

**KATERINA KOLOZOVA (Skopje)**

**Philosophy as capitalism and the socialist  
radically metaphysical response to it**

---

**Abstract**

*The author starts from the thesis that there is no such thing as a "natural" or "apolitical" economy. The economy is always already political, as it is the economy's material core of power, control, and its main mechanisms, i.e. exploitation and oppression. It is no less so in the era of neoliberalism, a time in which we witness the divorce between capitalism and democracy. In order to lay the foundations of a different economy, one that is not based on wage labor and the exploitation of human life and nature based on their auto-alienation, but rather on action in accordance with their resources, we need – according the author – to rethink the concept of the state in a non-philosophical and post-capitalist fashion, structurally different from the modern bourgeois state. If the structure originating in the bourgeois state, as conceived by modern humanism, is preserved, it will mean that the determination in the last instance is still the same. In order to arrive at a determination in the last instance of a non-exploitative, non-wage-labor-based social order where the determination is affected by the real, we must first arrive at the generic core of the notion of the modern state. As soon as we determine the generic term of "the state," we can radicalize it by letting it be determined by the effects of the real. The generic notion, isolated from the chôra of the transcendental material that is offered by modern philosophies originating in the Enlightenment, should be used as the minimal transcendental description for the determining effect (or "symptom") of the real.*

**Keywords:** François Laruelle, Karl Marx, capitalism, neoliberalism, state, non-philosophy

---

**1. The neoliberal state is no weak and naturalness of capitalism  
if a philosophical phantasm**

The organization of social production beyond the principle of private property qua property based on wage labor needs to be conceived in terms of a given historical and material context. There is no single form of commonality, beyond historical context and the real conditions that it generates. Any form of commonality that transcends the praxis of historically determined conditioning circumstances are an abstraction, and idea hovering independently from the material universe. In the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we possess active

memory of the reign and demise of "the communist states" of the mid-20th century in Eastern and Central Europe. By inertia, we tend to imagine the state-owned commons of those states as the model of socialist commonality in ownership.

If we submit to the dictate of the real of the material and immaterial conditions of our contemporaneity, the concept of commonality that we would generate would follow the syntax of the real as the conditioning of its possibilities. We live in an era of accelerated capitalism, in capital's "bubbles" and "financial crises," which, as we already tried to demonstrate, exist in an almost parallel fashion to the real economy of the deregulating neoliberal politico-economic doctrine. The alleged deregulation of the neoliberal economy is in fact a product of a meticulous scientifically, ideologically, politically, and technocratically elaborated methodology of control, masquerading as the manifestation of the anarchic natural laws of the free market economy. We live in an era in which states bailout banks with the money collected through taxes paid by wage laborers. The "weak state" of neoliberalism is stronger and more economically disciplining and socially ruthless than any other form of a bourgeois state that we have witnessed in the second half of the 20th century. In addition to the bank bailouts by the state, let us note that "austerity measures" are one of the most prominent features of the post-2008 economy in Europe.

In short, there is no such thing as a natural or apolitical economy. The economy is always already political, as it is the economy's material core of power, control, and its main mechanisms – i.e. exploitation and oppression. It is no less so in the era of neoliberalism, a time in which we witness the divorce between capitalism and democracy. The divorce is scandalous as we see totalitarian states, such as China, Russia, and Turkey as the new economic superpowers, ever more superior to the West, being the EU and the US. Western countries also are executing a split between democracy and capitalism, nonetheless one that is less scandalously ostensible. Their means of state controlled economy, whose policies do not require and moreover prevent the possibility of democratic expression of endorsement or refusal on the part of the citizens, consists in the measures of "austerity cuts," "market oriented education," rising gender and social inequality, and the sacrifice of the basic human freedoms in the name of "security" in an era of "war against terrorism" that has lasted for more than a decade. *To believe the narrative of the weak state overpowered by the elemental forces of capitalism implies a prior belief in the narratives of the naturalness of the economic laws (of capitalism).*

In order to lay the foundations of a different economy, one that is *not* based on wage labor and the exploitation of human life and nature based on their auto-alienation, but rather on action in accordance with their resources, we must rethink the concept of the state in a non-philosophical and post-capitalist fashion, structurally different from the modern bourgeois state. If the structure originating in the bourgeois state, as conceived by modern humanism, is preserved, it will mean that the determination in the last instance is still the same. In order to arrive at a determination in the last instance of a non-exploitative, non-wage-labor-based social order where the determination is affected by the real, we must first arrive at the generic core of the notion of the modern state. As soon as we determine the generic term of "the state," we can radicalize it by letting it be determined by the effects of the real. The generic notion, isolated from the *chôra* of the transcendental material that is offered by modern philosophies originating in the Enlightenment, should be used as the minimal transcendental description for the determining effect (or "symptom") of the real.

