

The Evolutionary Theory Of Value

Eugene Panferov

Revision 4, 2019-12-09

Abstract

We propose the first economic theory of value grounded in biological reality that allows us to escape traditional circularity of theories of value defined in "economics" terms that in turn are inherently dependent on the theory of value. We explore evolutionary causes of trade, and demonstrate how goods have value from the evolutionary perspective, and how this value is increased with trade independently of any economical theories. This "Darwinian" value of goods exists before humans assign monetary value (or any other value estimate) to traded goods. We propose objective value estimate expressed in energy units.

1 Introduction

This paper does not analyze existing economic theories, neither it disputes any opinions about free markets. The proposed theory has its goal to give physical meaning to the notion of "value" that is basic for economics.

This paper proposes a new foundation for the economic theory – the notion of value that does not create contradictions intrinsic to all existing notions of value. The proposed notion of value is derived from biology, not economics. It breaks the circularity of the modern definitions of value derived from the economics to lay foundation for the economics. It removes the necessity for the axiom of "needs", it unfolds "needs" into a sound biological strategy underlying economic activity.

Economic activity is a biological phenomenon therefore any economic theory should be a continuation of the evolutionary theory of life. We transcend the artificial metaphysical division between biology and economics. We postulate the absence of any and all supernatural differences between the subject of biology and the subject of "social sciences" (e.g. holy spirit, consciousness, mind, humanity, rationale, life force).

We use the term "reproductive success" meaning exactly what the term "fitness" means in proper biological jargon.

2 State Of The Art

The modern economics has very few theories of value, none of which is satisfactory for any coherent and complete picture of economic activity of humans as a whole. The limitations of those theories had been admitted by their authors themselves (e.g. Smith [4], or Marx contradicting himself [7] vs [8], also [10] [9] [12] [13]).

As being apparent in the political affiliation of the authors referenced above, Marxism proves itself the most cancerous in the field of value theories, so the labour theory of value requires a quick, utterly shameful, and final refutation. Imagine two identical shoes: one made by a skilled craftsman in his shop, and another made by him in the same shop with prison moons attached to his legs. According to Marx (and also Smith!) these shoes have different value, and the one made without handicap is a worse shoe in itself. Marx attempts to patch this hole below the water line with “socially necessary labour”, but we can easily imagine Titanic being built in Himalayas. According to Marx this ship is much better than her sister Olympic built in Belfast, because building a ship in Belfast does not take as much “socially necessary labour”.

Despite the abundance of marxism, the dominant belief among practicing economists is derived from a perfectly sensible view by Menger [3] *The value of goods arises from their relationship to our needs, and is not inherent in the goods themselves. With changes in this relationship, value arises and disappears.* However, it is customary reduced to *There is no intrinsic value in goods, it is all our imagination.* This notion is easily refutable by any anorexic person: clearly food have some intrinsic value INDEPENDENT FROM PERSONAL EVALUATION. The “relationship” Menger speaks about should not be reduced to “personal evaluation”! We are about to unfold this “relationship”.

The 2000 year long continuous failure to understand value stems from two irrational desires: (a) to describe value as a univariate function [same book references] (b) to make this value a unique numeric characteristic of a unit of goods (e.g. as we observe utility, labour-cost, and price, every classical author struggles to pick just one instead of factoring all of them in!). Speaking of (a): *The major debate about value has always been about whether it inherent in things, or is a function of human desires. Plato regarded value as inherent in a commodity, but Aristotle attributed it to a commodity's utility, and he said the standard of value lies in wants.* [5] The sheer age of this debate suggests the futility of the traditional approach to the problem that has been exercised so far. In the same direction goes Smith's “paradox of water and diamonds” [4], which is not nearly a paradox unless you demand value to be a univariate function. There is nothing paradoxical in multivariate functions! They exist everywhere! It is great shame that Menger's revelation about the value arising from a relationship between two domains (commodity and consumer) was not taken seriously.

On the bright side, the neoclassical economics acknowledges the fact that the *perceived value* must exceed the price. But the neoclassical economics offers no theory of value that would allow us to estimate the value of goods, and their entire economics depends on a notion of value that is not “analytical”.

