

CAHIER 9703

**The Wage Rate and the Profit Rate in the Price of
Production Equation: a New Solution to an Old Problem**

Jean-Guy LORANGER¹

¹ Département de sciences économiques, Université de Montréal

Mars 1997

C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec) H3C 3J7

Télécopieur (FAX) (514) 343-7221
Courrier électronique (E-mail) : econo@ere.umontreal.ca

Résumé

La nouvelle solution qui est présentée ici respecte le cadre d'équilibre général statique qui est celui d'une longue tradition depuis Bortkiewicz en passant par Samuelson, Morishima et des « nouvelles solutions » proposées par Duménil-Foley-Lipietz. L'essentiel de la solution alternative présentée ici repose sur le remplacement de la détermination exogène du taux de salaire réel par la contrainte d'un taux de profit général moyen unique aux deux espaces, bien que le taux de profit par secteur reste différencié dans l'espace des valeurs travail social. Ce choix se fonde sur celui de Marx et qui est le seul choix compatible avec la satisfaction des deux contraintes d'égalité au niveau macro-économique. S'il est généralement admis sans discussion que la matrice des coefficients techniques de Léontief provient de flux physiques ou monétaires entre les diverses branches industrielles, on admettra aussi que le taux de profit général moyen peut être calculé à partir de ces flux globaux sans connaître les prix et les salaires. Le taux de profit moyen est donc déterminé en dehors du système des prix de production ou du système des valeurs au niveau micro, bien qu'il dépende des équilibres macro entre les deux espaces. D'où l'impossibilité du postulat d'indépendance de Samuelson entre les deux espaces et l'impossibilité que le taux de profit moyen calculé dans l'espace monétaire, soit différent de celui calculé dans l'espace des valeurs travail. Le postulat d'indépendance ne peut tenir qu'avec l'hypothèse d'un taux de salaire réel postulé dans l'équation des prix de production, hypothèse qui est remplacée dans l'approche alternative par la détermination concurrentielle du taux de salaire monétaire, comme les prix de tous les autres biens. Cette solution est une alternative à la solution de Marx car elle transforme tous les coûts, respecte les deux contraintes macro et un taux de profit moyen identique.

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate that, even if Marx's solution to the transformation problem can be modified, his basic conclusions remain valid. The proposed alternative solution which is presented here is based on the constraint of a common general profit rate in both spaces and a money wage level which will be determined simultaneously with prices. The justification for this choice is based on Marx's choice and is linked with the respect of the two macro equalities. Moreover, it is intrinsically linked with the simultaneous measurement of value in the monetary space as well as in the labor space, since the aggregate profit is measured by aggregate quantities empirically observed in money value but theoretically explained in labor magnitudes. It is not true that there can be two aggregate profit ratios. If such an assumption has been made in the past, namely by Samuelson, neo-ricardians and many others, it is because of the assumption of a constant real wage which acts as a predetermined constant like any other technical coefficients of the Leontief system. By replacing this assumption by a common aggregate profit rate, it is the money wage rate which is determined simultaneously with prices.

This solution diverges from the Duménil-Foley-Lipietz solution on the assumption of the money wage rate which is assumed here as an endogenous variable. The money wage level is determined by competition on the labor market. It is no more assumed to be fixed by the value of a subsistence basket, although it is still the case in the labor space. This is also quite different from the Morishima or the neo-ricardian solution, who have accepted the samuelsonian postulate of independence between the two spaces and which led them to the rejection of one of the two macro constraints. This solution is an alternative to the Marx solution because it fully transforms the cost of production and maintains the two macro constraints and a general profit rate between the monetary and the social spaces.

Key words: Transformation, value, price, surplus value, profit, wage, capital, labor, equilibrium
JEL classification: B-14, B-24, D-33, D-46, D-57, E-11, P-16.

INTRODUCTION¹

The debate around the transformation problem is more than a century old and it continues to fuel passionate discussions among marxian and neo-ricardian economists and, to a lesser extent, mainstream economists, namely since Samuelson (1971) outlined the independence between the two value systems². The latter views it as a good illustration of the redundancy of the old ricardian and marxian labor value theory while radical economists, who still believe in the validity of an alternative approach to marginal utility theory, periodically attempt to give an adequate answer to objections formulated against Marx's way of establishing the correspondence between labor values and prices. Moreover, the "new" solutions proposed by Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz (1982) or by the neo-ricardians like Morishima (1973) do not offer an adequate answer to Samuelson's critique. Some radical economists pursue the debate either by looking for a monetary solution in a static framework (Wolff-Roberts-Callari, 1982), either by proposing a dynamic approach (Shaikh 1977, Naples 1989, Freeman 1995, Freeman and Carchedi 1995). As was pointed out accurately by L. Gill (1996, p. 532) in quoting M. Desai ... "the debate does not seem to end and is viewed as a rare example of a problem which continues to produce new solutions or reformulation of old solutions in a new mathematical language ... [perhaps] there is more than a simple technical question." Indeed, since the turn of the century, neo-classical economists have attempted to demonstrate the irrelevance of Marx's theory of value.