## **2. Auto-acceleration of capitalism as speculation and its political infrastructure**

According to Marx in Volume 3 of *Capital*, the inherent laws of the capitalist political and economic order will nourish and exacerbate the contradiction between pure speculation as the primary mode of operation of capitalism and the instance of the material it aims to control and exploit. Speculation out of joint will assume a life of its own, detached from the material possession of capital as private property or as simply having actual money. Speculative capital, the capital with which the finance industry operates today, is potential money, it is projection of value or speculation. Its potentiality derives from investments of mere estimations of the worth of third persons' material property and assets. It is the association of investors and clients, creditors and debtors, the networks they create, and the financial fluxes that such networks navigate, that create financial growth and its economic (side) effects. Marx writes:

The capital, which in itself rests on a social mode of production and presupposes a social concentration of means of production and labour-power, is here [stock exchange market] directly endowed with the form of social capital (capital of directly associated individuals) as distinct from private capital, and its undertakings assume the form of social undertakings as distinct from private undertakings. It is the abolition of capital as private property within the framework of capitalist production itself. (Marx 1984)

Contemporary finance capital, or the so called finance industry, relies and profits from the operations of circulation as a process *per se* and as tautology, divorced from any grounding in the material basis of capital.

I have explained the process in more detail in the previous pages of this book, not only in theoretical terms, but also in terms of evidence related to the post 2008 crisis in the US and henceforth globally. I also presented data, derived from the US Government commissioned report on the crisis, pointing out the fact that the greatest giants of the finance industry had been operating with virtually no capital investment of their own. Their "capital" had been the information, knowledge, and political empowerment – an engagement of speculation that the US government report on the crisis termed more than once as swindling. (See Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission 2011) According to Marx, such a development is necessary and inevitable as the last stage of capitalism:

This is the abolition of the capitalist mode of production within the capitalist mode of production itself, and hence a self-dissolving contradiction, which *prima facie* represents a mere phase of transition to a new form of production. It manifests itself as such a contradiction in its effects. It establishes a monopoly in certain spheres and thereby requires state interference. It reproduces a new financial aristocracy, a new variety of parasites in the shape of promoters, speculators and simply nominal directors; a whole system of swindling and cheating by means of corporation promotion, stock issuance, and stock speculation. It is private production without the control of private property. (Marx 1894)

This stage is metastatic for capitalism, ensuing into the greatest imaginable contradiction that will lead to self-dissolution, says Marx.

Post-2008 finance capitalism is one of perpetual crisis, whereas, as Jacques Rancière says, crisis cannot be a permanent pathological state as, by definition, it is not permanent. Instead, it is the "robust health system" of exploitation presented as illness to the "ignorant ones" or to the exploited (those who can be scientifically convinced that they are "ill" rather than exploited). (Rancière 2014, 13) What our contemporary media and corporate political powers call "crisis" seems to be, by all of its constitutive characteristics, the final stage of capitalism which Marx describes as "self-dissolving." It unveils the reality of economic production and social and technological progress as one unfolding virtually independently from the "material basis" (monetarily re-presented materiality) of private capital.

The acceleration process, which is bound to happen through what Marx called "the credit system," the ever growing distance between actual paying and buying of a commodi-

ty, and the possibility of an ever expanding "intermission" of the credit period, divulges the spectrality of capital, money, and private property. Acceleration through the "credit system" as the final stage of capitalism is announced and elaborated by Marx in Volume III, Chapter 5 of *Capital*. As the US Government Report on the 2008 financial crisis shows, Wall Street CEO's do not have to invest any *real* or *actual* private property, and practically no capital of theirs has to be invested in order to initiate, manage, and profit from an investment project. Quite the contrary, it is the private property of the poor that had been invested and then defaulted as the post 2007 crisis occurred. By no material investment of one's own, "industrialists" create an unstoppable growing capital that enables them and the government to control society as the highest form of politico-economic power. The illusion of capital's materiality and material property, serving as the basis for an economy, has become apparent through the financial speculation whose final form had become sheer swindling. Albeit aiming at pure profit and exploitation of the poor only, the crisis has also and unwittingly so shown that the "emperor had been naked" for quite some time – that capital as the material and real basis of economic processes is a mirage. On the basis of this particular contradiction, the "stock exchange managers" have managed to amass most of the material resources for themselves.