Another non-analytical notion of value “comparative value” appears in various sources. It defines value as a binary relation in the space of pairs of goods: for each random pair you personally can tell in your present circumstances which one is more valuable. Despite non-guaranteed transitivity, this describes a useful notion, but limited to a single consumer. This relation is defined for each consumer in his own space of choices, and

there is no relation defined between these spaces. Thus the “comparative value” does not offer value comparison between different consumers.

In order to explain demand, modern economics utilizes the notion of *need* or *needs and wants*. What is *need* economists vaguely understand, it is any necessity for sustaining one’s life. In order to tackle the *wants*, the rational choice theory was developed [10], which does (instead of defining *want*) add yet another axiom to the system, the assumption of *rational mind*. Then it was superseded by the theory of bounded rationality [11], which retains the basic assumption of *rational mind* and retains close ties to psychology, which does not add clarity. Thus the entire economics hangs on the undefined prime mover.

The evolutionary perspective allows us to reveal a simple universal foundation of all *wants and needs*, without assuming *rational mind*.

3 The Value

3.1 The Value Is 2-variate

We recognize the fact that individual customers value goods differently. Moreover, this fact is necessary for a market to exist. If two people value an item equally, they have no motive to trade this item. If the value of goods is 100% intrinsic then all well informed people value all things equally, then no honest trade is possible, which is contrary to the observable reality.

At the same time the very existence of any demand suggests that goods do have intrinsic value. Shoes make your life objectively better by being shoes themselves. Shoes have a valuable function which is enabled and defined by the physical properties of the shoes. The attribution of the shoes’ value to the physical property of the shoes is easy to reveal by merely wearing several different shoes – by being able to compare these shoes you admit that your evaluation depends on the physical properties in question.

Moreover, this objective value is necessary for a market to exist. Lets make another thought experiment. A pair of boots reduces my energy expense for heating my feet by 1MJ/day while I am hunting. Note that this amount will not change if the price of my boots change on the market. However, the price change can motivate me to sell my boots, if the price covers my expenses for inventing and implementing another method of heating my feet. It does not mean that my boots lost their value, it means that I exchange their value for a greater value. And this greater value is represented by the boots price in the act of selling the boots. Without this difference the transaction is not possible, and by extension a transaction is not possible. Therefore the objective value is necessary.

Thus, the value is “objective” and “subjective” at the same time – it depends on both intrinsic properties of goods and the customer (alongside all his local circumstances). Two men value the same pair of boots differently, but they both value them for their physical properties. In other words, **the economic value is a function of two variables**: a customer in a particular local situation, and a goods item of certain properties.

A proper theory of value must reflect this fact.

3.2 The Value Is Scalar

All our feelings, cravings, needs – all are products of adaptation – congenital analgesia causes death. You are able to feel thirst and you can not resist it only because those who could resist it, or did not feel it failed to reproduce. It does not depend on what you think about this statement and the feeling of thirst. You think that thirst is “natural”, “INEVITABLE”, the suggestion of improper reaction to thirst seems insane to you, you think that thirst could not be misinterpreted – this very thought, this obviousness is also a result of adaptation.

Same with economic *wants* – if those wants do not affect our reproductive success, we would not be able to feel them, and those who did not feel them are long gone. In the end the natural selection decides who was better at assessing goods value and smarter at trade.

Only as much as your quality of life affects your reproductive success the evolution grants you the ability to assess the *quality of life*, and it does that inevitably. We can think and talk about comfort, health, safety (whatever particular aspect of your life motivates you to buy or sell anything) only because this very ability to reason about these things has evolutionary significant impact on your reproductive success. This is the general fundamental property of all traits of all life.

A man thinks that his *wants* are motivated by expected increase of his quality of life. The quality of life is a very multi-dimensional object, impossible to be formally accounted for. But we live within the evolutionary framework, and Darwinian evolution reduces all properties of our life (however multi-dimensional) to a single dimension *reproductive success* (so called *fitness*). Such complex objects as quality of organization of multicellular bodies, or efficiency of a hunting strategy, or man’s life comfort – are all being reduced to the amount of genes’ copies being propagated to future generations (the only tricky part of this measure is to account for more than one generation).

