

## *SUMMA OECONOMIE*

### Summary

Written 1986,

#### *Economic science today*

At the beginning of his book the author draws attention to the fact that economic science is in chaos and that it can no longer constitute the means of managing economy.

This chaos, the author believes, is the result of sketchy and inadequate understanding of capital. The classics of economy and Marx have formed a school of thought on capital, a theory on capital that seemed to be totally true and final. It appeared that capital as such was thoroughly understood. This has been amply confirmed in practice – in the application of their theories in comprehending the movement of capital and in controlling that movement. Their theories did not, however, foresee that capital would continue to *develop* (perfecting within itself) and that it would prove itself through that very *development* to be quite different from their concept of it.

When capital had reached the stage of true development it began to function quite differently, and this was – according to the author – the reason behind the inadequacy, impotence even, of those theories to either explain its movement or to control it. In order to deal with the resultant problems and to forestall damage, economists are attempting to discover a different application of existing theories, or to create their own new, modified ones on the basis of the existing. Since those new and modified theories all fall short of being able to explain matters, they are being propped up by auxiliary theories which in their turn are supported by secondary theories... and so on. The sheer volume of those auxiliary means is rendering contemporary economic science utterly ineffective. It can no longer be aided by refinement or modification of existing theories; there is a need for *change of Copernician* dimensions to put matters to rights.

The economic theory of social ownership is not plagued by such confusion, but only – the author believes – because there is as yet no theory.

#### *New dialectics – a precondition for change*

If anyone were to attempt to implement that Copernician change utilizing the same thought-and-cognitive apparatus as used by the classics of economy, by Marx, and which is still in use by bourgeois and non-bourgeois economists alike, and if that apparatus were to be correctly applied, results would be identical to those achieved by the foregoing economists. Any such attempt is therefore doomed to failure in advance. A Copernician change in economic science would require a new and more advanced thought-and-cognitive apparatus.

This new instrument is a tetradic dialectic, presented by the author in his book *A Draft for Criticism of Dialectics* (Zagreb, 1985). This article focuses only on those elements of the new dialectics which are required for a sound understanding of economics.

In addition to **thesis**, **antithesis** and **synthesis** (the elements of triadic dialectics) the tetradic dialectic contains also the EPITHESES. Development of a being does not evolve through three basic, essential stages as has been thought until now, rather – the author

claims – through four stages. Epithesis, the fourth stage, is the stage of **reproduction**. According to incomplete (triadic) dialectics the synthesis (the result of development) is abolished (revolutionised), since it is in fact the result of a new and higher development process. In the tetradic dialectic the synthesis is not abolished (revolutionised) but is reproduced – maintained. A house, for example, is not **pulled down** after being built but is **maintained** in order that one may live in it. Every being passes first through a stage of self-development (through thesis, antithesis and synthesis), after which follows the stage of self-reproduction or self-maintenance (through epithesis). It is important to keep in mind that the result of development is maintained (reproduced) by devising ever more perfect **methods** of self-maintenance.

Through thesis, antithesis and synthesis development has an **revolutive** form (manner), and through epithesis, **evolutive**.

*Summa oeconomie* is the application of tetradic dialectics in the field of economic science.

### ***Capital is a being***

Capital, the author believes, is in reality the basis on which both work and humane life are founded, while in economic science it is at one and the same time a basic category and the greatest enigma.

So far, economic science has approached capital via the question: How does it function? The author however believes that the crux of the matter lies in the question: What is capital? And he immediately gives his answer: capital is a being, a being serving a purpose.

