

Andrew Kliman, Nov. 17, 2025

Romaniega's Big Lie

Romaniegoism Means Never Having to Say You're Sorry

In his response to me, Romaniega alleges that I misrepresented his position when I said that he claimed to have exposed logical errors in Marx's demonstration in chapter 5 of *Capital*, volume 1. He alleges that he was referring to the "labor theory of value," not to the chapter 5 demonstration. On pages 6 and 7 of his response, he writes:

2.2. Kliman's misrepresentation of my position around the labor theory of value. He also states:

What Romaniega is doing here is moving the goalposts by shifting the burden of proof. He is the one who claimed to have "expose[d] the logical errors" in Marx's demonstration that the process of exchange does not alter the total amount of value in existence.

Kliman quotes me partially ("expose the logical errors") and adds his own gloss that this concerns Chapter 5 of Marx's work. I exposed the logical errors in Marx's demonstration of the labor theory of value, and that phrase follows a quote of Kliman saying, emphasis added "Thus, **the aggregate value-price equalities** follow inevitably—without exception—from Marx's account of the value-price transformation (as understood by the TSSI) **and** his demonstration in chapter 5 of *Capital*, volume 1".

...

In [Rom20], *I explicitly expose the logical errors in Marx's demonstration of the labor theory of value*. There is no goalpost shifting here; rather, Kliman misquotes to attribute to me a claim I did not make.

...

Finally, he presents my quote in a way that suggests that I am talking about Chapter 5, while I am referring specifically to the labor theory of value, as we have already argued and explained in the addendum to the note. This is not something one would miss if one reads carefully before criticizing.

Romaniega has shown what he claims to have shown—"that Marx's [chapter 5] demonstration is incorrect."

He is lying.

In his August 19, 2025 revised version of his critique, p. 5 begins as follows:

When deriving this result,³ I imposed no special-case restrictions. Thus, the aggregate value-price equalities follow inevitably—without exception—from Marx’s account of the value-price transformation (as understood by the TSSI) and his demonstration in chapter 5 of *Capital*, volume 1. No special cases whatsoever can yield a contrary result.

Let me emphasize that I am not saying or implying that nothing can yield a contrary result. In principle, it would be possible to overturn the aggregate value-price equalities by disproving Marx’s demonstration in chapter 5 of *Capital*, volume 1. But no one has succeeded in disproving it.⁴ Bortkiewicz did not even try, nor does Rallo.

It is evidently false that no one has shown that Marx’s demonstration is incorrect. Without going any further, in my work [Rom20] I expressly analyze Marx’s demonstration and expose the logical errors it contains.

The first two (indented) paragraphs quote me. I referred to

(a) “Marx’s account of the value-price transformation”

and

(b) “his demonstration in chapter 5 of *Capital*, volume 1.”

Note that (a) is referred to as an “account,” while (b) alone is referred to as a “demonstration.”

And in a second reference to (b), I wrote that “no one has succeeded in disproving” “Marx’s demonstration in chapter 5 of *Capital*, volume 1.”

In the third paragraph, Romaniega claims that this statement—about Marx’s demonstration in chapter 5—is false. “It is evidently false that no one has shown that Marx’s *demonstration* is incorrect. ... I expressly analyze Marx’s *demonstration* and expose the logical errors it contains” (emphases added).

He was clearly alleging that he had analyzed and exposed logical errors *in Marx’s demonstration in chapter 5*. His subsequent denials of this fact are false and his fancy-footwork argumentation is bullshit. He is a **despicable liar**.

And what is the purpose of the lie? After all, instead of lying, he could have said that he was wrong, that what he analyzed was actually the “labor theory of value,” not Marx’s demonstration in chapter 5. But Romaniega refuses to say that. His unwillingness to admit that he was wrong (analyzed further here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uUOn3NGzQik>) is extreme and malignant. Romaniegoism means never having to say you’re sorry.