

A. Sebastián Hernández Solorza

Discussant Comments for October 8, 2023 Class

I would like to thank Marxist-Humanist Initiative for the invitation, as well as Andrew's for having me here today.

The first thing I would like to say to all the audience struggling with the math and still have some doubts is that the notes for this class and the interactive spreadsheet that Andrew did are very helpful, and I am sure that if you keep on studying them you will certainly succeed. I would also like to warn you that I think you shouldn't take a stance until you fully understand what Andrew did, otherwise you will be unconsciously taking a political position without a theoretical one. I believe the key is understanding the difference between Marx's theory of crisis and Grossman's theory of crisis, which Andrew's explains in his 2021 writing, but you should also refer to [Andrew's-Alan-Nick-Alexey-Brendan](#) writing [on Heinrich](#).

Now, I think discussing this "breakdown" of capitalism is crucial for two reasons:

- 1) As Andrew says in his 2021 writing, is an issue about the truth. Here I think Andrew has proved that Grossman's assertion that capitalism will have an inexorable breakdown for pure economic reasons is false. His paper is forceful on Grossman's mistakes and particularly on Grossman's silences. I believe the biggest mistake was that Grossman knew about the failures of Bauer's model where countertendencies were not fully accounted for and nevertheless, he underestimated them as mere retardants of the collapse without any further analysis. What Andrew did was to fill Grossman's silence with a true understanding on the underlying causes of the alleged breakdown and once this is done, we can be sure that there is no breakdown at all. But the silence is meaningful in other sense, and here is the second point I would like to discuss and Andrew to comment about.
- 2) The political relevance of Andrew's disproof of Grossman's breakdown. Grossman's silences where his political hope for a historical change. His hope was supported by beliefs and not knowledge or proven theory. These theoretical silences allow others to fill the gap with the political blindness of fatalism and is worrisome for today's world political context. Here I think Andrew's major contribution is to provide us with the theoretical guidance for an unbiased political perspective. Here my question to Andrew: what do you think is the practical usefulness of your writing in the coming years for the world political context?

To finish I would like to say that Alan's talk about the relevance of Marx's reproduction schemes is also crucial, and it may be the theme for a future class because there is also a lot of confusion about what Marx intended with them.