

THE IMPACT OF BASIC LAWS OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS ON THE MOVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF GOODS IN MARX'S CAPITAL SERIESPham Thi Thu Huong, Tran Thi Thuy Ninh, Nguyen Thi Thu
Nam Dinh University of Technology Education**Abstract:**

Goods are labor products with two attributes of use-value and value that exist in unity and conflict with each other. Under the influence of the laws of dialectics, goods undergo many stages of development from low to high. In each stage, it has the fundamental substance that manifests itself in the necessary expression of value. This method has a dialectical inheritance, reflecting the level of the social division of labor, the specific quantity of labor, the number of goods, and the development of contradictions in the production of goods. When money becomes capital, the value of a commodity has a fundamental property that distinguishes it from the value of a commodity in the previous stages, that it becomes a self-moving, self-increasing subject, creating a surplus value that reflects the fundamental contradiction of the capitalist commune between the bourgeoisie and the working class. Resolving that conflict inevitably leads to the transformation of goods into items.

Quality and quantity of goods

The commodity is the most abstract thing in a capitalist society, but this is not an abstraction without content, in contrast, it has properties, constitutive determination.

First of all, Marx defines goods as labor products with use-value attributes (substances). "As use-values, goods differ primarily in quality" [2, 73]. The qualitative difference between goods is due to qualitatively different use-values of particular laborers. Thanks to that qualitative difference between goods, we can distinguish different goods.

Labor products have not yet taken the form of goods (items) and goods have in common that they have use-values. This is the inheritance of goods. But this is not a primitive inheritance but dialectical inheritance. Use-value in goods is not to meet the needs of the producer himself, but to meet the needs of others through the way of exchange. To produce a commodity, a person must not only produce a use-value but also produce a use-value for others, that is, a social use-value, Marx wrote. more association" [2, 78].

The substance has a quantity of substance. The use-value of the good is the quantity of the use-value. Since goods have different use-values, in terms of the total world of goods, the more goods, the more use-values. Reuse value is created by specific workers. So the more specific labor, the more variety of goods. The specific number of workers depends on the level of the social division of labor. Finally, in this respect, the quantity of use-value comes from the level of the social division of labor. Therefore, Marx affirmed: "The total of different use-values or commodity objects representing all useful labors, also many forms, also divided into many types, varieties, families, and branches. And different variations - in short, showing the social division of labor"[2, 80]. In terms of each commodity, the amount of the use-value of the commodity is also large. Marx writes: "Each such thing is a collection of many properties and can therefore be useful in many different ways" [2, 69]. In this respect, "finding the multifaceted uses of things is the work of history" [2, 69].

Based on the use-value attribute alone, it is not clear whether the product of labor is a commodity. Thus, in the set of Capital, Marx pointed out that the next determinism of goods is value. The value of a commodity, according to Marx, has only a purely social character; it is the crystallization of abstract human labor in the commodity. As a value, all goods are identical in quality. That is because all private labor, when putting aside its usefulness, is a waste of human labor, abstract human labor.

Like the value of use, the value of a commodity also has a quantity, that is, the quantity of value. "Then how to measure its value? It is measured by the amount of the "value-creating entity" contained in it, by the amount of labor. The quantity of labor itself is measured by labor time" [2, 74]. However, this is not an isolated labor time but a "necessary average labor time or socially necessary labor time" [2, 75].

The two attributes (also two substances) use-value and value do not exist separately, but they are unified with each other, creating the basic quality of the goods. Therefore, only the basis of both these attributes and the

unity between them is enough to tell us that a product of labor is a commodity. Therefore, Marx writes: "But the reason why they become goods, is only because of their dual nature, because they are both consumer goods (use-value, author) and bearer. Therefore, they are only goods, or only take the form of goods, insofar as they have a dual form - a natural form (use-value, author) and a value form". 89]. Of course, it is necessary to understand the value here in its comprehensiveness including the qualitative side (abstract labor), the quantitative side (the amount of value), and the inevitable mode of expression of value (exchange value or form). Based on this basic substance, goods can be defined as follows: Goods are human labor products with two sides of use-value and value that exist in unity.

Conflict of goods

The unity between use-value and value is the unity of two opposite sides of the same commodity object. That creates an internal conflict of goods between use-value and value. This contradiction manifests outwardly as a contradiction between the relative form of value and the equivalent in the inevitable mode of expression of value or the form of value. Marx wrote: "The relative form of value and the form of equivalence are two aspects that are related to each other, mutually determining, inseparable, but at the same time two poles that are incompatible or opposed to each other. , i.e. two poles of the same value expression" [2, 91].

The contradiction of goods originates from the contradiction in commodity production between private labor and social labor, between the two-sided social natures of private labor: concrete labor and abstract labor. The minds of the producers reflect that duality in product exchange: the social usefulness of productive labor is reflected in the commodity that must have a use-value; while the social character of equality between different types of labor is reflected in the fact that goods are all values.