Capital is not a natural being, the author tells us; rather, it is an ‘artificial’ being. It is not a self-purposeful being but a being *serving a purpose*. The difference is in the following: Self-purposeful (natural) beings find their *raison d’être* in their own existence – they are a purpose unto themselves – while the purpose of the existence of capital is not in itself but in man, since it exists because of man. Capital is not a living being, but as it is Something only with an entity with man neither is it a non-living being. In itself it is not rational, despite the fact that it is – among other things – the reproduced and useful mind of man, and partly because the original human mind is an inseparable part of it. Capital is not a thing (RES, HREMA or PRAGMA) since, as opposed to a thing, it has a *capacity for self-development*. A thing, on the other hand, is *Something* which possesses no such capability. However, capital could not exist if it did not also appear as a thing. One could also take it as wealth, but thus categorized it is insignificant; capital is first and foremost a being (ENS or TO ON) created to free mankind from being slaves to work. And finally, capital is not merely a *relation* – as Marxists claim – since it exists realistically and actually. It does not therefore exist only as a *relation* (man’s relation towards a thing and towards another man) but also as a *substance*.

### ***The emergence and development of capital***

The author believes it to be beyond any shadow of doubt that the human species aspires towards liberation from work and from the constant concern for self-preservation. He further believes that such an aspiration can be realized only through the creation of a purposeful being – of Something that would contain within itself the power for self-development and an ability for purposeful activity – since the only form of a *being* is able to replace man in work. Things are incapable of performing that function. Individuals as such

cannot create an ‘artificial’ *being*. Only a *species* is able to do that. Creative acts by individuals, nations and even of entire civilizations are essentially different from the creative acts of a species; however brilliant or universal their deeds, they remain always at the level of things. *A new being can be introduced into the world through a creative act of a species.* Through the creation of a new (purposeful) being, an intelligent species manifests and proves its creative abilities.

Capital is a purposeful *being*, the author claims – it is Something that contains within itself the power of self-development. In order to achieve its full development it must avail itself of man’s abilities. At the same time, and since it is a purposeful being, it serves man as a means to reproduce those things which meet his needs and desires. Creation and self-development of capital depends on human abilities. Self-preservation of the human species depends upon the productivity of capital. When an intelligent species creates a purposeful being, a being which is to free that species from work and concern for its self-preservation, then that species must, for the very sake of its own liberation, submit itself (up to a point) to laws and aims of the self-development of that being, as well as to its power over that same species.

### ***Development dialectics of capital***

Here, the author demonstrates that up until now the inner development of capital has been a totally unknown quantity in economic science because that same science has approached it as if it has always been as it is today, only in a somewhat lesser quantity. The author claims, however, that capital has undergone within itself a number of revolutionary changes, and he goes on to present us with a potted history.

The first form of existence of capital – the THESIS – is *money*. At this initial stage of its development, evolution of capital can only be quantitatively enlarged, amassed. The outward means for its self-amassment is the passion for hoarding, the method being usury. Usurious, commercial and bank accumulations of the late Antique period and the Middle Ages were the first accumulations to be made by the human species; in other words the first essentially significant form of the existence of capital.

The second stage of its development – the ANTITHESIS – is *technique*. This is a degree of evolution at which capital acquires the art of producing (TECHNE) and when it produces diverse usable objects. The outward means of its self-enlargement is the business acumen (entrepreneurship) of its owner and his desire to become rich.

The SYNTHESIS, or the result of the (revolutive) development of capital, is *science (positive sciences)*. The term ‘science’ is not incidental; it is in fact a degree of self-development at which capital is self-cognizant as a purposeful and productive power. Science, therefore, is nothing more than *self-aware* or *self-cognizant* capital. Through that self-cognisance, which is but a synthesis of its development, capital gains a full beingness. The means of spreading and expanding the science (i.e. capital) is the scientifically trained labour force and its creative activity.

The EPITHESES of the development of capital is *technology*, which is the result of self-application, a practical and effective self-reproduction of science. Such a self-reproduction of science is the key method of capital self-reproduction in general, i.e. of its self-maintenance. In this stage of development capital develops itself in a evolutive manner, by

devising (through the application of science) ever more efficacious methods of self-reproduction (self-maintenance).

**Money, technique, science and technology** are no more – the author believes – than degrees of the self-development of capital. Technique results from the negation, i.e. the revolutionization, of money; science through revolutionization of technique, and technology through the reproduction of science. Science, being the result, the synthesis of development, is not subordinate to abolition (revolutionization). According to the principles of the tetradic dialectic it can only be reproduced.