Acceleration is immanent to capitalism. Capitalism is unstoppably accelerated by the inherent laws of speculation itself, and therefore that of de-materialization.

On one hand, the acceleration is technical; for example, with the same magnitude and number of actual turnovers of commodities for consumption, a smaller quantity of money or money tokens performs the same service. This is bound up with the technique of banking. On the other hand, credit accelerates the velocity of the metamorphoses of commodities, and thereby the velocity of money circulation. [...] Acceleration by means of credit, of the individual phases of circulation or the metamorphosis of commodities, and later the metamorphosis of capital, and with it an acceleration of the process of reproduction in general. (On the other hand, credit helps to keep the acts of buying and selling apart longer, and serves thereby as a basis for speculation.) Contraction of reserve funds may be viewed in two ways: as a reduction of the circulating medium on the one hand, and on the other, as a reduction of that part of capital which must always exist in the form of money. (Marx 1894)

One does not need the enactment of a "process of acceleration" of capitalism as a form of resistance aimed at its demise, as the "Accelerationist Manifesto" argues, (Williams and Srnicek 2013) simply because it is a process generated by capitalism itself. Acceleration does not only take place in the form of finance capital, but also in the area of material

production, i.e., in technological-militaristic development. The unstoppable development of the means of production, which is also the means of exploitation of the human species, is constantly accelerated. This is technological development. Technological development is subject to private property, capital invested in it, and the material conditions for it; its inventions are in the possession of capitalist oligarchs exclusively. The imagined political revolution via technological acceleration requires a reversed model of ownership and reinvention of the social role of technological development. In order to achieve these communist goals, following the model of associations of producers advocated by Marx, the technological processes, which are physically (really or "materially") grounded in the individuals who innovate, should be appropriated by the actual producers. As a consequence, this will lead to a replacement of the spectrality and superfluity of capital (money, derivatives, bitcoin, in all its forms) by real and tangible social re-production, whereby I am reducing production to reproduction and any productive excess is simply that, excess and excess is creativity.

However, politics in the strict sense is far more complex than economics. It enacts the totality of the relations in a society. That is why the new political horizon cannot be reduced to a shift in economic production and ownership. It needs to be invented in accordance with the principle of radical sociality of production as the central economic fundament, as well as with the political (and metaphysical) goal of transcending the dualism of "the belly and the abstract activity." (Marx 1959a)

In capitalism, the product of a social process, i.e. of an "association of producers" of commodities, consists of use value and surplus value, or in the case of the finance industry, of surplus value only. It is claimed as property by a handful of people coordinating the social process, including both the political and the economic reality. In other words, capitalism, in particular in its neoliberal form, is not so much about the material possession of what is potentially capital, but about the capacity and entitlement to assign monetary value, and hence, the status of capital and, for that matter, of commodity as well. This is political capacity and entitlement.

In what Marx announces as the late stage of capitalism, i.e. in finance capitalism, the process of signification – of turning a material, physical good into market value or commodity – is mainly carried out through mere "swindling," as mentioned in the US report on the post 2008 financial crisis. In this process, the "private ownership of property" has been proven to be "just ownership" as Marx predicted – a mere instance of the material to be exploited by the "stock exchange managers" as Marx anticipated in the Third Volume of

*Capital*. As the essentially speculative nature of the capitalist economy has accelerated, the central contradiction has moved to an extreme. According to Marx, the contradiction taken *in extremis* must be resolved by self-dissolving the impossible, unsustainable, contradicting couple. If the unsustainable and bubbled up speculative aspect of the contradiction culminates, if it exacerbates the fissure with the real and the physical that it has introduced *in principio*, it will founder as the real starts to "act on its own," escaping the control of philosophy (= ideology of capitalism). Unruly as it is, thanks to its brutal, physical force, or/and the force of the real, which can include material actions carried out by inanimate agencies, it will disperse the ruling webs of meaning, or the existing universe and estimation of values. Such a process would lead to the self-dissolution of the founding binary of capitalism, because *the reality is constituted by, grounded in, and conditioned by social process, rather than capital investment (in the form of actual monetary assets)*. Materiality of contemporary reality lies in society, in its physicality and effects of a conditioning real, rather than in the symbolism of money.