Dialectical negation between the stages of the commodity

Under the influence of the law of quantity and quality, the law of contradiction leads to the dialectical negation between the stages and forms of goods. Since "the development of the commodity form also agrees with the development of the form of value" [2, 111], our study of the movement of goods cannot be separated from the study of the forms of goods. Form of value.

a. Goods in a single form of value (I)

Goods in the form I have the mode of expression of value: a good manifests its value in the use-value of another good. This mode is the basic substance of goods in form I. It is expressed in the equation: $x \text{ good A} = y \text{ good B}$.

According to this method, the internal contradiction between the used price and the outwardly manifested commodity value is the contradiction between the relatively unitary form of value and the unitary equivalent form. The contrast between use-value and value here is not fixed. Depending on how the equation is read from left to right or vice versa, each commodity A and B in these two poles follow that taking the relative form of value, sometimes taking the form of an equivalent thing.

The mode of expression of the value of goods in form I reflects that the division of labor in the society is not extensive; the number of specific laborers and the number of goods on the market are not yet rich and diverse. Thus, in practice, this mode "is common only in the first germ of exchange, when the products of labor are transformed into goods only in single and random acts of exchange." [2, 117].

However, the division of labor is growing; the number of specific labor and the number of goods is increasing. That quantitative change to a certain limit leads to a qualitative transformation of the mode of expression of value. At that time, the mode of expression of the existing value is replaced by the new one, the goods in the form I are replaced by the new goods.

b. Goods in the extended form of value (II)

A commodity in form II whose mode of expression of value is a good that manifests its value in the use-value of all other goods. This mode is the basic substance of the goods in form II. It is expressed in the equation: $z \text{ good A} = u \text{ good B}$, or $= v \text{ good C}$, or $= w \text{ good D}$, or $= x \text{ good E}$, etc.

The expression method of the above value has the dialectical inheritance of the method of expressing the value of goods in the previous form. The new method is a sum of the old method and the old method as the elements that make up the new method. Thus, Marx writes: "The relatively extended form of value is only a sum of relatively simple expressions of value or the sum of the equations of the first form." [2, 115]. However, when the old method forms the new method, it is no longer the same as before. In the new model, goods in the role of a

relatively unique form of value are transformed into a relatively extended form of value (commodity A); while goods in the role of a single equivalent are transformed into specific equivalents (goods B, C, D, E...).

The method of expressing the value of goods in form II shows that the contradiction between use-value and value is developed one step further. This is reflected in the fact that, in this mode, "the distinction between the value of a good and the use-value of the good itself is more complete" [117,118] because the value of good A stands against It represents its use-value in all its possible forms, as something equal to B, equal to C, etc., equal to all but equal to A.

Goods in Form II reflect a new level of development of the social division of labor with a greater abundance of private workers, specific quantities of labor, and quantities of goods on the market. That quantity leads to an exchange of goods that is no longer random and unique. Thus, for this commodity - writes Marx - "first appeared in practice when a certain product of labor, such as cattle, was exchanged for many other goods at once. The usual way, and not in the form of an exception" [2,118].

Due to the development of the productive forces and the deepening of the social division of labor, the quantity of specific labor and goods on the market is increasingly richer. That change in quantity to a certain limit will lead to a qualitative change in the mode of expression of the existing value, leading to the replacement of this model with a new one, replacing the goods in the picture. One state with a commodity in another form.

c. Goods in the general form of value (III)

Goods in form III have a basic substance to distinguish them from other goods, which is reflected in the mode of expression of its value. According to this method, the value of all goods is expressed in the use-value of a single commodity. That is shown by the following equation: $2B; \text{ or } 3C; \text{ or } 4D; \text{ or } \dots = 1 A$

The new value expression method has a dialectical inheritance of the previous value expression methods. The new expression method is the result of the reverse of the second expression method, and it is still composed of the first expression method. However, existing in the new mode of expression of value, the role of goods in both sides of the past equation is no longer the same as before. In the first, there is a transition from the relatively single and extended form of value to the more general form of value; in the latter, the unique and particular equivalent develops into the universal equivalent.

The newly acquired method of value expression shows that the contradiction of goods has developed to a higher level. If the commodity is in form I, the value of a commodity is distinguished from its use-value by the use-value of good acting as a single equivalent; if the commodity in form II, the commodity's value stands opposite its use-value through all the use-values of the commodity acting as a particular parity, then now, the commodity in form III, the value of each commodity "is different not only from its use-value, but also from any other use-value, and thereby manifests something in common." (same value - author) for that good and all other goods" [2, 118]. This contradictory development in goods reflects the development of contradictions between private labor and social labor, between concrete and abstract labor in commodity production.

In practice, goods in form III appear when there are "forced goods to manifest into exchange values for each other" [2, 118]. It reflects the growing social division of labor, the number of private, concrete labor, and the more abundant quantity of goods.

