laws expounded by Althusser but with a careful insistence on the necessary congruence between the Object of study and the analysis proposed, taking great care to distinguish among the different forms it assumes, either investigation or

exposition. (See .

<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1963/unevenness.htm>.

The analytical greatness of the great Marxist Louis Althusser must be modestly emphasised here, although or because he unfortunately did not possess the elucidated theory of productivity. In effect, Althusser's rigor comes out distinctly especially when compared to all the Lilliputians who tried to get on his back from all corners, including in his intimate life.)

We all know the pseudo-paradox which opposes determinism and indeterminism in the social sciences as succinctly reformulated by Simon and Cyert in the MIT: Given that Man or at least the Human groups who control the resources of the Community, do act on their environment, including when it is modified by their own actions, is scientific prediction possible? Idem for economic planning.

Some English theoreticians answered with the concept of back-planning: Within pre-existing parametric constraints, it is possible to forecast tendencies and thus to fix the objectives one wishes to reach, above all when Human actions are preponderant. It then suffices to make the necessary adjustments as one goes. This apparently ingenuous argument supposes a (socialist?) unanimity or, at least, a monopoly on the decision-making process, one that would be able to eliminate any deleterious interferences. The real answer lies with the Marxist mediation. However, as explained above, this will be true in the domains for which the specific concrete-in-thought has already been demonstrated. The rest will either look like a puzzle to be completed or, failing that, it will raise the question of a coherent transition to a new Universe (That is to say, it will point to a new referential system that in no way does confute the preceding Universes, previously elucidated for their respective fields, no more than Euclidian geometry is debunked in ordinary tasks by other more modern theories, be they proposed by Einstein or by Lobachevski and others.)

Mutatis mutandis, similar causes producing similar effects, real unexpected effects send us back either to an incomplete understanding of the causation chain, or to the intervention of subordinated but intervening variables. For instance, competition fatally abolishing itself in the medium and long terms, it cannot explain value or constant prices and necessarily points to a different causality, namely that induced by the Marxist Labor Law of Value.

Consequently, if the Marxist Labor Law of Value is truly scientific, the variations and distortions flowing from market prices must necessarily be

explained on the basis of the more or less conscious mediations based on it. One purpose of this book is precisely to demonstrate this assertion.

The capitalist market is nothing other than a form of the market generically speaking, namely a topological or abstract institution that defines the specific rules and framework in which exchanges do unfold. Exchanges and thus markets are historically defined by their respective Modes of production and their Epochs.

The market is the class operator of these mediations in so far as it transforms the exchange values of commodity into their nominal or monetary epiphenomena. We will show later that the variations introduced in the capitalist Mode of production by the price epiphenomena are strictly over-determined, hence entirely understandable and susceptible to be corrected by the Marxist Labor Law of Value when it is duly reintegrated within the Equations of Simple and Enlarged Reproduction.

A similar if more complete manner to express this is given by the key statement made by the **Communist Manifesto** according to which History is the History of class struggle. Although we are all conscious of the pioneering and refined version proposed by Vico in his **Scienza nuova**, it truly becomes scientifically founded once the scientific method marshalled by the Marxist Labor Law of Value is substituted to the ingenious, yet not entirely pertinent, philological method developed by the great Neapolitan thinker, who was himself potentially inspired by the « secularization of the Spirit » operated by the great Pythagorean Calabrian Abbot, Joachim of Fiore.

In brief, within a specific framework, or worse still, within a post-scientific or narrative (i.e., Marginalist) framework, the social mediations made necessary by the debilitating hiatus existing between narration and reality are operated by class choices, but only through an empirical and often haphazard and blind method. In a scientifically elucidated framework, the mediations are chosen according to the level of class struggle so as to optimize the minimal common interest and welfare compatible with the class legitimization process.

For instance, the indexation of wages does not resolve the inflation or deflation problems, no more than the massive injections of liquidities by the capitalist central banks can resolve the current economic problems, among which the « credit crunch » which, in fact, they tend to aggravate. The Marxist Quantitative Theory of Money already laid down in my essay **Tous ensemble** – 1996 –

allows a scientific understanding of the problem. Thanks to appropriate mediations, it then becomes possible to tolerate a so-called « civilized rate of inflation » corresponding to the divergence verified between the social salary mass, which includes UI and Social Security programs, and the real salary mass, this last concerning strictly the effectively employed working force.