### ***Dialectic of the development of human society***

The author explains that the tetradic dialectic substantiates the claims of freedom being the aim to mankind aspires and advances. The condition of that freedom is liberation from work. Progress towards that aim is achieved through increasingly productive implements and the establishment of ever more productive social relations (societies). However, by means of the tetradic dialectic the author uncovers some rather radical misconceptions in the understanding of the future society and the manner of its establishment. The author believes that such misconceptions can, for the most part, be laid at the door of dialecticians, among them being and in particular, of course, Marx.

But in addition to these misconceptions we also owe to those dialecticians, the author believes, our true awareness of the dialectic nature of human history and of the differentiation between phases of history according to the characteristics that human relations have imprinted upon them. We are presented here with a schematic exposé of the concept itself that is based on tetradic dialectics.

1. Thesis - Neolitical society
2. Antithesis - Slavery
3. Synthesis - Capitalism - Burgeois society
4. Epithesis - Antropotechnological civilisation, or antropotechnological universe

The methods by which capitalism maintains itself and through which it attains its inner goals (development of capital) are at the same time a method of leading towards the achievement of the aims of mankind (the metahistorical aims). The capitalist society is, therefore, a purposeful social instrument attuned to realization of the goals for which mankind strives. In that light, the capitalist society is the aim, a *synthesis* or a result of the social development of mankind. This is indicated also by the above scheme. However, capitalism is not the final goal of human species. By creating a society such as capitalism, mankind has created but a tool, a social means that is yet to enable it to realize the metahistorical goals – final goals of mankind.

Since capitalist society is a social means with the aid of which the human species is to attain its goals, it cannot, must not, be abolished (revolutionised); rather, it must be reproduced. Such a conclusion stems from the principles of the author's new, tetradic dialectic. The society following after capitalism – and which has not been given a name in the scheme – can be created only through the process of self-reproduction (self-maintenance) of capitalism. In order to survive, capitalism must search for and devise ever more efficacious and purposeful methods of self-reproduction. Once the method finally becomes more

valuable than the basis it is to preserve, it will itself become a new basis (a new type of society).

### **Marx and capital**

In the author's opinion, Marx perceived the beingness of capital, it being both the goal and the result of *mankind's* creative drive, as an alienated human strength that has turned against man. In other words, he understood it as an evil rather than as a blessing. Having so perceived capital, Marx went on to insist that capital should be abolished as capital, that it be decapitalized, i.e. that it be transformed into a *means* that should meet the needs of man – the needs of the comprehensively developed individual and not of *mankind*. To abolish capital as capital, to decapitalize it, would be to deprive it of its beingness and to reduce it to a mere *thing*. If such a move were to be accompanied by an insistence that man be freed from work – as did Marx – then such an insistence is, the author of *Summa* believes, shown to be utterly absurd since no *things* (with which one must work) can free a man from work. Such a goal can be attained only by a *being* that is able to work instead of a man. The economic experience of socialism is right now manifesting the full absurdity of Marx's demands.

### **The true substance of real-socialism**

The society that is to follow after capitalism must, in the author's opinion, grow through the self-reproduction of capitalism and not, as has been attempted in fact, through the revolutionary abolishment of private ownership coupled with the establishment of some kind of Utopian, anti-economic society based on social ownership, for which it is not even known whether it can function at all.

The architects of the 'new' and 'humane' society, as well as of 'social' ownership, did not wish to reproduce 'alienated' capitalism and private ownership and were instead compelled to reproduce slave ownership and feudalism in socialist practice.

Slave ownership was reproduced through *coercing* workers to work – through forced labour. A worker is *not motivated* to work since his income remains constant whether or not he works. In fact the less he works the more his wage actually rises, as he exchanges less of his labour for the same wage. It is therefore a matter of one's own intelligence and, naturally, in one's own personal interest to work as little and to as low a standard as possible. In this situation the only way to extract the maximum from a worker is to force him to work.