### 3. Reversing the self-dissolving binary

Following Marx's prescriptions, if and when the above takes place, we will be called upon to build a vision of materiality, sociality, and socialism on the material or real basis of the determination in the last instance of the existing and most profitable economic models. This ought to be done by recourse to their materialist revolution, i.e. by way of arriving at the material/physical determination in the last instance of social representation. The goal of such procedure would be to ground the economic models subject to revolutionary reversal in the material qua real, and condition them by it, i.e. by their material determination in the last instance.

This result of the ultimate development of capitalist production is a necessary transitional phase towards the reconversion of capital into the property of producers, although no longer as private property of the individual producers, but rather as the property of associated producers or outright social property. On the other hand, the stock company is a transition towards the conversion of all functions in the reproduction process that still remain linked with capitalist property into mere functions of associated producers, or into social functions.

Divested from any real, material, or physical base, divested from a base that maintains its connection with the material via the proxy of investment capital, the model of production dominated by the finance industry unravels the economy's fundamental sociality. Let us remind ourselves of the US Government's report on the post 2008 financial crisis, which notes and documents that the crisis was provoked by the fact that investment giants were operating with virtually no capital of their own. Investment mortgage backed funds or bank crediting were *de facto* made possible by clients' investments, i.e. assets that were at risk to be defaulted. In line with Marx's vision of the last, most developed, and metastatic stage of capitalism, we will call the latter "mere capital owners" (Marx), whereas the true capitalists are those who "manage" the funds without investing any of their material property. He writes:

Transformation of the actually functioning capitalist into a mere manager or, administrator of other people's capital, and of the owner of capital into a mere owner, a mere money, is capitalist [sic]. Even if the dividends that which they receive include the interest and the profit of enterprise, i.e., the total profit (for the salary of the manager is, or should be, simply the wage of a specific type of skilled labour, whose price is regulated in the labour-market like that of any other labour), this total profit is henceforth received only in the form of interest, i.e., as mere compensation for owning capital that now is entirely divorced from the function in the actual process of reproduction, just as this function in the person of the manager is divorced from ownership of capital. Profit thus appears (no longer only that portion of it, the interest, which derives its justification from the profit of the borrower) as a mere appropriation of the surplus-labour of others, arising from the conversion of means of production into capital, i.e., from their alienation vis-à-vis the actual producer, from their antithesis as another's property to every individual actually at work in production, from manager down to the last day-labourer. In stock companies the function is divorced from capital ownership, hence also labour is entirely divorced from ownership of means of production and surplus-labour. (Marx 1894)

The Report of the Inquiry Committee on the 2008 financial crisis confirms this projection to be true, and provides ample evidence for it:

In the years leading up to the crisis, too many financial institutions, as well as too many households, borrowed to the hilt, leaving them vulnerable to financial distress or ruin if the value of their investments declined even modestly. For example, as of 2007, the five major investment banks – Bear Stearns, Goldman Sachs, Lehman Brothers, Merrill Lynch, and Morgan Stanley – were operating with extraordinarily thin capital. By one measure, their leverage ratios were as high as 40 to 1, meaning for

every \$40 in assets, there was only \$1 in capital to cover losses. (Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission 2011, xix)

Those who capitalize on an investment and those who extract immense profit do not in fact own the material basis for it. What they own is a legally designated status to operate and profit from someone else's private property. Once this becomes obvious, what remains to be done is that someone finally shouts, "the emperor is naked," or at least starts behaving like it. What gives life to the finance industry is the will of "the mere owners of capital" (the exploited ones) to enter into associations that create profit. These processes are fundamentally social. Only a purely social process can enable the usurpation of the real by speculation. In order to overcome the alienation created by such usurpation, which foregrounds exploitation of the bodies of human and non-human animals, one ought to seek the purely material – as the real, physical or practical, and "material," in Marx's sense – grounding of the social.