However, due to the constant movement of contradictions in the production of goods, the division of labor continued to develop deeper and deeper, so the number of specific laborers and the number of goods on the market became more and more abundant. That increase in quantity when the limit is exceeded inevitably leads to a qualitative transformation in the mode of expression of value. That leads to the replacement of the existing mode of expression of value by a new one, goods in form III are replaced by goods in the form of money.

d. Goods in the form of money

Goods in the form of money have the mode of expression of value which is the value of all the world of goods expressed in a single commodity, gold. The method of expressing this value is expressed in the equation: $2B; \text{ or } 3C; \text{ or } 4D; \text{ or } \dots = 0.1 \text{ gr of gold.}$

Compared with the mode of expression of the value of goods in form III, the mode of expression of the value of goods in the form of money has only one difference that the universal equivalent has been fixed in gold. The substance of an object is determined not only by the method of association but also by its constituent elements. Therefore, this method of expressing values is also a basis for distinguishing from previous methods of expressing values.

The emergence of a new mode of expression of value represents the development of goods. This development also has a dialectical inheritance of all previous modes of value expression. That is shown in that, the mode of expression of value in newly acquired goods is only distinguished from the method of expressing

the value of goods in form III in the equivalent; the method of expressing the value of goods in form III is due to the reverse of the method of expressing value in form II; while the mode of expression of the value of goods in form I becomes a constitutive element of all modes of value expression. It can be said that the mode of expression of the value of goods in form I is the germ of the mode of expression of the value of goods in form IV.

Commodities in the form of money appear to mark the higher development of commodities. That is the inevitable result of the conflicting movement between use-value and value, the development of production, and the exchange of goods. C. Marx writes: "The process of expansion and ingraining of exchange increases more and more the smoldering opposition like commodities, between use-value and value. The need to make that opposite manifest outwardly to serve the transaction has tended to give rise to an independent form of commodity value, and that need is never silent until when in the end it is achieved by splitting goods into goods and money" [2,150-151].

The introduction of money goods does not mean that the conflict of goods has been resolved here. Its resolution of contradiction creates a new form in which the contradiction of goods can continue to operate. When the world of goods splits into ordinary goods and money goods, the money commodity increases to a certain quantity (conversion quantity) which inevitably leads to its transformation into capital (conversion).

e. Commodities in a capitalist market economy

In capitalist production, as capital, the value of a commodity "became the subject of a process, (...) that value itself also changed its quantity, spontaneously changing its quantity. Its surplus value pushes it out of itself as the initial value, i.e. self-increasing" [2, 256]. The ability to increase itself, to create surplus value, is a fundamental attribute that distinguishes it from commodity value in simple commodity production.

This capacity of commodity value, according to Marx, is derived from the special use-value property of the commodity labor power. The use-value of the commodity labor power in the process of being consumed not only creates use value but also creates value, not only creating value but also creating value greater than itself. However, the surplus value created by workers does not belong to them but the capitalist. For when labor power is in the possession of the capitalist, the process of using it and the product of that consumption does not belong to the worker, but to the person who purchased it.

Thus, when money (commodities) is transformed into capital, the value in its particular form is surplus value as well as the specific expression of surplus-value, which is profit, not only reflects the relationship between commodity producers, as in simple commodity production, but it also reflects the conflict between workers and capitalists.

Development trend of goods

In Capital, Marx pointed out that when the contradiction reflected in the surplus-value between the working class and the bourgeoisie is resolved when the working class fulfills its historical mission, it is inevitable that leading to the transformation of private ownership into public ownership. At that time, the conditions for the existence of commodity production no longer exist, and labor products in the form of commodities will be transformed into articles. This is the negation of the negation in the movement of the product of labor: item - commodity - item. For the product of labor to complete that cycle of dialectical negation, according to Marx, it requires "a set of definite physical conditions of existence, which are the natural products of a long and painful process of development" [2, 139]. But before completing that cycle, Marx did not deny the existence of commodities in the transition from capitalism to the new mode of production. The existence of a socialist-oriented market economy in Vietnam is proof of that.

Conclusion

Thus, under the influence of the basic laws of the materialist dialectic, goods always move and develop through different stages. Commodities in each period have different qualities, have a dialectical inheritance of the previous stage, and reflect the degree of contradictions in commodity production, the level of the social division of labor, the number of specificity and richness of use-values. When a commodity is transformed into capital, its value becomes a self-moving subject, creating surplus value reflecting the conflict between labor and capital. Its development trend will transform into items.

References:

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

- [1]. E.V.I Lencov (2002 - Translator Nguyen Anh Tuan), Dialectical Logic, Information Culture Publishing House, Hanoi.
- [2]. Marx and Ph. Ang - jealous (2002), Complete volume, volume 23, National Politics Publishing House, Hanoi.
- [3]. Marx and Ph. Ang - jealous (2002), Complete volume, volume 25, part 2, National Politics Publishing House.
- [4]. M.Rodentan (1962), Dialectical problems in Marx's "Capital", Truth Publishing House, Hanoi.