Feudalism is reproduced through the key function within a society (the management function) being given to those who prove by their actions their *loyalty* to the idea (ideology) of that Utopian society based upon 'social' ownership. Needless to say, their actions and efforts are directed and dedicated towards maintaining the status quo in society and to perpetuating their function within it, but never towards the advancement of that society.

The author believes that in actual fact the socialist revolution was a counter-revolution, a leap into the past rather than into the future. Real-socialist societies have no future, since attainment of their goals is not pursued through methods designed to realize the aims of a species. In order to survive, the peoples in such countries must carry out fundamental reforms of their societies.

### ***New economy – a condicio sine qua non of reform***

The key problem of those societies, the author believes, lies in the economy, and the key problem of the economy is how and with what could the private ownership dependency on capital be replaced, i.e. how can the existence of individuals who come into contact with socially owned capital be made dependent upon it and, through such a dependency, be compelled to foster it, reproduce it and develop it (perfect it) regardless of whether or not they wish to do so.

The new – which should transform social capital into a productive capacity – can be based only on specific legislation that to date is non-existent and which the author has called logocracy. Its specific feature is in its being expressed as mathematical formulae.

The following is how the author sees the legislation on which the economy of social ownership should be based.

### ***Company law***

The author believes that in the first place one has to bear in mind the fact established by the classics of economy and by Marx – subsequently confirmed by economic practice – the rule which states that capital can survive only if it is developed (perfected).

The criterion for the development of capital is its productivity. Productivity of a company's capital may be calculated by dividing the total profit realized on the market by the total production costs of goods sold in the market place. The author calls the figure obtained through that operation the coefficient of capital productivity (QCP).

$$QCP = \frac{\text{profit realized on the market}}{\text{total production costs}} = \frac{\text{US\$ 300}}{\text{US\$ 100}}, \quad QCP = 3$$

The figure 3 is the coefficient of the productivity of capital. It shows us by how much US\$ 1 of capital has been increased through production and the sale of goods in the market place. *The law should rule that the income of those employed by a certain amount of capital must be in proportion to the coefficient of its productivity.* This can be achieved only by means of a cost list of work-hours which can be compiled in tabular form. This list should be valid for all types of labour force and for all companies within a state regardless of their occupation or employment since after all, the author believes, all companies are producers of money. The cost of one work-hour would depend on the coefficient of the productivity of each company's capital and upon the qualifications of its employees, while overall income would depend upon the number of work-hours. Salary also depends on quality of work of single worker. Bad working worker and good working worker, in one the same company, can not get an equal salary, in despite of equal qualifications and equal number of work-hours.

**Table 1**

KPK	Prices of work hours for various qualifications and manager. levels \$					
	NQ V	Q	HQ V	MNG 1	MNG 2	MNG 3

1	1,3	1,7	2,2	4,1	6,2	8,0
2	1,7	2,2	2,9	6,2	8,0	10,4
3	2,2	2,9	3,7	8,0	10,4	13,5
4	2,9	3,7	4,8	10,4	13,5	17,5
5	3,7	4,8	6,2	13,5	17,5	22,7
6	4,8	6,2	8,0	17,5	22,7	29,5
7	6,2	8,0	10,4	22,7	29,5	38,3
8	8,0	10,4	13,5	29,5	38,3	49,7
9	10,4	13,5	17,5	38,3	49,7	64,6
10	13,5	17,5	22,7	49,7	64,6	83,9

Symbols NQ, Q HQ denominates level of expertness of employees – NQ, no qualified, Q qualified, HQ high qualified, and MN 1, MN 2 i MN 3 denominates level of manager’s position in a manager’s team.

Such a principle of work compensation cannot be regulated through a verbal rule but only by numbers. Without a cost list for work-hours any verbal rule whereby work must be paid for in proportion to its productivity is merely an empty phrase to which no one need adhere. Where no such numerical law exists, one is faced first with a plundering of social capital through exorbitant and unscrupulous rises in employees’ wages and then by a plundering of the work force through a ruthless reduction in wages to an existential minimum. More succinctly, first the workers steal the capital, followed by the bureaucracy robbing the workers.

