

Beyond Marxism and Weberianism – an analysis of value –

“Value: measure whereupon somebody judges his own behavior and the behavior of others.” Geert Woltjer, *De economische manier van denken*, Publisher: Dick Coutinho, Bussum/1997, p. 25.

I lived myself the Marxism, and I have a lot of interest to know Weberianism. This is an enantiodromia from a completely value philosophy to pure science as amoral.

But, what is that value? **I prefer vanilla ice cream to chocolate ice cream.** I found the club of vanilla ice cream eaters. Later, it becomes a party. By the inherent numinosity of eating mostly vanilla ice cream, the party wins the elections. It takes over the whole state, prohibits the chocolate ice cream and kills its makers.

What happens above? In accordance with point 4 of *Excerpts of Fundamental Organizing Rules of Intellect Club*, I shall punctually analyze **Martin Heidegger’s** synthesis in *Being and Time*, §33, cf. *Sein und Zeit*, [157], Tübingen, 1977, apud *Ființă și timp*, p. 155, Bucharest, 1994: the philosopher analyzes value as: **objective, valid, and mandatory.**

Objectivity means that I nail my own shadow in order to make it intersubjectively perceptible. This is the trial to observe my own personality through subjecting it to norms we inherited from we don’t know who, that I don’t think anymore, because I consider them respectable, with a proven efficiency.

Validity — because the manner “I” think is the only one valid manner of thinking, from which, with quite an allowance, are possible a few variations, then “I” have to impose my value system as objectively valid absolute truth, thus applicable to all thinking rationally.

Mandatory — the manner upon which my own knowledge forces me to action, “I” find it as the only grounded one, and, that’s why, the others, from free will or coerced, they must blindly obey it.

I hope that de above is a sufficient, though modest, contribution to science, free from values and partial presuppositions.

But, what **Marx** got it right, is that **the economy**, in itself, or, more precisely, the market, **is a value philosophy**, written mostly not in books but on banknotes and gold bars. For example, a commercial transmitter sells a **Bach** concert to its public, for the sum of € x, publicity, minus sum € y, transmission costs, etc. The sum of all gain from **Bach** concerts from all times and all places, future included, this is the price of **Bach**, as it is seen by the market.

Plato is also sellable. The University sells **Plato** for a sum of € z per student. New is only the idea that **Bach** and **Plato** are sellable.

Now we can define **economy** as: **the science of objective values, as expressed in money**. But, what is a value that is still unknown. We may send to value being a form of oedipal possession, which is contagious, as this fact is observable in behavior.

* * *

Critique of above: Basically, one has Heidegger on values in his scissors, between too much value (totalitarianism) and too little value (anarchy).

This is a relative judgment, as Lucian Iordanescu writes: "In practical plane, value is a relative function, but in principle it represents an absolute state (the absolute being the antinomy of the relative). If we image on the ordinate the scale of value or of quality, it follows that on this interval the steps of value define distinct states only inside it [value -- TG], with no interrelation. The value step number 5 has nothing to do with value step number 6. Each has its own individuality, independent of the individuality of another step. The apparent relation is to be found only in respect to the external viewer which follows the succession of values, according to an arbitrary chosen order. Faculty year 5 has nothing to do with year 1. Only their sum is found in the faculty's absolvent which could have stopped in year 3 and, then, year 5 would have meant nothing for him."