The simplicity of evolution allows us to model the *value* with a 1-dimensional function – for the measure of the value we must use Darwinian fitness (more specifically the difference: how much fitness is affected by certain economic actions).

3.3 Value vs Cost vs Price

All three characteristics are NECESSARY, they all describe real aspects of a commodity, they are all DISTINCT, and none is more important than another.

We demand to cease the attempts to equate value with either cost or price! It is necessary for any trade that all three of the characteristic numbers follow the inequality:

$$Value > Price > Cost$$

No equality allowed. You decide to buy according to the discrepancy between the price and the value. If the price IS the value, then you must commit all transactions within your financial capabilities, and you have no reason to deny any deal you can afford – which is apparently ABSURD. On the other hand, if price equals cost, then what do you personally gain by selling? Why even bother creating things if you can not gain more than you invest in labour. If this strict inequality is violated no trade takes place.

3.4 The Ineluctability Of The Intrinsic Value

Every phenomenon existing within a biological system must have been evolved in the Darwinian sense.

Markets exist within a biological framework: the extended phenotype of Homo Sapience. [2]

Therefore markets have to have an evolutionary “reason”, simplest and likeliest of which is the reproductive advantage (in proper terms higher relative fitness).

On the other hand, a market is merely a collection of transactions, so it must derive its survival value from its transactions.

Thus transactions must have objective intrinsic Darwinian value.

Whereas transactions can only derive this value from the goods that are being exchanged.

Therefore the goods must have some intrinsic value that is also Darwinian.

Here we made a tiny leap of faith focusing on the reproductive advantage and dismissing “indirect” evolutionary “reasons” such as side effects of other evolved traits, or preservation of neutral traits, etc. Further reasoning (section 3.5) supports this assumption by demonstrating the presence of real reproductive benefits.

The requirement of the reproductive advantage for an evolved phenomenon has two weak spots: sexual selection (which happens to be arbitrary in many cases) and parasitic memes (such as religions). However, a religion shapes human behaviour in a way that creates artificial selection (e.g. killing infidels) that creates “artificial” reproductive advantage, whereas sexual selection provides value in and of itself (whatever neutral or even detrimental trait is sexually selected for it is responsible for some reproductive advantage due to the fact of the selection itself). That means markets require a Darwinian explanation involving aforementioned “intrinsic value” anyway.

3.5 The Source Of The Intrinsic Value

We use boots as an example of goods because the reproductive advantage created by food is too obvious (no food – no reproduction; a feedback loop that short does not allow us to illustrate a general case). Boots, on the other hand, encompasses all properties of a tool, and could be easily replaced with any other tangible item of value without disturbing the argument. On the example of boots, we can see that the following reasoning could be applied to all goods.

A pair of boots gives its owner a reproductive advantage over himself without the boots. The owner saves energy on heating his feet, on healing damage to the soles (which is inevitable if walking bare feet), he saves lots of energy required for thickening his soles. And all this is compounded with the energy required to acquire extra food that is his only energy source. His life with boots is significantly more energy efficient than without. All in all he uses some animal skin INSTEAD of growing his own – all the expenses are shifted onto another animal.

The vast majority of all things traditionally traded in the world’s markets provide reproductive advantage to buyers. Before anything else, it is FOOD; then clothing; then tools; then housing; then fuel; then medicine – all these things one way or another

prolong one's life and save labour, which translates almost inevitably into greater reproductive opportunity (not only more offspring, but also better reared ones).

Naturally, the buyer's perception of the goods value is not perfectly accurate and his psychology is exploitable and the market (as a finite knowable aggregate of human strategies) is also exploitable. This fact allows for fake-value goods (e.g. rhino horns, eye-phones, fridge magnets) to be traded. Those goods do not affect our reasoning for two reasons: (a) fake-value goods are vastly outweighed by real-value goods, food alone trumps all "gadgets" combined (b) market exploiting strategies are secondary to the market, a market exploit, in order to evolve itself, requires its victim market to evolve earlier. As we are comparing (from the evolutionary perspective) the "no-market" situation vs a situation of arbitrarily early phase of market development (reasoning about the cause of the market itself), we can safely discard these issues.