The same law should also establish the minimal annual rate of the CCP, *and any manager who fails to achieve it would automatically lose the right to manage a company – i.e. he would lose his job.*

### *The way on the management of society*

Before presenting an outline of this law, the author draws our attention to one feature that has been overlooked by all his predecessors.

According to the author, each worker has two work places. At one he expends his working energies in the production of various objects. At the other he reproduces or regenerates his energies in order that he may expend them again the following day. Our ‘home sweet home’ is, he says, nothing more than a production unit for the self-production of working energies, and that which we call our free, or leisure, time is in fact working time spent on the self-production and self-regeneration of working energy. And self-production and self-regeneration of working energy is by no means a free-time activity. On the contrary, it is even more vital than its consumption.

The author has drawn our attention to the above because he is convinced that it has to be borne in mind that the category known as surplus value is not produced only through the consumption of work energy on the factory shop-floor, but also the self-production of the same and which takes place at home. The surplus value produced at home is termed *reserves*. It is a surplus value realized over and above the costs of production of work energy. The lower the costs of self-production are, and the higher the savings, so then do the living standards of the labour force become proportionately higher. However, the author is interested in the *quotient of living standards* – the QLS. He has obtained that coefficient by dividing the ‘home-produced’ surplus value, i.e. the savings, by the surplus created by the workers on the factory shop floor, i.e. by profits.

$$Q_{LS} = \frac{\text{total savings}}{\text{total profits}} \frac{\text{US\$ 200}}{\text{US\$ 100}} \quad Q_{LS} = 2$$

The figure (number) 2 shows that the surplus value created by the labour force through self-production is twice the value created by self-consumption. The higher the QLS, the higher the living standards of the labour force (employees).

A basic task for any government or administration is to increase living standards, and the author believes that no other demands should be placed upon it.

### The Law controlling the efficacy of government or administration

Destiny of any elected government or administration will depend on the following formula:

$$QEA = \frac{\text{total savings} + \text{total profits} \dots \dots \dots 200. \$}{\text{Cost price of functioning of administration} \dots \dots \dots 100 \$} \quad QEA = 2$$

QEA is a *quotient of efficacy of administration*

***This second law should establish the minimum annual rate of the QEA, and any government or authority failing to meet at least that stipulated should automatically resign.*** The author is also of the opinion that no government should be obliged to resign if it manages to achieve a QEA rate of exceeding the minimal rate laid down by the relevant law. Incomes of those employed by state bodies or by public administrations, i.e. the cost of their work-hour, would have to depend on the level of the QEA and upon their individual qualifications. The cost of work-hours would have to be defined through a cost list similar to that applied in companies. The employees of the above services would be able to raise their salaries only through increasing the QEA and QLS of the people they would control.