Obviously, the best way to eradicate structural inflation – not to be confused with other forms of inflation – remains full-employment. This virtuous full-employment can be easily reached through the Reduction of the Working Week based on *the sharing of micro-economic productivity gains*. These productivity gains can be maximised thanks to the collective control of the « social surplus value », thus leading to the best possible *macro-economic competitiveness* within the given Social Formation (SF). Obviously, this will have to take into account the insertion of the given SF within the World Economy paying due attention to the current anti-dumping definition.

In this way, one can resolve many ancillary questions, for instance the normative or prescriptive aspects of the proposals derived from the analysis. They then appear uniquely as avatars emerging from an old dualist fund, left in the shadow despite the reasoned injunction embodied in Marx's *XI Thesis on Feuerbach*. The class struggle, organically expressed on an objectively demonstrable dialectical basis, does equally resolve the false paradox mentioned above. To summarize paraphrasing the **18 Brumaire**: Man does write History but not according to his/her own will because the past weighs on his/her shoulders like the Alps.

Lest us return to the heart of the question. It is clear that the manner in which the 3 main economic relationships, exploitation, distribution and juridical, are inter-related, is the same manner in which the immediate process of production is linked to the global process of reproduction. If political power can be defined as the ability to allocate the resources of the Community for the well-being of the Community, then according to this classical definition, reproduction is the proper space for politics and thus for the State.

However, this definition would remain corseted in arbitrary and, in the last instance, in purely ideological limits unless one is careful not to exclude the space, or « contested terrain », on which the real stakes are fought for, namely the production process. Production precedes any social distribution and redistribution. Similarly, the relations of distribution and the juridical

relationships, which make up the concrete content of reproduction, are generally analysed in abstraction of what constitutes their real stake, that is to say the maintenance, transformation or total subversion of the three aspects of exploitation on which they rest.

On this basis we can now specify the complex reality inherent to the Dialectics of History designated by the materialist conception of History as class struggle and class alliances. The theory of class struggle should afford us the possibility to theorise the role of the State within the capitalist society. »

If we simplify this schemata, we would obtain the following:

- I) Relations of exploitation, real or formal.
- II) Relations of distribution, real or formal.
- III) Juridical relationships (redistribution via the forms assumed by the State and its Epochs) in the narrow or larger sense.

To this would be added another section, relative to the exposition of the becoming of the discipline itself, namely the transition from its investigation status to the exposition status discussed above. In short, the scientific discovery of the Marxist Labor Law of Value and of its forms and its on-going critique of bourgeois economic pseudo-science.

We will notice that this schemata is none other than that adopted by Marx himself in the French edition of **Capital**, Book I. Marx presented his Magnum Opus as being composed of Four (4) Books. It is now possible to understand precisely why. This will spare us the infantile infra-Marxist puerilities churned out on the structure of **Capital** after its posthumous publications, for instance that done recently by a Rubel for the Editions La Pléiade. In these hands, Marx appears as inferior to the bourgeois theoreticians of the sociology of knowledge despite his **German Ideology**. Of course, Marx himself had taken great care to note in his prefaces that the French editions of **Capital**, Book I, should be considered as reference editions because he himself had entirely written and edited them.

Paul De Marco,
Copyright © La Commune Inc, 01 novembre 2012. Translated in English end of August 2016.

Readings :
Marx, **Méthode**

Kant, I, **Critique of Pure Reason.**

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/ethics/kant/index.htm>

Vico, G., **Scienza Nuova** in English **New Science**,

https://archive.org/stream/newscienceofgiam030174mbp/newscienceofgiam030174mbp_djvu.txt , (and the essays by Paul Lafargue on Vico available in

www.marxists.org)

Benedetto Croce, **What is living and what is dead in Hegel today.**

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/help/kainz7.htm>

Lénine, **Materialism and Empirio-Criticism** (1908)

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/mec/>

Staline (**Dialectical and historical materialism** Sept 38; et **Economic**

Problems of Socialism in the USSR Feb-Sept 1952) see www.marxists.org

Althusser, Louis, **On dialectical materialism.**

<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1963/unevenness.htm>.

Sartre, JP, **L'êtré et le néant.** (In English, **Being and Nothingness**)

Kojève, A, **Essai d'une histoire raisonnée de la philosophie païenne** (Kojève attempted to rehabilitate here the concept of labor in Hegel. Some Kojève's essays on Hegel in English are also available in www.marxists.org)