4 The Transaction

4.1 The Social Value

Evolutionary processes typically run with positive feedback. Every trait that exists in multiple generations and millions bodies, once was a single mutation of a single body. Evolution is a process of magnification of small "positive" deviations – a mutation that is "slightly better" in Darwinian sense becomes a new norm. This allows us to reason about an isolated trait not as a mere example but a signifier of an evolutionary trend. Demonstration of a slight particular advantage constitutes a demonstration of an entire evolutionary trajectory. Thus we can maintain the generality of our reasoning while only focusing on local competitions between particular traits.

Let's assume 4 men: 2 from tribe A , and 2 from tribe B . The men of tribe A manufacture 2 spears and 2 axes. The man A_1 creates 1 axe and 1 spear, the man A_2 creates 1 axe and 1 spear. As they complete the task they are ready to conquer the tribe B . They spend energy on the task: $E(\text{spear}, A_1) + E(\text{axe}, A_1) + E(\text{spear}, A_2) + E(\text{axe}, A_2) = E_A$. At the same time in the B tribe, the men B_1 and B_2 (similar in skills and all characteristics) create the same set of weapons, but they are capable of trade. Since it is easier for B_1 to manufacture an axe than it is for B_2 , B_1 creates 2 axes, and B_2 creates 2 spears. Then they trade 1 axe for 1 spear between them, and become equally equipped for the conquest of the tribe A . They spend energy on this preparation: $2E(\text{axe}, B_1) + 2E(\text{spear}, B_2) = E_B$. Since $E(\text{axe}, B_1) < E(\text{axe}, B_2)$ the tribe B saved some energy. If we assume everything else being equal, except for the distribution of labour, then $E_A > E_B$. The tribe A spends more energy to achieve the same result as tribe B . When they go to war, who is likely to eat whom? Tribe A eats tribe B or vice-versa? Obviously the tribe B eats tribe A .

The assumption of "everything else being equal" is legitimized by the law of large numbers. The "all things being equal" is a metaphor for a very large sample in which all variants are presented, so that our deviation (the advantage represented by the example) has a chance to express itself in the whole spectrum of circumstances. Obviously, if the capability of trade spawns in a weak tribe, its genes will perish, but evolution is a long process and over time this ability will spawn in many different circumstances.

We can now assume a tribe of N people, each of them demand a certain set of goods. If they are unable to trade then each of them has to manufacture all the goods he

needs. In other words, from all possible variants of the labour distribution the one is fixed. Highly unlikely this variant is the least energy expensive. It is even possible to prove rigorously. Let's say people $P_1..P_N$ manufacture goods $G_1..G_M$, their energy expense is a $E_{min} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M E(P_i, G_j)$. If this an optimal labour distribution then any reassignment of labour will increase the expense. Let's investigate a minimal reassignment: P_n works on 2 items G_m , and P_k works on 2 items G_p (it affects only 4 members of the sum, other elements remain the same). From optimality of E_{min} follows: $2E(P_n, G_m) + 2E(P_k, G_p) > E(P_n, G_m) + E(P_k, G_p) + E(P_n, G_p) + E(P_k, G_m)$ Therefore: $E(P_n, G_m) + E(P_k, G_p) > E(P_n, G_p) + E(P_k, G_m)$ From this follows that the opposite reassignment will gives us reduction in expense: $E(P_n, G_m) + E(P_k, G_p) + E(P_n, G_p) + E(P_k, G_m) > 2E(P_n, G_p) + 2E(P_k, G_m)$ Which means that E_{min} is not optimal. This contradiction proves that the original assignment can not be optimal unless all assignments are equal. Thus our tribe without trade stuck with a non-optimal distribution of labour.

On the other hand, if they are capable of trade, they are free to explore all possible combinations, among which there are more energy efficient combinations than the current one. **The trade opens up a possibility to minimize aggregate energy expense of a tribe's industry.**

We omit the topic of theft because the theft is not evolutionary stable – a tribe can not contain a majority of thieves and survive.