Table 2

Q E A	Prices of work hours for various qualifications and position in administration staf or body in \$																	
	COMUNE						REGION						STATE					
	NQ	Q	HQ	MN1	MN2	MN3	NQ	Q	HQ	MN1	MN2	MN3	NQ	Q	HQ	MN1	MN2	MN3
1	1,0	1,3	1,7	3,7	4,8	6,2	1,0	1,3	1,7	4,8	6,2	8,0	1,0	1,3	1,7	6,2	8,0	10,4
2	1,3	1,7	2,2	4,8	6,2	8,0	1,3	1,7	2,2	6,2	8,0	10,4	1,3	1,7	2,2	8,0	10,4	13,5
3	1,7	2,2	2,9	6,2	8,0	10,4	1,7	2,2	2,9	8,0	10,4	13,5	1,7	2,2	2,9	10,4	13,5	17,0
4	2,2	2,9	3,7	8,0	10,4	13,5	2,2	2,9	3,7	10,4	13,5	17,0	2,2	2,9	3,7	13,5	17,0	22,7
5	2,9	3,7	4,8	10,4	13,5	17,0	2,9	3,7	4,8	13,5	17,0	22,7	2,9	3,7	4,8	17,0	22,7	29,5
6	3,7	4,8	6,2	13,5	17,0	22,7	3,7	4,8	6,2	17,0	22,7	29,5	3,7	4,8	6,2	22,7	29,5	38,3
7	4,8	6,2	8,0	17,0	22,7	29,5	4,8	6,2	8,0	22,7	29,5	38,3	4,8	6,2	8,0	29,5	38,3	49,2
8	6,2	8,0	10,4	22,7	29,5	38,3	6,2	8,0	10,4	29,5	38,3	49,2	6,2	8,0	10,4	38,3	49,7	64,6
9	8,0	10,4	13,5	29,5	38,3	49,2	8,0	10,4	13,5	38,3	49,7	64,6	8,0	10,4	13,5	49,7	64,6	83,9
10	10,4	13,5	17,0	38,3	49,7	64,6	10,4	13,5	17,0	49,7	64,6	83,9	10,4	13,5	17,0	64,6	83,9	109,

Symbols NQ, Q HQ denominates level of expertness of employees, and MN 1, MN 2 i MN 3 denominates level of manager position in administrative hierarchy.

In this case also a bad working employees and good working employees, in one the same comunal or regional administration, colud not get an equal salary, in despite of equal qualifications and equal number of work-hours.

If an administration want to increase its salary an improve its own life it could do it, as I just said, only by increasing QEA and QLS ie. through more efficacious social management. That is the a good way to forcing administration to govern efficacious and productively (In this summary there is no place to quote whole two laws.)

By establishing that two laws, capital would be transformed in an *artificial private owner*. It means that it will have in itself the will or power to enrich and to prefect itself,– *an artificial will or power*.

### **Logocratic principles and private ownership**

In this chapter the author attempts to portray that principles of logocratic economy can also be applied in the sphere of a private ownership economy. He shows us that private capital by stimulative compensation for work is already paying for work according to logocratic principles – albeit unknowingly – and without any systematic approach. In other words, the only thing a private economy lacks is a formula, a law on the basis of which it could determine the level of income gained through the ownership of capital. That formula is as follows:

$$\text{income} = \frac{\text{capital mass} \times \text{quotient of its productivity, ie.QCP}}{100}$$

Income resulting from the ownership of capital should be determined as the income earned through interest. Just as it profits bankers to raise interest rates, so it would benefit factory owners to increase the productivity coefficient of their capital. This would also be to the advantage of the society and in the interests of humanity in general, since it is in the interests of neither humanity nor societies to increase the mass of capital but rather to perfect it, to increase its QCP. A logocratic economy is not, the author points out, indifferent only towards opposing ideologies but also towards opposing forms of ownership.

### ***Application of logocratic principles***

It is vital that mention be made of the fact that the author is convinced that a just price can be put on a work-hour for every type of work and for every type of work qualification, and which can be accomplished with the aid of the Gaussian curve. A just work-hour price is one that offers optimum stimulation to an employee to perform his task. Justice, the author tells us, is not the ultimate aim of economy but it is its (best) way through which to achieve its aims.

It is further pointed out that the said laws could prove an exceptionally useful anti-inflationary instrument, since by using them governments would be able to exercise full control over the cost of labour. Establishing the just cost of a work-hour would not only break the arbitrariness of trades unions but would also render them pointless.

Additionally, it is demonstrated that a law designed to determine the level of incomes earned on the basis of ownership would again turn the role of the capitalist into a socially beneficial category, since the law would compel it to develop the capital, perfect it, instead of merely expanding its mass. In other words, only a perfecting of capital can attain the aims of mankind and, consequently, any activity aimed at so perfecting capital is a socially beneficial activity.

One task of the logocratic economy is to make an *artificial* private ownership, ownership more economical than the existing private ownership with living private owners.