#### **4. The material or non-speculative grounding of the social**

Sociality is a linguistic and communicative reality. Its means are of language. Fundamentally, it is subjectivity. Its radical subjectivity is that which admits the jarring difference between the Laruillian "Stranger," the inevitable gesture of the auto-alienation of the real as the fundament of subjectivity formation, and the real. The radical subjectivity is defined by its anteriority to any philosophical ambition to reconcile the two instances by way of usurping the real, a gesture executed by virtue of establishing an amphibology between the real and the "meaning" (language, subjectivity, truth). Philosophy, regardless of its inner plurality, can be seen as a monolithic phenomenon in the following sense – it inevitably establishes an equation between the real and thought. Even when it declares an insurmountable split between the two, even when it declares the real to be inaccessible, as in the case of the post-Kantian critical legacy, it still thinks in terms of the equation. Namely, by relegating the real into the realm of the unthinkable, the inaccessible to thought, it commits a "fuite en avance (preemptive escape) into fiction" (Laruelle), resulting into instituting language (thought/"fiction"/the Stranger) as the only form of reality that thought should be interested in and aspire to understand. (Laruelle 1989, 231) Thereby, the philosophical affirmation of the irreconcilable split between the real and thought, and of the real's radical indifference to thought's aspirations, remains within the perennial philosophical

equation rendering the real reducible to "truth," i.e. to thought. This result is brought about precisely by the reversal of the equation. Namely, through the gesture of declaring the real non-existent, being that it is non-existent for and to us, the philosophical thought of the post-Kantian turn assigns to language the status of the real and perpetuates the same amphibology. (See Kolozova 2014, 1)

Consequently, in order to determine the material grounding of sociality in the last instance, i.e. in order to establish its determination in the last instance as determination in terms of the real, one ought to avoid philosophical circularity of thought. With the aim of achieving this goal, we shall apply the non-philosophical method of arriving to a concept that is radically descriptive, i.e., minimally transcendental in its identification of the effect of the real that determines it in the last instance. (Laruelle 2000, 47) Such posture of thought is fundamentally scientific, argues Laruelle consistently throughout his opus. Scientific thought is primitive and naive insofar as it aims to be descriptively exhaustive but does not institute a "truth" of the real, nor does it deal with its "essence." (Laruelle 2012, 98) Describing exteriority, its locations, its operations, its effects (on the environment, including the humans), and arriving at an elaborate description is what scientific thought aspires to do.

Philosophy will always look for and posit science too late – at the end of its 'reflection,' at the end of its 'project' of objectivity, at the end of its 'dialectic', and in general at the end of the transcendence that founds all of its techniques. Now, it is precisely transcendence that science excludes, at least from the relation (of non-relation) that it 'maintains' in the last instance with the real. Hence, its naivety, its unreflectiveness, its realism, its 'blindness,' which is so insupportable to philosophical objectification that the latter never stops denigrating them, reducing them, or falsifying them – this is what goes by the name of 'epistemology', and is the very epistemo-logos in every epistemology. (Ibid., 99-100)

To define the "essence" of human existence in philosophical terms is to commit violence against the physical (or the "material" in the Marxist or non-philosophical sense). To place it in the realm of abstraction or "pure value" is to formulate it as a *surplus value*. The philosophical determination in the last instance of the human species is no different from the capitalist one. A materialist determination of the human based on Marx's conception of materialism without philosophy, i.e. "scientific" materialism, is one that views the instance of the mental also materialistically. Therefore, if the fundamental interest of the proletariat

is social, the form of sociality that the "communist horizon" postulates as its goal is one that would be materially determined by a sense of wellbeing. It will consist of what Marx calls "spiritual satisfaction," combined and in no contradiction with the bodily. Let us remind ourselves one more time that Marx argues that the true goal of communism is the transcendence of human alienation created by the body/mind dichotomy. (Marx 1959b) The "spiritual" necessarily materializes itself as a bodily sensation:

That man's physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature. (Karl Marx 1959a)