Marx's solution to the transformation problem³ is based on the hypothesis of the non-transformation of the cost of production (constant and variable costs). It is a simplifying assumption which allows him to concentrate on the distribution of the surplus value and the profit rate in the labor value space and the monetary space. His main interest was to show that, although the profit rate can be different from one sector to another in the value space, the monetary profit rate in a competitive world must be the same in all sectors. The reason why the profit rate varies from one sector to another in the value space is caused by the differences in

¹ This article is a major revision of a first paper written on the new solution to the transformation problem which was published in the working paper 9625, Dept. of Economics, University of Montreal, under the title "The transformation problem: an alternative solution with an identical aggregate profit rate in the labor value space and the monetary space". The revised solution presented here is more formal and general.

² For a review of this debate, see in particular Dostaler (1979), Baud and Dostaler (1983), Enweil, Migale and Newman (1987-1990), Gill (1996), Lubiano (1973), Marodi and Freeman (1994), Samuelson (1971), Steedman (1981), Sweezy (1949). The authors who have contributed with new solutions to the debate are Dumenil (1980, 1983), Freeman and Carchedi (1995), Foley (1982, 1985), Lipietz (1982, 1993), Morishima (1973), Morishima and Sebn (1985), Napies (1989), Sebn (1987), Shaikh (1977), Staffa (1980), Wolff, Roberts and Callari (1982).

³ See in particular Marx (1967) Book III, part 1 and 2.

organic composition of capital due to unequal development between industries. It is also because some sectors do not produce any surplus value, such as the circulation sphere, in particular, the financial sector. Marx was well aware that the non transformation of the production costs was a simplifying assumption and did not consider that his conclusion would be substantially changed if that assumption were modified⁴.

His main conclusion is twofold: on a micro basis, prices differ from values -and this is why a labor value theory is relevant as an explanation- but on a macro basis, there are two macro constraints which ought to be satisfied if the principle of value conservation is to be preserved. The first constraint is that the sum of values must be equal to the sum of prices, i.e. the aggregate gross production must be equal in both monetary and abstract labor spaces. The second constraint is that the sum of profits must be equal to the sum of surplus values. Since the transformation problem is a static analysis similar to a general calculable equilibrium approach⁵, the same amount of value must be preserved in both spaces when one chooses a general equivalent form for measuring prices. There is more than one way of choosing that price standard:

- i) Choose a level of expenditure common to both spaces and one macro constraint. This is the Marx solution with the hypothesis of no-cost transformation.
- ii) Choose a level of wage common to both spaces and one macro constraint. This is the Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz solution (1980, 1982, 1982) of the money wage determined exogenously and fixed to the nominal wage in the value space.
- iii) Choose a level of real wage common to both spaces and one macro constraint. This is the Morishima solution (1973) of money wages determined simultaneously with prices. It is also the neo-ricardian solution based on Sraffa's composite commodity (1960) as a standard of value⁶.

⁴ Marx (1967), in Book III, chapter 11, p. 165, says: "Since the price of production may differ from the value of a commodity, it follows that the cost-price of a commodity containing the price of production of another commodity may also stand above or below that portion of its total value derived from the value of the means of production consumed by it... Our present analysis does not necessitate a closer examination of this point."

⁵ The dynamic approach put forward by M. Naples (1989) is an interesting approach which should be pursued. After all, even neoclassical economists have developed a dynamic general equilibrium approach; but I still consider that Marx's static equilibrium approach has to be addressed adequately in this debate.

⁶ For a survey of the neo-ricardian debate, see Mandel and Freeman (1984) and Steedman (1981). Also, a good criticism of the neo-ricardian approach is found in Naples (1989) and Shaikh (1982).

Only the Marx solution preserves the same general profit rate between the two spaces and satisfies the two macro constraints, although only one constraint is effective. The other two solutions generate a monetary profit rate which is not equal to the general profit rate in the abstract space. Worse still, the other two solutions cannot satisfy the two macro constraints so dear to Marx and his followers. This implies that, even if the macro constraint of value conservation is preserved, some monetary surplus value would be created or lost during the transformation process, an awkward situation, since the core of the labor theory of exploitation is to explain how the monetary surplus value is created in the value space. Samuelson's sharp criticism of Marx's theory of labor value would still remain valid since he pretends that there is no logical connection between the two spaces: the monetary values would be independent of the labor values and, hence, there is no point in having two value spaces to explain what is going on in the real world.

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate that, even if Marx's solution can be modified, his basic conclusions remain valid. It will be shown in particular by the three following points:

- i) Marx's solution requires the specification of one macro constraint despite that his results satisfy the two macro equalities and a common general profit rate. This conclusion is already well known in the literature, but needs to be restated since it is a very crucial point.
- ii) The Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz solution requires one macro constraint and satisfies the two macro equalities if the value added is chosen, although the general profit rate is different between the two spaces. The result is not valid anymore if the gross value is chosen as the macro constraint. The Morishima solution yields a similar result, even with the value added.
- iii) The new alternative solution which is presented here is based on the constraint of a common general profit rate in both spaces and a money wage level which will be determined simultaneously with prices and will produce results which satisfy the two macro constraints. This solution contradicts the neo-ricardian approach based on a composite commodity as a standard of value, since neo-ricardians argue that there exists a linear relation between profit and wage and, once one of them is specified, the other is automatically determined. Moreover, the average profit rate cannot be determined here in the monetary space only:

it is equal to the general profit rate determined in the abstract value space, and simultaneously excludes independence between the two spaces.