We need to establish an *artificial* private ownership because ownership of today is too complicated and gives us too much frustration and risk, but not so much money like sometime

### ***subjects The true economic***

The author of *Summa* holds the opinion that unless the human species had precisely defined aims, economic science could never have come into existence. *Economic activity is the method by means of which an intelligent species is able to realize its aims.*

In order to realize its aims mankind must rely on the appropriate economic subjects – the protagonists of economic activities. The author proceeds to draw attention to the deficiencies of bourgeois thought which considers individuals and nations to be the chief subjects of economic activity, whilst at the same time regarding them as forms of individual-cum-general economic subjects.

The author regards Marx's opinion that classes are the basic and most important economic subject – an opinion formed from a sound understanding of the fact that all individuals are segregated into specific classes and that all nations are divided into classes – to be a significant advance towards the discovery of the true economic subjects. But he goes on to point out that through merely regarding individuals, nations or classes as the chief economic subjects, one is unable to comprehend the whys and wherefores of the emergence of economic activity and its purpose, and an understanding of that the author believes to be of crucial importance.

He also regards generations as the chief economic subjects, and inter-generational economic relations as the most important of relations in the economy as a whole. If economic activity is to have any point at all, then those relations must be productive, and the proof of their productivity is an ever more developed capital bequeathed to successive generations. Only through the mediation of productive inter-generational economic relations (through the development of capital) can the aim of the species be realized. Furthermore, only if generations are comprehended as the chief economic subjects can the purpose of economy and the cause of its emergence be elucidated, economy being – the author tells us – a method for the realization of the aims of the species, with generations being the only subjects capable of realizing them.

The author continues his exposé by suggesting that the economic science that has prevailed to date has concerned itself with 'spatial' aspects in economy, i.e. with relations between subjects divided only by space (individuals, nations, classes). Logocratic economy concerns itself first and foremost (in contrast to the national and class economy) with 'time' relation, i.e. with relations between economic subjects that are separated one from the other by time – that is, with generations. Through such an approach, economic science is not only undergoing a Copernician change but it is also initiated into a phase of a new synthesis, the likes of which has not been witnessed since the times of classical economy.

### ***The technological society and logocracy***

A society based on laws expressed through numbers and as presented above, the author calls neither Communist nor Capitalist, but Technological. His choice of name stems from the fact that the fundamental laws of such a society are in fact *applied science* concerning self-reproduction and self-development of capital, i.e. a reproduction of economic laws on the basis of social legislation.

Those laws, the author believes, are in fact established by capital itself, which safeguards both its survival and development through them. Through their factual legalization capital will in socialist countries regain the beingness of which it was temporarily deprived by *revolution*, while in capitalist countries this *being* will receive encouragement for a more rapid and more harmonious development. A form of rule in which science, i.e. capital as a form of science (the science being a synthesis of a development of capital) grants to or withholds from a government, administration or a manager legitimacy, cannot be considered as democratic. This form of rule the author calls logocratic, or a logocracy – the rule of science. In other words, logocracy is the scientific control of authority. It is not a democratic form of rule, but nor is it undemocratic since it puts the people in a position, by means of science, to control a government and to decide whether its actions are in the interests of the people, or otherwise.

Governments and peoples must adhere to Logocratic laws, since the laws are a scientific expression of the will of mankind (reified in capital) striving towards the realization of its goals, while at the same time being a method of their realization. As opposed to a democracy, which is rule by the people, logocracy is rule by the human species. The goal of democracy is to satisfy the interests of a living generation, whereas for a logocracy the fulfilment of the interests of all generations is just a means of realizing the goals of mankind.

A capitalist society is a synthesis of the development of human society, while a bourgeois democracy is a synthesis of the development of a form of social rule, i.e. of a form of management of society. A technological society should be the *epithesis* of the development of human society, and logocracy the epithetical form of social rule. As distinct from Socialism or Communism, a Technological society has a future, since the methods through which it realizes its inner goals lead towards the realization of the goals of the human species. It is the author's belief that the human species permits survival only of those societies which are, and for as long as they remain, a purposeful (social) means for the realization of its aims.

