

The below is a footnote (#7) in a paper <http://www.vcn.bc.ca/~vertegaa/ontology.pdf>; which itself is an extended version of the abstract of another paper [http://www.vcn.bc.ca/~vertegaa/Marx\\_Debunked.pdf](http://www.vcn.bc.ca/~vertegaa/Marx_Debunked.pdf)

The diametricality of historical materialism (Marx's premise of a determinate and *positively* valued *static* point of departure) and the accounting for existing capital values as previously spent and thereafter, for a continuity, *dynamically* in need to be resolved expenditures (or *negatives*), never leaving the debit side of a booked ledger and consequently without an attributable return, remaining *less than valueless* in the stark reality of business accounts; has had Marx needing to resort to gibberish in his conclusion as to how, yet *accounting-wise*, the value of worn-out (capital) means of production gets replaced under *equilibrium* conditions, *in addition to* capturing new profits during the same investigative period. (i.e.) Marx's "reality" whereby a continued renewal of already existent and *deemed* positively valued material means of producing becomes assured, as new and determinate starting point to a wearing-out process in perpetuity, is a fake reality regarding such operations in any accounted-for economy. And while his exposition of an inherent conundrum in capitalism's workings, unrecognized as such by capitalists as well, indirectly proved the manifest nature of capital, he couldn't accept the result as his entire oeuvre thus far had derived from the opposite perspective. Even though yet more devastating to capitalist ideology than his own, his pre-analytical premise prevented him from grasping the true answer within his reach. Consequently Marxism, regardless of its well-demonstrated merit in awakening class consciousness and resistance to oppression, isn't a viable economics' alternative when the essential point of contention is an at any time reigning determinateness (is it already *ex ante*, or only *ex post*?) of capital values, and as to how these come about in the first place; and ulteriorly, as being accumulable positives. But with the present discourse irrefutably confirming that any economy, capitalist or not, inherently is a chronically in *disequilibrium* social structure; the thus naturally valid principle of socialism, rather than all too often denigrative, only becomes strengthened by the above elucidation.