DEFINITION OF A TWO SECTOR ECONOMY

In order to illustrate the various solutions, a two sector economy will be chosen as an example. The value equations in the abstract space are written:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 x_1 &= c_1 + v_1 + p_1 \\ \theta_2 x_2 &= c_2 + v_2 + p_2\end{aligned}$$

It is assumed that the turnover of capital is unity for all types of capital c and v , that the exchange rate between one dollar and one unit of social labor is unity, that there exists different organic compositions of capital γ and exploitation rates e_i specific to each sector. Hence, the profit rate of each sector will be $r_i = e_i / (\gamma_i + 1)$, $i=1,2$. The unit value of commodity in each sector is θ_i while the output quantities are respectively x_1 and x_2 . The gross value measured in abstract labor units is $\theta_i x_i$. Since Marx defines the exploitation rate as the ratio of unnecessary labor to necessary labor for the production of value added, let μ_i be the necessary labor time for one hour of labor and $(1 - \mu_i)$ the unnecessary labor time. The relation between the wage rate and the exploitation rate in the labor value space is $\mu_i = (1 + e_i)^{-1}$. Assuming that sector 1 produces consumption goods, the real wage rate in the abstract space is μ_1 / θ_1 , $i=1,2$.

The equivalence of Marx's equations in the Leontief form is

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 x_1 &= a_{11} \theta_1 x_1 + a_{21} \theta_2 x_1 + l_1 x_1 \\ \theta_2 x_2 &= a_{12} \theta_1 x_2 + a_{22} \theta_2 x_2 + l_2 x_2\end{aligned}$$

The transposed matrix of coefficients $\{a_j\}$ has the usual meaning, i.e. a_j is the quantity of commodity j which is necessary for producing one unit of commodity i while the element l_i is the quantity of living labor necessary for producing one unit of commodity i . The identification of each component is based on the definition of gross value made by the two components constant capital and value added:

$$\begin{aligned}c_1 &= a_{11} \theta_1 x_1 + a_{21} \theta_2 x_1 \\ c_2 &= a_{12} \theta_1 x_2 + a_{22} \theta_2 x_2 \\ v_1 + p_1 &= l_1 x_1 \\ v_2 + p_2 &= l_2 x_2\end{aligned}$$

These last two equalities can be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned}v_1 + p_1 &= \mu_1 l_1 x_1 + (1 - \mu_1) l_1 x_1 = (1 + e_1)^{-1} l_1 x_1 + e_1 (1 + e_1)^{-1} l_1 x_1 \\ v_2 + p_2 &= \mu_2 l_2 x_2 + (1 - \mu_2) l_2 x_2 = (1 + e_2)^{-1} l_2 x_2 + e_2 (1 + e_2)^{-1} l_2 x_2\end{aligned}$$

The price of production equations can be written in the monetary space according to the marxian notation

$$\begin{aligned}p_1 x_1 &= c'_1 + v'_1 + \pi_1 \\ p_2 x_2 &= c'_2 + v'_2 + \pi_2\end{aligned}$$

When transcribed into the Leontief notation, these equations are

$$\begin{aligned}p_1 x_1 &= (1+r)(a_{11} p_1 x_1 + a_{21} p_2 x_1 + w_1 l_1 x_1) \\ p_2 x_2 &= (1+r)(a_{12} p_1 x_2 + a_{22} p_2 x_2 + w_2 l_2 x_2)\end{aligned}$$

The term by term identification is

$$\begin{aligned}c'_1 &= a_{11} p_1 x_1 + a_{21} p_2 x_1 \\ c'_2 &= a_{12} p_1 x_2 + a_{22} p_2 x_2 \\ v'_1 &= w_1 l_1 x_1 \\ v'_2 &= w_2 l_2 x_2 \\ \pi_1 &= r(a_{11} p_1 x_1 + a_{21} p_2 x_1 + w_1 l_1 x_1) \\ \pi_2 &= r(a_{12} p_1 x_2 + a_{22} p_2 x_2 + w_2 l_2 x_2)\end{aligned}$$

MARX'S SOLUTION

Marx's solution is based on the hypothesis of the non transformation of costs and on the macro constraint that the gross value in the social space must equal the gross value in the monetary space. Translating these hypotheses in the mathematical model, the implication is:

$$C_1 = C_1'V_1 = V_1$$

$$C_2 = C_2'V_2 = V_2$$

$$P_1X_1 + P_2X_2 = \theta_1X_1 + \theta_2X_2$$

It is immediately observed that Marx's second macro constraint, -the sum of profits is equal to the sum of surplus values- is already implied by the previous constraints. Indeed,

$$C_1 + V_1 + \pi_1 + C_2 + V_2 + \pi_2 = C_1 + V_1 + P_1 + C_2 + V_2 + P_2$$

Hence,

$$\pi_1 + \pi_2 = P_1 + P_2$$

Therefore, Marx's solution does not imply two independent macro constraints, but only one. In that respect, his solution is not different from the other "algebraic" solutions proposed by neo-ricardians, Morishima or by Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz. What is interesting, however, is that Marx's particular choice of assumption, -the non- transformation of costs- yields two remarkable results:

- i) the sum of profits equals the sum of surplus values;
- ii) the general or average rate of profit is the same in both spaces, although it is different on a sectoral basis in the social labor space.