The material that Marx is concerned with is that of the physical, of what can suffer or sense pleasure, or in other words, the material of the organic. In the last instance, praxis is also determined by the physical. The communist emancipation is an emancipation of the physical from the tyranny of Hegel's Spirit detached from and opposed to the material or the real. It can be reduced to the hierarchically superior constituent of the archaic binary of the body and mind, or matter and idea. It also entails emancipation of the spiritual, which suffers from the alienation and the split between the spiritual and physical production. The spiritual suffers insofar as it is an abstract ruling the physical turned into an object, treated as if it was an inanimate matter. It suffers from its own deprivation of physical sensation, of the death of the physical that it contains in order to be an abstraction. Therefore, technological progress and its acceleration, in communist terms, can be emancipating so long as they are emancipating the subjugated physical and nature. A society of emancipated bodies and minds, a society that has transcended the split and hierarchy between the two, can create and sustain an economy based on the "free associations of producers." The communist concept of economy operates only by virtue of suspending the hierarchy of the "higher good" (an abstraction) over the physical, including the "higher good" of communism and its economy of "free associations." As long as they produce the division of "the belly and the abstract activity," they are not communist. (Marx 1959a)

A communist producer is not alienated from his or her work and its fruits. Therefore, in some sense, communism offers a sense of possession or ownership for every member of society. In order for this "sense of possession" to be material, it has to be realized physically through the bodies of the members of the society. Therefore, in order for communism to be communal it also has to be very individualistic, as each *body* in a society must vouch for it. The idea that the individual must suffer in the name of a common good is absurd (from a materialist point of view, meaningless) and one never argued for by Marx. If so, the com-

mon good would become a purpose in itself, a self-serving and auto-referential goal. Hence, it would become an abstraction, detached from the physical experiences of the bodies of a society (not the "social body," as that is yet another abstraction).

In short, by the very logic of Marx's argument, the opposition between the individual and the common would be untenable. Also, it is something Marx never argued for. His critique of the private property is historical, and therefore concerns its bourgeois and/or capitalist form. An argument in favor of sacrificing the individual wellbeing in the name of an abstract higher good is one of martyrdom. Martyrdom is a theological and metaphysical value, not a communist one. Communism is radically democratic. The Leninist and post-Leninist legacy of communism has instituted it as a form of Abrahamic theology, of self-sacrifice and sacrifices, of martyrdom and physical suffering in the name of a grand idea. The theology of this tradition, i.e. the Judeo-Christian and Islamic theology of self-sacrifice, is hateful of democracy in the sense that Jacques Rancière writes of "the hatred of democracy." (Rancière 2006) It is hateful of the idea that everyone is equally competent enough to participate in the building of a just society. It is also hateful of the bodily, of individuality as linked to a mortal body, and its finality vis-à-vis the immortality of the great idea. Such structure of a world (in Larulle's sense, a universe of language, which is no less material or real, i.e. a universe determined by the real) is fundamentally religious, and more specifically, Abrahamic. Contrary to this, Marx's idea of commonality is profoundly individualistic, as the idea of equality is one materially established among the individuals in a society, rather than a detached, self-sufficient, or ubiquitous abstraction. As far as property is concerned, commonality should create a reality that is not only perceived, but also experienced – not only as collective, but also as individual – by each and every individual in a society.

The free associations of producers collectively hold possession of the means of production that originate in the commons of all products and forms of access to natural resources. The commons should effectively be equally and directly accessible to every-*body* in a society. The very logic of the structure of a community should determine the accessibility of the commons, as well as the collective or desired contributions to their creation, instead of coerced ones. It should be fundamentally democratic by way of enabling everyone to contribute equally to its re-production, and also by having unlimited access to the use of its products. The products are not commodities, as the surplus value is out of the equation. It is a radically different. At the dusk of capitalism, in the zone of the internet, commu-

nities appear that constitute commonality and produce common goods simultaneously. Their products are not final, they do not offer objects that can be manipulated, separated from the community, or commodified. Instead, they enable a process of continuous production. The mechanisms of control are set as internal rules of its productivity, determined in the last instance by a radically democratic concept of knowledge, which is one affected by the immanence of knowledge. The real of knowledge immanently affects the program of its production by allowing it to be constantly generated by the operations of knowledge as real or a matter in its own right, rather than by the philosophical agenda of a group of people who would programmatize the "development" of the community and its production. The mechanisms of control rely precisely on contradiction, conflicting knowledge or views, which are resolved in a way that is more a matter of craft than political power. Anonymity, in the sense of suspension of "auctoritas," is the mode of operation of the creative online communities. The anonymity at issue is not an effacement of the individual, but quite to the contrary, it results from the multitude of individuals that participate in it. The functioning of such a community and its production is fundamentally social, where the social is "superposed" (as in quantum theory) with the individual.