4.2 The Personal Value

A second pair of boots provides much less value to the owner relative to the first pair, because two pairs can not be worn simultaneously. The aggregate value of these two pairs of boots is lower than the double value of one of them. However, a man having no boots does value your second pair as high as you value the first pair. If you sell your second pair to him you receive from him in compensation as much value as he acquires with these shoes. As the result you end up having the double value of a pair of shoes, which is much greater than the value you had before the transaction. Since the motivation is symmetrical, the buyer must have increased the aggregate value of the things he owns, e.g. he had two identical pelts and he gave you one in exchange for your boots. Both participants benefit from the transaction – this benefit sums to the value of the transaction.

The cost of production adds more motivation for trade. If you spend less energy/labour to produce a pair of boots than another man does it is advantageous for him to buy boots from you rather than manufacture them (which is explained in 4.1) – and this is how you end up having two pairs of boots in the first place.

Still the motivation of all parties is strictly selfish: a transaction is motivated by the increase of value being owned on both sides, and the division of labour is motivated by the decrease of energy expense on both sides.

4.3 The Model Of Transaction

A simple transaction consists of: $User_1, User_2; Item_1, Item_2$

where $User_1$ owns $Item_1$ and $User_2$ owns $Item_2$, then the items change hands.

Users value items with the value function: $Value(User, Item)$

The aggregate value before the transaction is:

$$Value(User_1, Item_1) + Value(User_2, Item_2) = V_b$$

The necessary condition is:

$$Value(User_1, Item_1) < Value(User_1, Item_2) \text{ and } Value(User_2, Item_2) < Value(User_2, Item_1)$$

The aggregate value after the transaction is:

$$Value(User_1, Item_2) + Value(User_2, Item_1) = V_a$$

The condition explains PURELY SELFISH motives of the transaction participants, they do not care about the “global” aggregate value (social value of the transaction), they both increase the value of goods they personally own. Nevertheless, corollary to the necessary condition the aggregate value $V_b < V_a$, i.e. (without any intent by participants to increase it) the transaction increases the aggregate value of goods in the market.

4.4 The Value Of The Market

The model of transaction 4.3 shows that the market (as a collection of transactions) increases the aggregate value of goods. This increase of the social value of goods is the intrinsic value of the market, and it is derived from the intrinsic value of goods.

At the same time market (as an evolved phenomenon) must have Darwinian value. And we have already established that market increases reproductive advantage of the participants (relative to those who don't participate).

Thus, the argument to equate goods value with reproductive advantage works both ways bottom-up and top-down.

Please note:

1. a market does not create goods (although it consistently increase value)
2. a market in our theory is not an axiom, but a product of evolution
3. the proposed theory defines the value independently from the market, and derives market from it
4. goods, transactions, and market share the same physical notion of value that can be measured in same units same dimension.

Apparently, goods value can change. Not so long ago 5-inch magnetic disks were valuable, not today. Mainstream economists tend to blame the market for that: “price fell”; whereas the real reason, of course, is the invention of better data storage devices; without this invention the price and the value would not fall (this is an example of the causation confusion trap set up by monetarism).

As we equated value with reproductive advantage, and made it a basic notion, we must conclude on the role of a market: **A market does not determine value of goods, a market estimates the value.**

5 The Measure

Apparently the intrinsic value of goods is multidimensional. Food alone has many dimensions of value: sugars, fats, proteins, multitude of vitamins and micro-elements, essential amino acids, and something we do not know yet – all these are required in certain proportions rendering one-dimensional comparison between different food types impossible. Shoes and axes add some more fully independent dimensions of value... However,

food is consumed for some purpose, tools are used for some purpose too. From the evolutionary perspective this purpose is ultimately the reproductive advantage. From the multitude of properties through the several intermediate goals (satiation, resting, lust, etc) to merely one measurable parameter the reproductive success.

We can compare goods (being consumed/used by people (remember the value is a function of two arguments)) by how much they affect the consumer's reproductive success (perceived or potential success or the expected value of the success in the probability theory terms).

Somewhat counterintuitive we propose to use energy units for this measure, i.e. translate "reproductive advantage" into the amount of energy saved (compared to what competitors have spent or might have spent). This makes sense because the energy saved by a person does translate into reproductive success of this person – the less energy you spend for a unit of food, the more/better offspring you can rear.