This last result is easily deducted from the definition of the general profit rate in both spaces:

value space

$$r = \Sigma p_i / \Sigma (c_i + v_i)$$

monetary space

$$r = \Sigma \pi_i / \Sigma (c_i + v_i)$$

Since, by hypothesis, $\Sigma (c_i + v_i) = \Sigma (c_i + v_i)$ and, by deduction, $\Sigma \pi_i = \Sigma p_i$, it follows that $r = r$.

The monetary value table associated to Marx's solution is easily calculated after solving a system of three simultaneous equations:

$$(1) P_1X_1 = (1+r)(c_1 + v_1) = (1+r)b_1$$

$$(2) P_2X_2 = (1+r)(c_2 + v_2) = (1+r)b_2$$

$$(3) P_1X_1 + P_2X_2 = \theta_1X_1 + \theta_2X_2 = a$$

where b_1 and a are constant terms the value of which are determined in the abstract space the only endogeneous variables are P_1 , P_2 and r . The solution is

$$P_1 = (a/x_1)(1 - b_2/(b_1 + b_2))$$

$$P_2 = (a/x_2)(b_2/(b_1 + b_2))$$

$$r = (a - (b_1 + b_2))/(b_1 + b_2)$$

THE OTHER ALGEBRAIC SOLUTIONS

The rejection of the non transformation of costs assumption was judged by some marxists as a betrayal of Marx's insistence on the principle of conservation of value and that no monetary surplus value can be created or destroyed in the transformation process as long as it is analyzed in a static framework. The demonstration that the simultaneous solution put forward by the general equilibrium approach would require only one macro constraint did not please at all Marx's disciples since it lead to the rejection of one important constraint. For instance, if the Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz solution is calculated by standardizing with respect to the gross value instead of the value added, the sum of profits is no more equal to the sum of surplus values and their solution is not qualitatively different from Morishima's solution or from other neo-ricardian solutions. We can easily show that by choosing the value added constraint, the non- transformation of one

component will impose equality on the other component between the two spaces. Indeed, the definition of value added is

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{abstract space} & \\ va = v_1 + p_1 + v_2 + p_2 & \text{monetary space} \\ & va = v_1' + \pi_1 + v_2' + \pi_2 \end{array}$$

The non transformation of variable capital implies $v_1=v_1'$, and $v_2=v_2'$. Hence, $p_1+p_2=\pi_1+\pi_2$. In the Leontief form, these macro constraints are written as

$$va = l_1x_1 + l_2x_2 = w_1l_1x_1 + \pi_1 + w_2l_2x_2 + \pi_2$$

Hence,

$$l_1x_1 - w_1l_1x_1 + l_2x_2 - w_2l_2x_2 = \pi_1 + \pi_2$$

Since $\mu_1=w_1$ by assumption,

$$(1-\mu_1)l_1x_1 + (1-\mu_2)l_2x_2 = \pi_1 + \pi_2$$

or

$$p_1 + p_2 = \pi_1 + \pi_2$$

Therefore, the assumption of equality of value added between the two spaces is identical to the assumption of equality between the sum of surplus values and the sum of profits. It follows that if the gross value is chosen as the macro constraint between the two spaces, the sum of surplus values is not equal anymore to the sum of profits. Indeed,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{abstract space} & \\ gv = c_1 + v_1 + p_1 + c_2 + v_2 + p_2 & \text{monetary space} \\ & gv = c_1' + v_1' + \pi_1 + c_2' + v_2' + \pi_2 \end{array}$$

Assuming that $v_1=v_1'$, and $v_2=v_2'$, the macro constraint is reduced to

$$c_1 + c_2 + p_1 + p_2 = c_1' + c_2' + \pi_1 + \pi_2$$

Unless (c_1+c_2) is assumed equal to $(c_1'+c_2')$, (p_1+p_2) will be different from $(\pi_1+\pi_2)$. It necessarily follows that the measurement of the average monetary profit rate will diverge from the general profit rate calculated in the social space, because both the numerator and the denominator of the money profit rate will be different from those already established in the social space. But what would be the effect of imposing the same general profit rate on the now familiar algebraic solutions? This will be the topic of the next section.

THE GENERAL PROFIT RATE CONSTRAINT

Let us assume the Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz solution with the macro constraint of equalizing the gross value between the two spaces. The price equations are

$$\begin{aligned} p_1x_1 &= (1+r)(a_{11}p_1x_1 + a_{21}p_2x_1 + w_1l_1x_1) \\ p_2x_2 &= (1+r)(a_{12}p_1x_2 + a_{22}p_2x_2 + w_2l_2x_2) \\ p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 &= \theta_1x_1 + \theta_2x_2 = a. \end{aligned}$$

Since by hypothesis $w_1=\mu_1$ and $w_2=\mu_2$, these equations can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= (1+r)(a_{11} + a_{21}p_2 + \mu_1l_1) \\ p_2 &= (1+r)(a_{12}p_1 + a_{22}p_2 + \mu_2l_2) \\ p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 &= a. \end{aligned}$$

The endogenous variables are p_1 , p_2 and r . The solution is obtained by solving a non linear system of second degree equations with respect to one of the p and then find the corresponding value for r .

