

Review of: "György Márkus 75% Mensch: On the occasion of the Publication of the English version of How is a Critical Economic Theory Possible?"

George Liagouras¹

¹ Aegean University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Being a post-Marxist political economist with selective interest in sociology and philosophy, I found this paper extremely interesting. It is clear that it is written by an author who masters all the subtleties about the 'Budapest School'. *I think that the paper can be published as it stands.* The remarks/suggestions that follow below are *totally optional*.

First, I think that is possible to improve the paper's structure. It seems to me that it would be better to focus on the evolution of Markus' couple and Heller from 1972 upwards, regarding the initial question of 'How is a Critical Economic Theory Possible' (or of human needs).

- In part 2, G. Markus and A. Heller' thought is mixed with JP Arnason's work on European integration. I am afraid that the jump from the abstract level of 'How is a Critical Economic Theory Possible' to the more concrete question of European Integration and then to Heller's positions on Iraq and Afghanistan invasions leaves the reader perplexed. If the main question is the faith on the progress of humanity, it is difficult to see how this relies to 'How is a Critical Economic Theory Possible' (Part 1). In any case, Arnason and its relationship with the Budapest School deserves an article in its own.
- Similar remarks apply to the 4th part (The 'Bird of Paradise', Heller and Markus). There is here a very interesting comparison between Markus and Heller regarding the role of philosophy, and the fate of Modernity. But, once again, the relationship with the starting point of 'How is a Critical Economic Theory Possible' (Part 1) seems lost. This is a pity, because the Part 3, dedicated to Maria Markus' version on 'radical needs' (1995), joined again with the initial question. One can even ask about the place of economy, sociology and other social sciences in the opposition between 'high culture' and 'hard sciences'. Is there a shift in Markus and Heller's thought? If yes, why?

Second, the whole text seems a little bit 'esoteric' in the sense that it does not make enough links between Markus-Heller's corpus and other thinkers (except Arnason and Habermas). To give some examples:

- The controversial issue of use-value and social needs in Marxist scholarship (e.g. Rubine, Rosdolsky).
- Other scholarship on human needs (Doyal and Gough 1991, O'Neill 2011, Gough 2015). See for example: Gough, I., 2015. Climate change and sustainable welfare: the centrality of human needs. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 39 (5), 1191–214.
- Markus' position against the elimination of the market and Marcel Mauss' similar critique of the Soviet system. There is

also an important literature on 'market socialism'. How could we situate the Budapest School vis-à-vis all these debates?

- Jean Baudrillard's alternative critique of the political economy, and its rebuttal by G. Markus in his 'Language and Production'.

Third, I am afraid that the title 'György Márkus 75% Mensch' could puzzle the reader. The bulk of the paper is a comparison between Markus and Heller.