Another reason to use energy units is that we can express in energy units the cost of an item of any level of refinement. Because all we harvest or manufacture costs human labour, which is ultimately what we eat, and all we eat is ultimately stored sunlight, the cost of converting sunlight and storing it in chemical bonds is again energy. The forms of stored energy (different fuels and foods alike) are all interconnected with energy conversion paths of certain specific cost for each – it allows us to use single abstract energy unit for all forms of energy.

Example: to extract nutrients and energy from grass you need to spend some energy (some in form of digestion, some in form of labour (to harvest and chew the grass), and some in the form of waste); a cow can do the same job much more efficiently with much less waste; by eating a cow you save plenty of energy – you shifted the largest part of the expenses onto the cow; and by taking care of a domestic cow, you save energy that you would otherwise spend on hunting a wild one; and by manufacturing tools involved in the process you save your labour (which is also a form of energy).

Although it is difficult in a general case to compute the exact amount of energy invested in an item and the exact amount of energy it provides to the consumer, still it is fundamentally possible, and the energy measure can be used for "local" comparison without knowing the absolute energy value.

We can compare (and ideally calculate) how goods affect energy efficiency of consumers' lives, and express this value in energy units.

6 Discussion And Refutations

We excluded from the scope all pathological market phenomena. Because they all require the existence of a "victim"-market to parasitize on. Therefore a market should evolve first, to give room for pathological phenomena.

The theory explores the origins of the market, not the transient contemporary excesses.

The conspicuous consumption does not destroy the reasoning above, it does provide reproductive advantage through sexual selection.

The theory does not have to explain phenomena of the physical realm that prevent a market from evolving. There are physical circumstances that make markets and the

notion of value negligible. From this fact nothing follows. The theory does not promise a creation of a market.

The theory does not claim that the capacity for trade causes humanity to choose the optimal variant of development – evolution does not guarantee optimality in any sense at all – any specie would go extinct with or without capacity for trade.

The theory does not claim that no value will be lost.

The theory does not make any claims about “items of art”, neither it demands any properties from them. As *value* is a function of two variable, there will be regions where one variable’s impact dominates the other (e.g. the variation of subjective value of items of art dwarfs the variation of physical value). From this fact nothing follows. The proposed theory does not limit the shape of the value function.

In connection with the above it is often said: “art experts determine the value of art and it is perfectly legit”. Although it has no impact on the proposed theory, we must note that the art evolved BEFORE “art experts”. Therefore the evolutionary value of art does not depend on “art experts”, even though it is out of the scope of our theory.

The theory does not make statements quantified as *all goods and services*. The theory says *there exist enough goods and services of a given property*.

A market follows from food and cloths, from tools and fuel, and many various tangible valuable goods each of which is SUFFICIENT to give rise to a market. Does a market follow from “items of art” we do not know. Thus the “items of art” is an invalid counter-example.

The aesthetics and entertainment value require more research to understand how they could be (if at all) represented with the present theory. However, there are no visible obstacle for this line of reasoning: aesthetics is involved in very basic biological processes such as resting, it could be argued that aesthetics decrease stress, increase diligence, etc, and thus improve one’s energy efficiency.

7 Conclusion

The Evolutionary Theory Of Value does not add new axioms. It uses the existing axiomatic base of biology, that is supported by a colossal corpus of research and evidence. The theory explains the cause of *demand* while removing the axioms: *wants and needs*, and *rationality*. A market participant exhibit some behaviour because he is programmed to do so, no understanding nor optimization nor even rationalization is required on his part. The irrational behaviour of a participant is no longer a paradox nor a hindrance for the theory. Optimal behaviour is not exceptional either. Furthermore, as an agent is biologically driven, it is not enough to provide relevant market information to him in order to change his behaviour, but it is possible to replace the agent along the course of evolution.

People trade with profit because this profit is evolutionary reinforced, evolution reinforces any profit, regardless of rationality, but rationality is also reinforced as long as it is profitable. This argument purifies economics from both teleology and moralism.

The theory reveals common foundation of all wants and needs and allows to formalize and quantify it.

The theory ends the debate between subjectivists and objectivists – the value is subjective and objective simultaneously necessarily.

The theory solves the “water and diamonds” [4, Chapter IV] paradox (without specifically targeting it).