If the equality of the general or average profit rate is imposed between the two spaces, r becomes exogenous in the solution and the macro constraint of the equality of gross value between the two spaces is redundant. Indeed, the price equations becomes a two linear equation system which can be solved easily with respect to the two unknown prices. However, this solution is of no interest since none of Marx's macro constraints are satisfied.

Obviously, it is necessary to modify the assumption of an exogenous wage rate if one wishes to re-establish the relevance of Marx's macro constraints with the hypothesis of a common general profit rate to the two spaces. Hence, it will be assumed here that the wage rate in the monetary space is determined by competition as any other price and that it can be different from its value determined in the abstract space. Incidentally, it is assumed here, contrary to the neo-ricardian and marxist current of thought, that the wage rate is not fixed in the monetary space by a subsistence basket equivalent to the real wage, although such an hypothesis is currently admitted by Marx and a number of other people in the social labor space. One can find many quotations in Capital which can support this viewpoint. Take for instance the excerpt of Book III, as quoted by A. Freeman (1995, p. 60):

" The 20v can similarly diverge from this value, if the spending of wages on consumption involves commodities whose prices of production are different from their values. The worker must work for a greater or lesser amount of time in order to buy back these commodities (to replace them) and must therefore *perform more or less necessary labour* than would be needed if the price of production of their necessary means of subsistence did coincide with their values " (underlined by Freeman).

One now needs to specify a non homogeneous system of three equations. The first two equations will be the price equations and the last will be the equality of the gross value between the two spaces. We do not need to specify the other macro constraint because it is already implicitly contained in the equality of the general profit rate between the two spaces. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{abstract space} & & \text{monetary space} \\ r = \Sigma p_i / \Sigma (0 \cdot x_i - p_i) & = & r' = \Sigma x_i / \Sigma (p_i x_i - \pi_i) \\ 1/r = \Sigma \delta x_i / \Sigma p_i & = & 1/r' = \Sigma p_i x_i / \Sigma \pi_i \end{aligned}$$

if, by hypothesis, $\Sigma \delta x_i = \Sigma p_i x_i$, then $\Sigma p_i = \Sigma \pi_i$. Therefore, the general profit rate constraint, combined with one of the two macro constraints, gives an analogous result to Marx's no cost transformation assumption. A unique monetary wage rate can be assumed for both sectors or a differentiated wage rate can also be assumed provided that one of the two wage rates can be fixed exogenous and equal to the subsistence wage of the social or abstract value of its sector. After all, if there are only three equations, a unique solution requires only three unknown variables. If an n equation system is specified, one could either assume a homogeneous labor force and determine endogenously a unique monetary wage rate, or assume a homogeneous work force in $(n-1)$ sectors, determine endogenously the corresponding monetary wage rate and fix exogenously the wage rate in the other sector equal to the wage rate already determined in the social labor space for that sector, or any other combination, such as an $(n-k)$ sectors of homogeneous labor force the unique monetary wage rate of which would be determined endogenously with the other prices and, in the k other sectors, the monetary wage rate would be fixed exogenously equal to the wage rates already calculated in the social labor space. This new approach is a major change with respect to the Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz solution where it is assumed that it is the wage rate instead of the profit rate which is determined simultaneously with the production prices. The improvement is also felt in terms of calculus, since a linear solution is obtained instead of a non linear one, as simple as the one that was already found with the Marx solution. Hence, the new system is written as

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 x_1 & = d(a_{11} p_1 x_1 + a_{21} p_2 x_1 + w_1 l_1 x_1) \\ p_2 x_2 & = d(a_{12} p_1 x_2 + a_{22} p_2 x_2 + w_2 l_2 x_2) \\ p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2 & = a. \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume here that the labor force is heterogeneous and, consequently, the wage rate in the first sector is fixed to $w_1 = \mu_1$ and, in the second sector, it is determined endogenously with the other prices. Then, the system is written as

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 x_1 & = d(a_{11} p_1 x_1 + a_{21} p_2 x_1 + \mu_1 l_1 x_1) \\ p_2 x_2 & = d(a_{12} p_1 x_2 + a_{22} p_2 x_2 + w_2 l_2 x_2) \\ p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2 & = a. \end{aligned}$$

The endogenous variables are p_1 , p_2 and w_2 , while the other variables $d=(1+r)$, μ , and a are exogenous and fixed equal to their values already found in the social labor space.

A NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In order to illustrate the application of this new solution, a case already elaborated in another article will be used (Loranger, 1996). Tables 1 and 2 contain basic information of a two sector economy, where the measurement unit is one hour of social or abstract labor.