The analogy of superposition taken from Laruelle's non-standard philosophy (a term more often used in the latest stage of non-philosophy), and inspired by quantum theory, serves to enable us to understand the fundamentally social nature of the individual and its reverse, not as a paradox but as two realities that can be viewed unilaterally. The fact that they are viewed unilaterally does not mean that one does not affect the other as its real foregrounding and its determination in the last instance. As questions of temporality are not relevant for our discussion, we are neither interested in the issues of "simultaneity" of both realities, nor in the issues of "sequentiality." It is of no relevance to us whether the individual or the society comes first, neither in the temporal nor in the axiological sense. What matters is that the social constitutes a real in its own right, as does the human-in-human, and that one conditions the other by immanently affecting it.

Only in community does each individual have the means of cultivating his gifts in all directions; therefore, only in the community is personal freedom possible. In the previous substitutes for the community (e.g., in the State), personal freedom has existed only for the individuals of the bourgeois society, and only insofar as they were individuals of the ruling class, namely those who do not need to rely on their wage labor. (Karl Marx 1968)

The relations of the two realities ought to be regulated in a way that enables the wellbeing of the bodies that constitute the society as its communist determination in the last instance. Whether the individual engenders society, or the other way around, is a fundamentally philosophical question, one of assigning values in the axiological sense that boils down to theology. The question of the eventual "superposition" of the two realities, a method suggested by Laruelle in his project of non-standard philosophy borrowing from quantum theory, would not be a non-philosophical one, in spite of the intention. Exploring this issue in such manner would be a self-indulging, purely speculative, and an auto-referential project, as it is of no direct relevance for the social praxis that is subject to our study. It is inoperative with regard to the project of creating a society that enables equality and wellbeing for every-body, and is therefore irrelevant for the subject matter of this study. Methodological questions in sciences are determined by the subject matter (or "the material") of research. The subject matter in our case is "a transcendental material" that is in its last instance linguistic, namely the political, and is determined by a real that has its own intrinsic laws. It may be an abstraction, but it is a real abstraction (Sohn-Rethel 1978). It requires a language of universality. However, universality is not the same as generality. The concept of superposition borrowed directly from quantum theory operates as a generalization, as it is not the product of a radicalization of a singular and unilaterally postulated real.

*Prof. Dr. Katerina Kolozova, Institute in Social Sciences and Humanities - Skopje,  
katerina.kolozova[at]isshs.edu.mk*

## References

- Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission (FCIC). *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report: Final Report of the National Commission on the Causes of the Financial and Economic Crisis in the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2011.
- Kolozova, Katerina. *The Cut of the Real: Subjectivity in Poststructuralist Philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Kolozova, Katerina. *Towards a Radical Metaphysics of Socialism: Marx and Laruelle*. Brouklyn, New York: punctum books, 2015.

- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 3: The Process of Capitalist Production: Interest and Profit of Enterprise*, ed. Frederick Engels. New York: International Publishers, 1894. Web. <<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894-c3/ch23.htm>>
- Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts 1844*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959a. Web. <<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/wages.htm>>.
- Marx, Karl. "Third Manuscript: Private Property and Communism," in idem. *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959b. Web. <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/comm.htm>>.
- Marx, Karl. "Feuerbach: Opposition of the Materialist and Idealist Outlooks," in idem. *The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968. Web. <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01.htm>>.
- Laruelle, François. *Philosophie et non-philosophie*. Liege: Pierre Mardaga, 1989.
- Laruelle, François. *Introduction au non-marxisme*. Presses Universitaires de France: Paris, 2000.
- Laruelle, François. *From Decision to Heresy: Experiments in Non-Standard Thought*. New York: Urbanomic x Sequence Press, 2012.
- Rancière, Jacques. *Hatred of Democracy*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Rancière, Jacques. "Time, Narrative, and Politics," *Identities: Journal for Politics, Gender and Culture*, 11.1 (2014): 7-18.
- Sohn-Rethel, Alfred. *Intellectual and Manual Labor: Critique of Epistemology*. London: Macmillan, 1978.
- Williams, Alex and Nick Srnicek. "#Accelerate: Manifesto for an Accelerationist Politics," *Critical Legal Thinking*, May 14, 2013. Web. <<http://criticallegalthinking.com/2013/05/14/accelerate-manifesto-for-an-accelerationist-politics>>.