The popular belief that the value is fundamentally unmeasurable is now totally refuted. We do not claim it is easy or even feasible, we claim that the value is in principle measurable, and even without knowing its absolute value we can compare values, which is the foundation for development of adequate relevant measures to replace ill-defined monetary indicators (e.g. GDP)) Parameters that were believed to be unmeasurable can now be measured, statements that were believed unverifiable can now be verified.

We created an extremely simple yet rich mathematical model of a transaction, which also shows how the market creates value. And this value does not depend on human opinions, communists create same value if they engage in trade.

The proposed theory is ontological, it explains the mechanisms and origins of phenomena, which is a huge advance for economics.

Civilizations with all their cultural and physical artifacts live on biological substrate, so we can not ignore the effects of biological factors on the development of civilizations. Conversely, on a sufficiently large time span we can not ignore the effects of civilization on the human genome, because civilizations are powerful machines of selection. Various civilizations develop in different ways, and only one of them associates with a rapid scientific and technological progress; we hope we touched ONE of the root causes of this difference.

From the proposed theory follows that anti-market arguments are outside the scientific framework completely. From the evolutionary explanation of human behaviour follows ineluctability of a market. Market critics are not even wrong, they are criticizing a fundamental unmovable order of things.

Monetarism causes confusion between money and value. Money replace real value in all practical calculations, although they merely represent value in SOME cases. Monetary metrics expel understanding of physical meaning from economics. This dirty trick was enabled by the lack of proper (non-contradictory and functioning) theory of value. The evolutionary theory of value closes this gap.

Almost all claims about motivation and effects of taxation can be contested, as money is no longer the end-game of taxation, but a medium of value transfer, whereas the value is physical. For example, a claim *the top income quintile of taxpayers are the only net-payers*, although true in monetary terms, is false in value terms – this is an example of the limits of monetary expression of value.

Money lose the monopoly on representation of value, and we can now assess the validity of monetary indicators, that were ASSUMED to be relevant so far. For example, from the evolutionary perspective, the GDP represents a sum of loses and gains.

The Evolutionary Theory Of Value returns physical meaning into economics. The physical notion of value is absolutely necessary for any macro-economic argument, because in macro-economic, where the printing press is not an external factor, all monetary expressions of value have no meaning at all.

And that is why **The Evolutionary Theory Of Value puts an end to Keynesian rampage.**

References

- [1] Richard Dawkins *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press, 2006, ISBN-10: 0199291152
- [2] Richard Dawkins *The Extended Phenotype*, Oxford University Press, 1989, ISBN 0-19-288051-9
- [3] Carl Menger *Principles of Economics* 1871, p. 120
https://cdn.mises.org/Principles%20of%20Economics_5.pdf
- [4] Adam Smith *The Wealth Of Nations*, 1776, Chapter IV
http://www.online-literature.com/adam_smith/wealth_nations
- [5] Lindy Davis *Why Are Theories of Value Important?*,
<http://www.politiceconomy.org/value.htm>
- [6] Nathan W. Bailey, Janelle R. McNabb Marlene Zuk *Preexisting behavior facilitated the loss of a sexual signal in the field cricket *Teleogryllus oceanicus** Behavioral Ecology, Volume 19, Issue 1, 1 January 2008, Pages 202207,
<https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arm123>
- [7] Marx, Karl Heinrich *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1859, page 276
- [8] Marx, Karl Heinrich *Capital Vol.1*, 1867, Chapter 1, Section 1,
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch01.htm>
- [9] Isaac Rubin *Essays on Marx's Theory of Value*, 1927,
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/rubin/abstract-labour.htm>
- [10] John Scott *Rational Choice Theory*, 2000,
<https://web.archive.org/web/20090227085005/http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~scottj/socscot7.htm>
- [11] Gerd Gigerenzer, Reinhard Selten *Bounded Rationality* 2002,
<https://books.google.rs/books?id=dVMq5UoYS3YC&dq=%22bounded+rationality%22>
- [12] Jonathan Nitzan, Shimshon Bichler *Capital as Power: A Study of Order and Creorder* Routledge, 2009, p. 10
- [13] John Milios *Marx's Value Theory Revisited. A 'Value-form' Approach* 2003, Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference in Economics. Ankara: METU. p. 9.
- [14] Wikipedia