Table 1

sector	constant capital c	variable capital v	surplus value pl	total oX
I	3 240	2160	1 080	6 480
II	2 760	1380	2 070	6 210
Total	6 000	3540	3 150	12 690

It is assumed that the turnover of capital is unity for all types of capital, that the exchange rate between one dollar and one unit of social labor is unity, that sector I produces 4000 units of consumption goods and sector II 2000 units of production goods. It is also assumed that output of sector II is chosen as an input for both sectors and that output of sector I is chosen as an input of that sector in the proportion of 1/5. By inspecting the figures contained in the table, the following results can easily be deducted.

Table 2

sector	quantity x	unit value θ	exploitation rate e	organic rate γ	profit rate r	wage rate μ
I	4 000	1.82	0.5	1.5	0.20	.667
II	2 000	3.105	1.5	2.0	0.50	.40

The values of the technical coefficients of matrix A' and of the labor force vector l are

⁷ Since the turnover of capital is assumed equal to unity for all types of capital, $r=(\gamma-1)$.

$$A' = \begin{matrix} & \text{I} & \text{II} \\ \text{I} & 0.20 & 0.1565 & 0.81 \\ \text{II} & 0.00 & 0.4348 & 1.725 \end{matrix}$$

The average profit rate is $r = 3150/9540 = 0.3302$ and the gross value of production is $a = 12690$. The system is now written as

- (1) $p_1 = 1.3302 (20p_1 + 1565p_2 + 81) / 0.667$
- (2) $p_2 = 1.3302 (4348p_2 + 1.725w_2)$
- (3) $2p_1 + p_2 = 6.345^*$

After re-organizing terms, the system to be solved is

- (1) $.7340p_1 - 2.082p_2 = 0.7184$
- (2) $.4216p_2 - 2.2946w_2 = 0$
- (3) $2p_1 + p_2 = 6.345$

The solution is

$$p_1 = 1.773p_2 = 2.80w_2 = 0.514$$

The corresponding table for the monetary values is⁸

Table 3

sector	constant capital	variable capital	profits	total
I	3172	2180	1760	7092
II	2435	1773	1390	5598
Total	5607	3953	3 150	12 690

⁸ The macro constraint is $4000p_1 + 2000p_2 = 12690$. Dividing by 2000, one gets the previous equation.

⁹ The detailed calculus for the various entries in the table are

$$c_1' = (20(1.773) + 1565(2.80))/4000 = 3172$$

$$c_2' = (4348(2.80))/2000 = 2435$$

$$v_1' = (1.725(1.773))/2000 = 2180$$

$$v_2' = (1.725(5.14))/2000 = 1773$$

$$p_1 = 3302(3172 + 2180) = 1760$$

$$p_2 = 3302(2435 + 1773) = 1390$$

It is verified that the sum of prices is equal to the sum of social values 12690 and that the sum of profits is equal to the sum of surplus values 3150. The general profit rate is the same in both spaces and equal to .3302. Money prices and wages differ from their values on a sectorial basis:

abstract value	monetary value
$\theta_1 = 1.796$	$P_1 = 1.667$
$\theta_2 = 2.754$	$P_2 = 3.012$
$\mu_1 = .667$	$w_1 = .667$
$\mu_2 = .40$	$w_2 = .514$

CONCLUSION

The proposed new solution diverges from the Dumenil-Foley-Lipietz solution on the hypothesis of the money wage rate which is assumed here as an endogenous variable. The money wage level is determined by competition on the labor market. It is no more assumed to be fixed by the value of a subsistence basket of goods, although it may be so in the social labor space. If the labor force is assumed heterogeneous, one wage rate (which can be applied to many sectors) is determined endogenously, while the other (or many others) is fixed exogenously equal to the value already found in the abstract space. This result is in contradiction with the neo-ricardian approach which assumes that the monetary wage rate is fixed at the subsistence level and is a linear relation with the average profit rate. The real wage constraint in the Morishima solution is replaced by the average profit rate constraint simultaneously determined in the social labor space. This hypothesis is fundamental, since it imposes the interdependence between the two spaces, while the neo-ricardians assume Samuelson's hypothesis of independence between the two spaces and, therefore, argue only within the monetary space. This result is fully compatible with the Frobenius-Perron theorem which states that there is a unique profit rate associated with the dominant characteristic root of a matrix formed by all the technical coefficients of the system¹⁰. This solution is an alternative to the Marx solution because it fully transforms the cost of production and maintains the two macro constraints which link the two interdependent spaces. Hence, Samuelson's devastating critique is ill founded!

¹⁰ This statement may appear ambiguous since the Frobenius root comes from a matrix usually constructed in the monetary space with a unique profit rate for all sectors. It can be shown that it is possible to construct a different matrix in the labor space which would include an exploitation rate in addition to the other technical coefficients. The average profit rate is then a weighted average of the sectorial profit rates.