### ***The future of the State and the state of the future State***

The author begins this chapter with a critical review of the withering away of the state as perceived by Marx. Obsessed with a passion for the abolishment of everything existing that was inspired by a triadic dialectic approach, Marx also hit upon the idea of the withering away of the state. The unprecedented strengthening of the state in socialist countries, those very countries in which it was to die, is an excellent criticism of the idea. The author considers, however, that this practical criticism presents no opportunity for gaining any insight into the future of a state organism.

A tetradic dialectic portrays the bourgeois state as being a synthesis of development of the human state organization, and being a synthesis it can neither wither away nor can it be abolished. In other words, as a synthesis it must be able to sustain itself. However, the only way it can do that is to reproduce itself in the form of a world state. This world state will be

the epithesis of the development of state organization. An analysis carried out on the basis of a tetradic dialectic indicates that a world state is by no means a Utopia. On the contrary, it is a pure necessity, the condition for survival of the human species and for the realization of its aims.

### *Aims of the human species*

One of the aims is liberation from work, a matter already discussed. What we have not touched upon is the fact that freedom thus won is but an instrument of man's *inner* development. This development came to a halt some ten or twenty thousand years ago. In order to survive, man was obliged to devote himself to a *development of the world* in which he lived, that world being a general means for his survival. Quite simply, he was left with no time for himself, for his own inner development. When he is able to complete development of a purposeful being, i.e. capital, and which will work instead of himself, man will once again find time to devote to his inner development.

Permanent survival and security of the human species will most probably demand eventual departure from the home planet. Every second the universe witnesses the explosion of billions of stars which, in their destruction, involve in their death throes those species which failed to abandon their vicinity in time. The probable abandonment of the home planet is therefore not merely a theme for a science fiction-oriented imagination, or a luxury, but a condition for survival. Additionally, it would appear that the proper environment for a mature and intelligent species is not the surface of a planet but rather the space of the universe. The planets are most probably only a form of cosmic womb where intelligent species are born and where they dwell until they mature. Remaining on Earth would, more likely than not, lead to degeneration or death. But in order to be able to live and survive in the universe the species must be able to complete the development of a purposeful being that would build worlds for it to live in.

### *Method of realizing the aims*

The method which mankind has for a long time been applying in the realization of those aims is presented by means of a critical review of Marxist teachings on exploitation. According to the author, Marx overlooked the fact that a capitalist *does not enjoy* all that he has (through exploitation) taken from the workers, but is instead saving. He is saving so that, among other things, he would have more to leave to his son, who in his turn is also giving up the enjoyment of all his wealth and is accumulating as much as possible for his own son; and so it goes on. Through the generations their transient *private* ownership of capital is transformed into *ownership by the human species* of capital, while the capitalists themselves become the 'bankers' of mankind.

Further critical thought has demonstrated that in addition to the inter-class exploitation referred to by Marx, there exists also inter-generational 'exploitation'. Quite specifically, each generation 'exploits' the work of the preceding generation. Such a form of 'exploitation', however, would not be possible if each generation were not to *voluntarily* forego the consumption of a part of its work for the benefit of a future generation. In other words, the said 'exploitation' is based on a kind of 'self-exploitation'. Everything that one generation foregoes is a sacrifice, a contribution to the realization of the aims of mankind. Without such a sacrifice neither progress nor realization of aims would be possible since all the surplus of labour foregone by one generation is 'built into' capital, thereby enlarging and

perfecting it and handing it on to the next generation. Inter-generational ‘exploitation’ is therefore one of the fundamental and essential aspects of the method by means of which mankind is realizing its aims. At this point the author focuses attention on the fact that each generation is entitled to the realization of *all* its aims and the satisfaction of *all* its interests, but *only in such a way* that leads simultaneously to the realization of the aims of humanity. Relations between generations are regulated by special laws which are unable to be presented in this short summary.

Through this summary the author has attempted to outline some of the more important ideas presented in his book.