Bibliography

- BEAUD, M. and DOSTALER G. (1993), La pensée économique depuis Keynes, Paris, Seuil.
- BOHM-BAWERK, E. von 1884-89. Histoire critique des théories de l'intérêt du Capital, translated by J. Bernard, Paris, Giard et Brière (1902), 2 volumes.
- BOHM-BAWERK, E. von 1896. " Zum Abschluss des Marxschen Systems " in O. v Boenigk (ed), Festschriften für Karl Kautsky zur fünfundsiebzigsten Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages, Berlin, Haering.
- BORTKIEWICZ, L. von (1907), " Essai de rectification de la construction théorique fondamentale de Marx dans le troisième livre du Capital ", Cahiers de l'ISEA, 76 (janvier 1959), 20-36.
- DOSTALER, G. (1978), Valeur et prix. Histoire d'un débat, Grenoble, Montreal, Presses de l'Université de Grenoble-Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- DOSTALER, G. and Lagueur M. (1985), Un échiquier centenaire, Paris-Sainte-Foy, La Découverte-Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- DUMÉNIL, G. (1980), De la valeur aux prix de production, Paris, Economica.
- DUMÉNIL, G. (1983), " Beyond the transformation riddle: a labour theory of value ", Science and Society, vol. 47, no 4, 427-450.
- EATWELL, J., Milgate M. and Newman P. (dir) (1987-1990), The New Palgrave. Marxian Economics, London, Norton.
- FOLEY, D. (1982), " The value of money, the value of labour power and the marxian transformation problem ", Review of Radical Political Economics, vol. 14, no 2, 27-47.
- FOLEY, D. (1986), Understand and Inq Capital. Marx's Economic Theory, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press.
- FREEMAN, A. (1995) " Marx without equilibrium ", Capital and Class, 56, Summer 1995, 49-90.
- FREEMAN, A., Carchedi G. (eds) (1995), Marx and non equilibrium economics, London, Elgar
- GILL, L. (1996), Fondements et limites du capitalisme, Montreal, Boréal.
- GLEICHER, D. (1989), " Labour specialization and the transformation problem ", Review of Radical Political Economics, vol. 21, no 1-2, 75-96.
- LAIBMAN, D. (1973), " Value and prices of production: the political economy of the transformation problem ", Science and Society, vol. 4, 404-436.
- LIPIETZ, A. (1982), " The so-called transformation problem revisited ", Journal of Economic Theory, vol. 6, no 1, 59-88.
- LIPIETZ, A. (1983), Le monde enchanté : de la valeur à l'envol inflationniste, Paris, La Découverte/Maspéro.

LORANGER, J.G. (1996), "The transformation problem: an alternative solution with an identical aggregate profit rate in the labor value space and the monetary space", cahier 9625, Département de sciences économiques, Université de Montréal.

MANDEL, E. and Freeman A. (dir) (1984), Ricardo, Marx, Sraffa, London, Verso.

MARX, K. (1867), Capital, vol. I-III, New-York, International Publishers.

NAPLES, M. (1989), "A radical economic revision of the transformation problem", Review of Radical Political Economics, vol. 21, no 1-2, 137-158.

MORISHIMA, M. and Seton F. (1961), "Aggregation in Leontief matrices and the labour theory of value", Econometrica, vol. 29, no 2, 203-220.

MORISHIMA, M. (1973), Marx's Economics, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ROBINSON, J. (1942), An Essay on Marxian Economics, London, Macmillan.

ROBINSON, J. (1950), "The labour theory of value", Economic Journal, reprinted in Collected Economic Papers, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, vol. 1, 146-151.

SAMUELSON, P.A. (1957), "Wages and interest: a modern dissection of marxian economic models", American Economic Review, vol. 47, no 6, 884-912.

SAMUELSON, P.A. (1971), "Understanding the marxian notion of exploitation: a summary of the so-called transformation problem between marxian values and the competitive prices", Journal of Economic Literature, vol. 9, no 2, 399-431.

SETON, F. (1957), "the transformation problem", Review of Economic Studies, vol. 24, 149-160.

SHAIKH, A. (1977), "Marx's theory of value and the transformation problem", in J. Schwartz (dir), The Subtle anatomy of Capitalism, 106-139.

SHAIKH, A. (1977), "Marx's theory of value and the transformation problem", in The Subtle Anatomy of Capitalism, J. Schwartz, ed., 106-139.

SHAIKH, A. (1982), "Neo-ricardian economics: a wealth of algebra, a poverty of theory", Review of Radical Political Economics, vol. 14, no 2, 67-83.

SRAFFA, P. (1960), Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

STEEDMAN, I. (dir) (1981), The Value Controversy, London, Verso and New Left Books.

SWEETZ, P.M. (dir) (1949), Karl Marx and the Close of His System by Eugen Bohm-Bawerk and Bohm-Bawerk's Criticism of Marx by Rudolf Hilferding, Clifton, A.M. Kelly.

WOLFF, R., Roberts B. and Callari A. (1995), "Marx's (not Ricardo) * transformation problem": a radical conceptualization", History of Political Economy, 14, no 4, 564-582.

Université de Montréal
Département de sciences économiques
Centre de documentation
C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec)
H3C 3J7

Cahiers de recherche (Discussion papers)
1996 à aujourd'hui (1996 to date)

Si vous désirez obtenir un exemplaire, vous n'avez qu'à faire parvenir votre demande et votre paiement (5 \$ l'unité) à l'adresse ci-haut mentionnée. / To obtain a copy (\$ 5 each), please send your request and prepayment to the above-mentioned address.

9601 : Deaton, Angus et Serena Ng, "Parametric and Nonparametric Approaches to Price and Tax Reform", janvier 1996, 28 pages.

9602 : Lévy-Garboua, Louis et Claude Montmarquette, "Cognition in Seemingly riskless Choices and Judgments", janvier 1996, 29 pages.

9603 : Gonzalez, Jesus et Serena Ng, "A Synthetic Framework for Analyzing the Dynamic Effects of Permanent and Transitory Shocks", mars 1996, 42 pages.

9604 : Boyer, Marcel et Jean-Jacques Laffont, "Toward a Political Theory of Environmental Policy", avril 1996, 42 pages.

9605 : Ai, Chunrong, Jean-Louis Arcand et François Ethier, "Moral Hazard and Marshallian Inefficiency: Evidence from Tunisia", avril 1996, 38 pages.

9606 : Mercenier, Jean et Erinc Yeldan, "How Prescribed Policy can Mislead when Data are Defective: A Follow-up to Srinivasan (1994) Using General Equilibrium", avril 1996, 29 pages.

9607 : Fortin, Nicole M. et Thomas Lemieux, "Rank Regressions, Wage Distributions, and the Gender GAP", avril 1996, 45 pages.

9608 : Fortin, Nicole M. et Thomas Lemieux, "Labor Market Institutions and Gender Differences in Wage Inequality", avril 1996, 13 pages.

9609 : S. Hostken, Daniel et David N. Margolis, "The Efficiency of Collective Bargaining in Public Schools", mai 1996, 54 pages.

9610 : Dionne, Georges et Tahar Mounaif, "Investment Under Demand Uncertainty: the Newsboy Problem Revisited", mai 1996, 18 pages.

9611 : Perron, Pierre et Serena Ng, "An Autoregressive Spectral Density Estimator at Frequency Zero for Nonstationary Tesis", juin 1996, 44 pages.

9612 : Ghyssels, Eric et Serena Ng, "A Semi-Parametric Factor Model for Interest Rates", juillet 1996, 29 pages.

9613 : Ghyssels, Eric, Andrew Harvey et Eric Renault, "Stochastic Volatility", juillet 1996, 70 pages.

9614 : Kollmann, Robert, "The Exchange Rate in a Dynamic-Optimizing Current Account Model with Nominal Rigidities: A Quantitative Investigation", juillet 1996, 54 pages.

- 9615 : Bosserts, Peter, Eric Chysets et Christian Gourierrou, "Arbitrage-Based Pricing when Volatility is Stochastic", juillet 1996, 58 pages.
- 9616 : Blum, U. et L. Dudley, "The Rise and Decline of the East German Economy, 1949-1989", août 1996, 33 pages.
- 9617 : Allard, Marie, Camille Brousard et Christian Gourierrou, "Actifs financiers et théorie de la consommation", juillet 1996, 50 pages.
- 9618 : Tremblay, Rodrigue, "La mobilité internationale des facteurs de production en situation de chômage et de libre-échange commercial : une revue de la problématique", juillet 1996, 41 pages.
- 9619 : Dudley, L., "The Rationality of Revolution", août 1996, 33 pages.
- 9620 : Dudley, L., "Communications and Economic Growth", août 1996, 34 pages.
- 9621 : Abdelhakak, T. et A. Martens, "Macroclousures in Computable General Equilibrium Models : A Probabilistic Treatment with an Application to Morocco", août 1996, 30 pages.
- 9622 : Proulx, Pierre-Paul, "La mondialisation de l'économie et le rôle de l'État", septembre 1996, 22 pages.
- 9623 : Proulx, Pierre-Paul, "Economic Integration in North America : Formal, Informal and Spatial Aspects", 22 pages.
- 9624 : Sprumont, Yves, "Ordinal cost sharing", octobre 1996, 40 pages.
- 9625 : Loranger, Jean-Guy, "The transformation problem : an alternative solution with an identical aggregate profit rate in the labor value space and the monetary space", octobre 1996, 18 pages.
- 9626 : Dausereau, Patrice, Martens, André and Schnabip, Hermann, "Production linkages between Informal and Formal Activities considering domestic and Imported Inputs : an Application of the minimal-flow-analysis Method to Senegal", novembre 1996, 28 pages.
- 9627 : Sprumont, Yves, "Equal Factor Equivalence in Economies with Multiple Public Goods", novembre 1996, 26 pages.
- 9628 : Amigues, Jean-Pierre, Pascal Favard, Gérard Gaudet et Michel Moreaux, "On the Optimal Order of Natural Resource Use When the Capacity of the Inexhaustible Substitute is Limited", décembre 1996, 18 pages.
- 9701 : Akitoby, Bernardin, "Termes de l'échange endogènes et cycles économiques réels : une application à la Côte-D'Ivoire", février 1997, 38 pages.
- 9702 : Sprumont, Yves, "A Note on Ordinarily Equivalent Pareto Surfaces", mars 1997, 14 pages.
- 9703 : Loranger, Jean-Guy, "The Wage Rate and the Profit Rate in the Price of Production Equation: a New Solution to an Old Problem", mars 1997, 18 pages.